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**Abstract:** The nomenclatural consequences of some recently published new combinations and replacement names under *Eulophia* R.Br. (Orchidaceae) are discussed with a suggestion to follow the existing usage of these name under *Geodorum* Andrews until their nomenclatural status is resolved in the future.
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**Introduction**

Chase *et al*. (2021b) proposed to conserve the name *Eulophia* R.Br. (Orchidaceae: Eulophiinae) against the name *Geodorum* Andrews. But even before the proposal was published, and naturally also much before the possibility of effective publication by approval of the General Committee (see Art. 14.15, Turland *et al*., 2018), Chase *et al*. (2021a) published thirty new combinations (*comb. nov.*) and five replacement names/new names (*nom. nov.*) in *Eulophia* as though that name had priority over the earlier validly published and legitimate name *Geodorum*. Because Chase *et al*. (2021a) explicitly cited *Geodorum* Andrews (1811) as a synonym of *Eulophia* R.Br. (1821), albeit mistakenly referring to the latter as “nom. cons.”, all the species names that they included under *Eulophia* are incorrect, including the existing names *E. ambongensis* Schltr., *E. schlechteri* H. Perrier and *E. tristis* (L.f.) Spreng., for which, given the authors accepted generic synonymy, new combinations in *Geodorum* should have been provided under Art. 11.4. The thirty new combinations and the five replacement names published in *Eulophia* by Chase *et al*. (2021a) are nomenclaturally incorrect as, under Chase *et al*.’s taxonomic treatment they should have been provided with species names in *Geodorum*. Although nomenclaturally incorrect, the new combinations are not illegitimate under Art. 52.4 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland *et al*., 2018) and would become the correct names if and when the conservation proposal is accepted. Though there is no doubt that these replacement names are incorrect, it is a matter of argument whether they are illegitimate as per the definition and example provided in the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland *et al*., 2018). Further, it is uncertain whether the replacement names would be illegitimate or legitimate as there is no provision in the *Code* to protect replacement names in such a way (Art. 6.4). So, for example, *Eulophia diffusiflora* M.W.Chase, Kumar & Schuit. (Chase *et al*.., 2021a), with the replaced synonym *Geodorum laxiflorum* Griff., was nomenclaturally not correct when published as a replacement name (*nom. nov.*) because *Eulophia* was not conserved against *Geodorum* when *E. diffusiflora* was published. Moreover, the name would not become correct/legitimate under the current provisions of the *Code*, notably Art. 6.4 (Turland *et al*., 2018), even if the conservation proposal of *Eulophia* against *Geodorum* is accepted in the future. Though the replacement names (*Eulophia bosseriana* M.W.Chase & Schuit., *E. chrysea* M.W.Chase & Schuit., *E. diffusiflora*, *E. exigua* M.W.Chase, Kumar & Schuit. and *E. hermansiana* M.W.Chase & Schuit) are incorrect/ illegitimate, they are validly published and therefore, they preclude later publication of the
same names. Therefore, new epithets would be needed for correct/legitimate replacement names to be published if the conservation of Eulophia becomes effective and these would only date to their actual publication. Though these names are presently treated as correct names in two recent publications (Chakraborty et al., 2021; Ormerod et al., 2022) and also on several websites, including POWO (2023), IPNI (2023), they are actually incorrect/illegitimate names. Hence, it is suggested to use the name Geodorum laxiflorum Griff. and G. siamense Rolfe ex Downie instead of Eulophia diffusiflora and E. exigua respectively, and to treat the names Eulophiella longibracteata Hermans & P.J.Cribb, Oeceoclades aureaLoubr., O. longebracteata Bosser & Morat under Geodorum by making new combinations or by using these names as such until their nomenclatural status is fixed in the future.

Therefore, one should abide by Rec. 14A.1 (Turland et al., 2018) which advises (though non-binding) to follow the existing usage of names as far as possible when a proposal for the conservation (Art. 14) or protection (Art. F.2) of a name has been referred to the appropriate specialist committee for study pending the General Committee’s recommendation on the proposal. Similarly, Rec. 56A.1 (Turland et al., 2018) suggests to follow the existing usage of a name as far as possible when a proposal for the rejection of a name under Art. 56 or F.7 has been referred to the appropriate specialist committee for study pending the General Committee’s recommendation on the proposal.
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