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Typus: Herb. Linnaeus No. 996.60 (LINN), typ. cons. prop.

The interpretation of the name Senecio sarracenicus L. has been changed over time by various authors. The lack of agreement among botanists probably arose because Linnaeus included Fuchs’s pre-Linnaean “Solidago sarracenicus”, upon which Gmelin (Fl. Bad. 3: 444. 1808) based his Senecio fuchsii C.C. Gmel. (a heterotypic synonym of Senecio oetus (G. Gaertn. & al.) Hoppe).


According to Herborg (in Diss. Bot. 107: 188–189. 1987), who thoroughly studied Senecio sarracenicus and its allied taxa, and Greuter (in Greuter & Raab-Stuabe, Med-Checklist 2: 718. 2008; Euro+Med PlantBase, http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/PTaxonDetail.asp?Namen=128762&PTRefFk=7000000, accessed 17 Apr 2015), the current usage of the name S. sarracenicus applies to a perennial herb with sessile cauleine leaves, ± pubescent involucre with 11–13 involucral bracts, and 7–8 ligulate florets per capitulum. This species concept fits the sense originally intended by Linnaeus (based on the plant cultivated in Uppsala) and matches the material kept at LINN (No. 996.60) and labelled in Linnaeus’s handwriting “23 sarracenicus”. In contrast, S. fuchsii (widely treated as a synonym of S. oetus) has upper cauleine leaves shortly petiolated, glabrous involucre with 7–10 involucral bracts, and capitula with 3–6 ligulate florets.

The name Senecio sarracenicus was lectotypified by Lacaita (l.c.) on a Clifford specimen at BM (barcode BM000647118) (see Jarvis, Order out of Chaos: 841. 2007). We recently realized that the mentioned specimen does not match the current concept of this species and does not support current usage of the name. Jeffrey & Chen (in Kew Bull. 39: 362. 1984) and Herborg (l.c.: 184) already noticed this, and they indicated the specimen LINN No. 996.60 as the type of
the name S. sarracenicus. However, there is no basis for superseding Lacaita’s lectotypification, which must thus be followed under Art. 9.19 of the Melbourne Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012). On this basis, it is appropriate to conserve the name S. sarracenicus with a conserved type to preserve the current usage.

To see if other original material matches the current concept of this name, in addition to LINN No. 996.60, we tried to locate material connected to the synonyms included in the protologue:

- Senecio folius lanceolatiss serratis, floralibus pedunculos aequantibus. Vir. cliff. 84. Roy. lugdub. 163. Gort. gefr. 481.
- Solidago sarracenic. Fuchs. hist. 728.
- Virga aurea angustifolia serrata. Baurh. pin. 268.

The first polynomial synonym cites the older Linnaean work Viridiarum Cliffortianum (1737) and the botanists Royen and Gorter. Since the latter author refers to Viridiarum Cliffortianum, which is a sketch for the magnum opus Hortus Cliffortianus (1738) (Griffiths in Linnean, Special Issue 7. 27. 2007), it is feasible to associate this poly- nomial with the one included in Hortus Cliffortianus (the second in the protologue). Lacaita found a Clifford specimen labelled “Doria quae Jacobaea alpina foliis longioribus serratis”, which is the current lecto- type of Senecio sarracenicus and corresponds to S. ovatus as men- tioned above. The Royen collection was studied by Linnaeus during his time in the Netherlands (Jarvis, l.c.: 153, 184). Thanks to the Guide: Van Royen Herbarium (Thijss & Veldkamp, 2003) we located a specimen labelled “Senecio. an ad S. sarracenicum” (L No. 0144083). The involucr architecture and the upper cauleine leaves shortly petiolated lead us to identify this specimen as S. ovatus. The third synonym refers to a Fuchs drawing that does not reveal enough characters to properly identify it. The fourth synonym cited by Linnaeus is associated with the sheet Herb. Burser XV(I): 68 (UPS: GUID: UPS:BOTV-174671). We studied and clearly identified it as S. ovatus. Consequently, the specimen LINN No. 996.60 is the only suitable original material that we found to maintain the current concept of the species.

Therefore, in order to preserve nomenclatural stability in accordance with Art. 14.2, we propose to conserve Senecio sarracenicus with this conserved type. If the proposal is rejected, the name S. sarracenicus must be applied to S. ovatus and another name, S. fluvialis, would replace the current usage of S. sarracenicus, which would be highly undesirable.
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