

(1696) Proposal to conserve the name *Senecio leucanthemifolius* against *S. varicosus* (Compositae)

Bertil Nordenstam

Department of Phanerogamic Botany, Swedish Museum of Natural History, P. O. Box 50007, SE-104 05 Stockholm, Sweden. bertil.nordenstam@nrm.se

- (1696) *Senecio leucanthemifolius* Poir., Voy. Barbarie 2: 28. 1789 [Dicot.: Comp.], nom. cons. prop.
Lectotypus (hic designatus): “*Senecio leucanthemifolius*. Cote de Barbarie”, Poiret (P-LAM).
(=) *Senecio varicosus* L. f., Dec. Pl. Horti Upsal. 1: 9. Apr-Jun 1762, nom. rej. prop.
Lectotypus (hic designatus): Herb. Linnaeus No. 996.25 (LINN).

Senecio leucanthemifolius Poir. is an annual species of *Senecio* sect. *Senecio*. As usually defined, e.g., in the *Flora Europaea* (Chater & Walters in Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 4: 203–204. 1976), the species is polymorphic and fairly widely distributed in the western and central Mediterranean region and mainly in coastal regions, also occurring in southern Portugal. It was originally described from North Africa, Algeria, “dans les prairies sèche pres de Bonne” (Poiret, l.c.). Original material collected by Poiret is present in P-LAM, “Cote de Barbarie”, and in G, “Ex Numidia” (specimen figured as “isotype” by Jeanmonod in Candollea 58: Fig. 6. 2003). “Barbarie” and “Numidia” both roughly correspond to present-day Algeria. The specimen in P-LAM is here selected as lectotype, and the G specimen is a probable ‘isolectotype’.

The circumscription of this species is notoriously difficult. Some authors (e.g., Coste, Fl. Descr. France 2: 303. 1903; Gamisans in Candollea 32: 70–71. 1977; Jeanmonod, l.c.: 429–459) prefer a narrow circumscription, whereas others have adopted a broader concept (e.g., Fiori, Fl. Italia: 590–591. 1927; Quezel & Santa, Nouv. fl. Algérie 2: 961. 1963; Chater & Walters, l.c.; Zangheri, Fl. Ital. 1: 728–729. 1976; Fournier, Quatre fl. France ed. 2, 1: 1471–1472. 1977; Alexander in Notes Roy. Bot. Gard. Edinburgh 37: 387. 1979; Pignatti, Fl. Ital. 3: 134. 1982; Guinochet & Vilmorin, Fl. France 4: 1471–1472. 1982; Alavi, Fl. Libya 107: 188–190. 1983; Blanca in Valdés & al., Cat. Pl. Vasc. N. Maroc 2: 668. 2002; Greuter in Willdenowia 33: 247. 2003).

A number of heterotypic taxa are often included in *S. leucanthemifolius* Poir. (1789), either as infraspecific taxa (subsp. or var.) or as pure junior synonyms. These include *S. humilis* Desf. (1799), *S. crassifolius* Willd. (1803), *S. vernus* Biv. (1806), *S. marmorae* Moris (1828), *S. pygmaeus* DC. (1838), *S. incrassatus* Guss. (1844), *S. atlanticus* Boiss. & Reut. (1852, non Coss. 1856), *S. rodriguezii* Willk. ex J. J. Rodr. (1874), *S. fradinii* Pomel (1874), *S. mauritanicus* Pomel (1874), *S. pinguiculus* Pomel (1874), *S. apulus*

Ten. ex Nyman (1879), *S. cyrenaicus* (E. A. Durand & Barratte) Pamp. (1918), *S. kebdanicus* Maire & Sennen (1935), *S. caroli-malyi* Horvatic (1956), and *S. transiens* (Rouy) Jeanm. (2003). Some authors (Alexander l.c., Greuter l.c.) go so far as to include *S. vernalis* Waldst. & Kit. (1800) as a variety or subspecies of *S. leucanthemifolius*. This traces to Chater & Walters (l.c.), who pointed to the difficulty of clearly distinguishing *S. leucanthemifolius* from some populations of *S. vernalis*. The latter has an original range in eastern and east-central Europe, from where it has spread since the 19th century into many countries of Europe, including in Fennoscandia.

Senecio varicosus L. f. was described, in the *Decas Prima Plantarum Rariorum Horti Upsaliensis* (1762), from plants cultivated in *Hortus Upsaliensis*, the botanical garden in Uppsala, where the younger Linnaeus held the position as *Botanices Demonstrator* since 1759. The plants of the *Decas* originated from different parts of the world. In the case of *S. varicosus* the origin was stated as “Habitat in Aegypto”, and it was grown in Uppsala from seeds provided by D. D. Roqvè (D. D. not being initials, but certainly meaning Divino Doctore). No biographical data on this person (perhaps Roqué?) are known to me. He probably visited Egypt, since he is cited in the same publication also under *Zygophyllum album* as supplier of material.

Senecio varicosus L. f. was adopted in Linnaeus’s *Species Plantarum* ed. 2 (1763) and later editions of this work as well as *Systema Naturae* ed. 12 (1767). The name continued to be cited up to Willdenow’s *Species Plantarum* (1803), but in Candolle’s *Prodromus* Vol. 6 (1838) it was listed among the ‘*Seneciones non satis noti*’. From then on it seems to have fallen into oblivion.

There is no *Senecio* in Egypt that even remotely matches the description and plate of *S. varicosus*, and the identity of the plant has remained enigmatic until now. However, in my opinion it matches perfectly the Balearic endemic taxon known as *S. rodriguezii* Willk. ex J. J. Rodr. (in Anales Soc. Esp. Hist. Nat. 3: 36. 1874). In habit and leaf-shape as described and depicted there is a very good agreement. Many details in the quite exhaustive description fit very well with *S. rodriguezii*, as I know it from excursions in Mallorca and in comparison with herbarium material.

Some of the important characteristics of *S. rodriguezii* are the hairiness of the stem, the shape and margins of the leaves and their fleshy texture with a bullate-pustulate upper surface (hence the epithet *varicosus*) and purplish-red lower side, the whitish or pinkish-purple recurved rays with a

deeper purple lower side, and the purple disc-florets with yellow stamens and styles. Of minor importance is the erroneous description of the fruits of *S. varicosus* as glabrous. Linnaeus filius remarks that the latter are immature, and the indumentum could therefore easily have been overlooked.

Pink or purplish rays are unusual in annual *Senecio* of the Northern hemisphere. Apart from *S. rodriguezii* only the two montane species *S. hoggariensis* Batt. & Trab. (Hoggar, Tibesti, G. Elba & Sinai) and *S. rosinae* Gamisans (very locally endemic in Corsica), and perhaps occasional specimens of *S. leucanthemifolius* have pink to purplish rays, but they all differ from *S. rodriguezii* by the constantly yellow disc-florets. The identity of *S. varicosus* with *S. rodriguezii* is firmly established.

For typification of *S. varicosus* two specimens in the Linnaean Herbarium in London have to be considered, viz. LINN 996: 25 & 26. The former specimen is annotated "HU" (*— Hortus Upsaliensis*) and at the bottom of the sheet "*Senecio varicosus*". Although Savage (Cat. Linn. Herb.: 150.1945) indicates that the name was written by Linnaeus, it was according to my interpretation in fact written by Linnaeus filius. This specimen agrees well with the original description and illustration of *S. varicosus*. The other specimen, LINN 996: 26 is annotated by the older Linnaeus: "HU", "aegypta" and "varicosus". It does not agree with the description and figure in Linnaeus fil. (1762) and certainly represents another taxon (probably *S. aegyptius* L., syn. *S. belbeysius* Del.). Since the specimen LINN 996: 25 agrees well with the protologue and is annotated by Linnaeus filius, it is here selected as lectotype of *Senecio varicosus*. Since this specimen also unequivocally matches *S. rodriguezii*, the correct name for that taxon is accordingly *S. varicosus*.

If we regard *S. varicosus* (syn. *S. rodriguezii*) as a species distinct from *S. leucanthemifolius*, as I and some other authors (Alexander, l.c.: 408; Bonafé Barcelo, Fl. Mallorca 4: 264. 1980; Bonner, Pl. Balearic Isl.: 112. 1985) are inclined to do, there are no further complications apart from loss of the name *S. rodriguezii*. However, many authors (e.g., Chater & Walters, l.c.; Beckett, Wild Fl. Majorca, Minorca & Ibiza. 1988 & Ill. Fl. Mallorca. 1993; Bolòs & al., Fl. Man. Països Catalans. 1990; Bolòs & Vigo, Fl. Països Catalans: 3. 1996) include *S. rodriguezii* in the polymorphic *S. leucanthemifolius* Poir., usually as a subspecies, the correct name of which appears to be subsp. *rodriguezii* (Willk. ex J. J. Rodr.) O. Bolòs & Vigo (in Collect. Bot. 17: 91. 1988). If this view on its taxonomic rank and position is adopted without further action, *S. leucanthemifolius* would need to be synonymized under the earlier *S. varicosus*, and a large number of new combinations of infraspecific taxa presently recognized under *S. leucanthemifolius* would be necessary under *S. varicosus*.

In the interest of nomenclatural stability, conservation of *S. leucanthemifolius* Poir. against *S. varicosus* L. f. is here proposed. Usage of the well-known name *S. leucanthemifolius* will be preserved and new combinations avoided for its numerous infraspecific taxa. For those, like myself, who prefer to treat the taxon formerly known as *S. rodriguezii* Willk. ex J. J. Rodr. as a species distinct from *S.*

leucanthemifolius Poir., the name *S. varicosus* will remain available.

An alternative solution to the displacement of names created by lectotypification of *S. varicosus* would be to propose outright rejection of this name under ICBN Art. 56 (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 138. 2000). If accepted this would prevent *S. varicosus* from being used at all, even for the much later and clearly synonymous *S. rodriguezii*. This would seem unjustified and unfair in view of the availability of a Linnaean name for a taxon accurately described and illustrated by Linnaeus filius and the presence of an unequivocal lectotype. My proposed solution represents a compromise between a strict application of the rule of priority and a complete avoidance of nomenclatural disruption, thereby preserving *S. varicosus* in the sense originally intended by Linnaeus filius for a restricted taxon, yet avoiding disruption of the well-known name *S. leucanthemifolius*.

Acknowledgements

My thanks are due to Charlie Jarvis, Mark Spencer, John McNeill and John Wiersema for useful and insightful nomenclatural and editorial comments.