Validation of two previously described species of *Annesorhiza*

Two species of *Annesorhiza*, *A. laticostata* Magee and *A. radiata* Magee, are here validated with reference to the previously and effectively published descriptions and diagnoses.
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**Introduction**

*Annesorhiza* Cham. & Schltdl. (Apiaceae) is a South African endemic genus centred in the Greater Cape Floristic Region (Magee et al. 2012; Magee 2013; Van Wyk et al. 2013). Twelve species were recognised in the last revision of the genus by Tilney and Van Wyk (2001), but the number of species has since nearly doubled to 22 species (Magee & Manning 2010; Van Wyk & Tilney, 2010; Magee et al. 2011; Magee 2015). A large addition to the genus came as a result of the re-assessments of the polymorphic genus *Peucedanum* L. in Africa (Winter et al. 2008). The African species of *Peucedanum* have been shown to be only distantly related to the type of the genus and subsequently accommodated in seven genera (Winter et al. 2008; Magee et al. 2011). Two of these, *Peucedanum filicaule* (Eckl. & Zeyh.) B-E. van Wyk & Tilney and *P. triternatum* Eckl. & Zeyh., together with five undescribed but closely related species, were as such transferred to *Annesorhiza* by Magee et al. (2011) based on morphological (fruit with a narrow commissure and leaves hysteranthous (Vessio 2001)) as well as molecular sequence data (Calviño et al. 2006). The validity of two of the five new species described within the *Annesorhiza triternata* group by Magee et al. (2011) have since been brought into question. The type collection for both species were made when the plants were in their reproductive phase with inflorescences and fruit evident, but vegetatively sterile. Subsequently, leaf material was added to these collections in the spring of the same year and indicated as such on the specimen label. In the type citation of these two species (Magee et al. 2011) more than one gathering was inadvertently indicated by the inclusion of a statement that the leaf collections had been added to the reproductive collections, without specifically excluding them, rendering the names invalid (ICBN Art. 40.2, Turland et al. 2018). These two names are therefore validated here with reference to the previously and effectively published descriptions and diagnoses (ICBN Art. 38.1, Turland et al. 2018).
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