

Missouri Bot. Gard. 52: 509. 1966), Liogier (Fl. Cuba Supl.: 105. 1969), Fournet (Fl. Guadeloupe & Martinique: 1514. 1978), Fryxell (Rev. Amer. *Hibiscus* sect. *Bombicella*: 6–7. 1980; in Syst. Bot. Monogr. 25: 218. 1988; in Howard, Fl. Lesser Antill. 5: 227. 1989; in McVaugh, Fl. Novo-Galic. 3: 219. 2001; in Stevens & al., Fl. Nicaragua 2: 1305. 2001), and Liogier (Descr. Fl. Puerto Rico 3: 142. 1994).

(4) Tacitly excluded in favor of *H. phoeniceus*, e.g., Sweet (Hort. Brit.: 51. 1827), Grisebach (Fl. Brit. W. I.: 85. 1859; Cat. Pl. Cub.: 28. 1866), Sauvalle (in Anales Acad. Ci. Méd. Habana 5: 240. 1868; Fl. Cubana: 13. 1873), Gómez de la Maza (in Anales Soc. Esp. Hist. Nat. 19: 220. 1890), Martínez (Fl. Estado México 2: 101. 1953–1972), Cervantes (Fam. Malvac. Estado Jalisco, México: 154. 1986), and Fryxell (Fl. Ecuad. 44: 53. 1992).

(5) Transferred to *Pavonia* as *Pavonia brasiliensis* (L.) Spreng. by Sprengel (Syst. Veg. 3: 100. 1826) without

explanation, later followed by Steudel (Nomencl. Bot., ed. 2, 2: 758. 1841).

(6) Treated as a synonym of *H. phoeniceus* Jacq., without explanation of its priority over this name, e.g., Dorr & Berendsohn (in Cuscutlania 1(10): 4. 1997) and Martin & al. (Gentry's Rio Mayo Plants: 391. 1998).

The continued use of the name *Hibiscus brasiliensis* L. will only perpetuate the confusion and misapplication that has been engendered by its prior use, as described above. Linnaeus's intent concerning the application of *H. brasiliensis* has never been satisfactorily ascertained, and now a “disadvantageous nomenclatural change” (Art. 56.1) in a widespread neotropical species most commonly known as *H. phoeniceus* would result from its only possible lectotypification. As a result, nomenclatural stability will be best furthered by accepting this proposal to formally reject the name.

## (1781) Proposal to reject the name *Androsace carnea* (Primulaceae)

Christopher J. Dixon & Gerald M. Schneeweiss

Department of Biogeography and Botanical Garden, University of Vienna, Rennweg 14, 1030 Vienna, Austria. gerald.schneeweiss@univie.ac.at (author for correspondence)

(1781) *Androsace carnea* L., Sp. Pl.: 142. 1 Mai 1753 [Dicot.: Primul.], nom. utique rej. prop. Typus: Herb. Burser XVI(1): 75 (UPS).

The name *Androsace carnea* L. has been widely used since its publication in 1753, but its application is complicated by confusing and often incorrect taxon delimitation. As an introduction, our current understanding of the relationships of the relevant taxa, based on extensive morphological and molecular investigations, needs to be presented (with the known distribution areas in parentheses; taxa considered at some point to be *A. carnea* L. are underlined): (1) *A. adfinis* group: *A. adfinis* Biroli subsp. *adfinis*, *A. adfinis* subsp. *brigantiaca* (Jord. & Fourr.) Kress, *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula* (Jord. & Fourr.) Kress (all SW Alps), *A. cantabrica* (Losa & P. Monts.) Kress (Cordillera Cantábrica); (2) *A. halleri* group: *A. halleri* L. s.str. (Cordillera Cantábrica, Massif Central, Vosges), *A. spec. nov.* (= *A. halleri* p. pte.; eastern Pyrenees), *A. laggeri* A. Huet (central Pyrenees), *A. pyrenaica* Lam. (central Pyrenees), *A. riojana* A. Segura (Sierra de la Demanda).

As explained by Kress (Primulaceen-Studien 6 (1–2): 47. 1984), the problems connected with *A. carnea* begin with Linnaeus himself. A detailed account of these problems and the choice of lectotype were given in Kress (l.c.). Briefly, considering the information included in the protologue, *A. carnea* comprises elements of *A. laggeri*, *A. halleri*, *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula*, and even *A. lactea* L. As the lectotype for this obviously heterogeneous taxon, Kress (l.c.)

chose a specimen in Burser's *Hortus Siccus* (XVI (1): 75, UPS), which is identifiable as *A. laggeri*. This specimen was chosen because (1) it is an unambiguously determinable specimen, (2) it was seen by Linnaeus at the time of his describing *A. carnea*, (3) it was the basis for Linnaeus's interpretation of one of the synonyms of *A. carnea* (“*Sedum alpinum, angustissimo folio, flore carneo*”) by C. Bauhin (Pinax: 284. 1623; 1671), (4) its indicated provenance (“In Pyrenæis”) agrees with the first part of the distribution of *A. carnea* given by Linnaeus (“in alpinis Pyrenæis”), and (5) it belongs to the same taxon as the one in the Linnean herbarium (LINN 197/12). This lectotype disagrees with the last part of the nomen specificum legitimum (“umbella involucris brevior”), but it must be questioned whether this description, which was later altered by Linnaeus, is actually based on any specimen or observation.

Although according to this lectotypification the name *Androsace carnea* has to replace *A. laggeri*, most authors have used it for other taxa: (1) *A. halleri* s.str.: pro *A. carnea* [var.] α [*carnea*] by de Candolle (Fl. Franç. 3: 442. 1805/1815; 6: 383. 1815); pro *A. carnea* subsp. *carnea* by Jovet & Vilmorin (Fl. Descr. Illustr. France l'abbé H. Coste, Quatr. suppl.: 354. 1977); (2) *A. halleri* s.str. plus *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula*: pro *A. carnea* by Reichenbach (Icon. Fl. Germ. Helv. 17: 48. 1855); pro *A. carnea* f. *typica* [nomen invalidum] by Knuth (in Engler, Das Pflanzenreich IV. 237 [Heft 22]: 195. 1905); (3) *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula*: pro *A. carnea* by Rouy (Fl. France 10: 210. 1908); pro *A. carnea* var. *typica* [nomen invalidum] by Lüdi (in Hegi, Illustr. Fl. Mitteleuropa

5(3): 1808. 1927); pro *A. carnea* subsp. *carnea* by Kress (in Hegi, *Illustr. Fl. Mitteleuropa*, ed. 3, 5(3): 2250a. 1967), by Ferguson (in *Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 64: 376. 1972, in Tutin & al., *Fl. Europ.* 3: 21–22. 1972), and by Heß & al. (*Fl. Schweiz* 2: 933. 1970); and (4) for all pink flowering species, viz. *A. halleri* s.l., *A. laggeri* and *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula*: by Fournier (*Quat. Fl. France*: 712–713. 1937), by Favarger (in Guinocet & Vilmorin, *Fl. France*: 359. 1973), by Pignatti (*Fl. Italia* 2: 280. 1982), by Saule (*Grande Fl. Ill. Pyrénées*: 156. 1991) and by Chas (*Atlas Fl. Hautes-Alpes*: 381. 1994). Jordan & Fourreau (*Breviar. Plant. Nov.* 2: 104–106. 1868) listed five taxa (among them *A. laggeri*) under their “*Grex Androsaces carneae* L.”, but did not use the name *A. carnea*. The name *A. carnea*, as lectotypified, was used correctly by Greuter & al. (*Med-Checklist* 4: (371–)372. 1989) and by Kerguelen (*Index Synonym. Fl. France*: 15. 1993). However, this was not adopted later by Kress (in Castrovieja & al., *Fl. Iberica* 5: 30. 1997), who considered the use of the name *A. carnea* untenable.

*Androsace adfinis* s.l., *A. halleri* and *A. laggeri* are commonly grown as ornamental plants. In the monograph of *Androsace* by Smith & Lowe (*The Genus Androsace*, The Alpine Garden Society. 1997), *A. carnea* subsp. *carnea* is used as the name for *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula* (thus following its use in the *Flora Europaea*), while *A. laggeri* is listed as a separate species. Searching the Internet indicates horticulturists also use the name *A. carnea* for a number of different taxa, including *A. adfinis* s.l., *A. halleri* and *A. laggeri*.

The name *Androsace laggeri* (or infraspecific combinations thereof) has been correctly and unambiguously

applied to the taxon of the central Pyrenees by Knuth (l.c.) [probably also includes *A. spec. nov.*], Rouy (l.c.) [probably also includes *A. spec. nov.*], Lüdi (l.c.), Kress (l.c. 1967, 1997), Ferguson (l.c.), Jovet & Villmorin (l.c.), and Smith & Lowe (l.c.). This is in stark contrast to the name *A. carnea*, which, apart from problems of taxonomic circumscription (e.g., Favarger, l.c.), has been widely applied to *A. adfinis* subsp. *puberula* and less frequently to *A. halleri*. As far as we know the correct use of the name *A. carnea* has been adopted in only two checklists, but this has not been followed in subsequent works. Although conserving *A. laggeri* over *A. carnea* would allow the name *A. laggeri* to be retained, we consider it better to reject *A. carnea* outright, as this name is burdened with confusion concerning taxon delimitation and nomenclature. Additionally, although the lectotype chosen by Kress (l.c. 1984) is the current best choice, in view of the conflict with the protologue noted above, were material better fitting the protologue (in particular the morphological description) to re-surface, this could cause a shift in the application of the Linnaean name. Therefore, rejection of *A. carnea* under Art. 56 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 146. 2006) seems the most effective way to establish a clear, stable nomenclature in this taxonomically complex species group.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Walter Gutermann for help during the preparation of this manuscript. This work is financially supported by the Austrian Science Foundation (grant P16104-B03).

## (1782) Proposal to conserve the name *Stylidium affine* against *S. drummondii* (Stylidiaceae)

Juliet A. Wege

Western Australian Herbarium, Department of Environment and Conservation, Locked Bag 104, Bentley Delivery Centre WA 6983, Australia. juliet.wege@dec.wa.gov.au

- (1782) *Stylidium affine* Sond. in Lehmann, *Pl. Preiss.* 1: 371. 1845 [*Dicot.: Stylid.*], nom. cons. prop.  
 Typus: Darling’s-range, Perth, Sep 1841, *Preiss* 2291 (LD).
- (=) *Stylidium drummondii* Graham in Edinburgh New Philos. J. 30: 208. Jan 1841.  
 Neotypus (hic designatus): [icon] *Stylidium drummondii* in Maund, *Botanist*: 5: t. 213. Apr 1841.

*Stylidium affine* Sond. is common and widespread in south-west Western Australia, occurring throughout the Jarrah Forest biogeographic region, most commonly in association with *Eucalyptus wandoo*. It is also known from

the eastern edge of the Swan Coastal Plain near Perth, and as an isolated coastal population north-west of Dunsborough. *Stylidium affine* is one of 21 species assigned to *Stylidium* sect. *Squamosae* (Benth.) Mildbr., a group of perennial triggerplants that possess both membranous scale-leaves and fibrous, grass-like leaves. *Stylidium affine* is further distinguished by its glabrous to subglabrous leaves with stomata confined to the adaxial surface, glandular scapes, paniculate inflorescences, vertically-paired corolla lobes bearing six dimorphic throat appendages, and a chromosome number of  $n = 7$  (Coates in *Austral. J. Bot.* 29: 397–417. 1981).

*Stylidium affine* is a regularly used and well-established name. It was accepted in the most recent monograph of the