

(1527) Proposal to conserve the name *Scrophularia auriculata* (*Scrophulariaceae*) with a conserved type

Ana Ortega-Olivencia & Juan A. Devesa

Departamento de Biología y Producción Vegetal (Botánica), Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Extremadura, 06071-Badajoz, Spain. E-mail: aortega@unex.es (author for correspondence)

(1527) *Scrophularia auriculata* L., Sp. Pl.: 620. 1 Mai 1753 [*Dicot.: Scrophular.*], *nom. cons. prop.*
Typus: “Habitat in Hispania”. Herb. Linnaeus No. 773.4 (LINN), *typ. cons. prop.*

Two of the moisture-loving *Scrophularia* species have been known as *S. lyrata* Willd. and *S. auriculata* L. The differences between the two taxa, which were assessed by Grau (in Mitt. Bot. Staatssamml. München 12: 622–627. 1976), and reiterated by Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (in Ruizia 11: 52. 1993), are to be found above all in the morphology of leaves, bracts, bracteoles, and staminode. The former, *S. lyrata*, includes plants which are often pubescent, with basal and medial leaves clearly lyrate, having 2–6 lateral lobules; bracts and bracteoles normally obovate and obtuse, with a broad, undulate, generally dark-purple scarious margin; and staminode orbicular or obovate (never more broad than long). It possesses $2n = 58$ chromosomes, and is distributed through the Iberian Peninsula, Sardinia, Sicily, Crete, Morocco, and Algeria. The latter, *S. auriculata*, includes plants which are often glabrescent, with basal and medial leaves that are generally simple or with 1–2 basal lobules; bracts and bracteoles generally lanceolate and acute, with a narrow scarious margin frequently relegated to the apex, barely or not at all undulate, normally hyaline or greyish-brown; and staminode generally broader than long, subreniform or flabellate. It possesses $2n = 84$ chromosomes, and is present in W and SW Europe, Corsica, Italy, and Morocco.

Dandy (in Watsonia 7: 165. 1969) and later Dalgaard (in Opera Bot. 51: 31. 1979) typified *S. auriculata*, taking sheet 773.4 of the LINN herbarium as lectotype, a type which matches the concept defined above. However, the only Linnaean annotations that appear on this sheet are “HU” [= Hortus Upsaliensis] and “*auriculata*”, and the sheet lacks the Species Plantarum (Linnaeus, 1753: 620) account number (in this case “4”) typical of material incorporated within the collection by 1753. This makes it almost certain that this cultivated material did not form part of the original material for the name, particularly as Linnaeus cited Loefling as the source of his diagnosis, and said that the plant came from

Spain. Of the three synonyms cited by Linnaeus (l.c.), (*Scrophularia betonicae* folio. Tournef. inst. 166 / *Scrophularia aquatica montana* mollior. Barr. rar. 189. t. 274 / *Betonica aquatica septentrionalium*. Lob. ic. 533. fig.), the first two correspond to a third species, *S. scorodonia* L., and the third is not really representative of *S. auriculata*.

For these reasons Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (l.c.: 51–52), in a revision of the genus for the Iberian Peninsula and the Balearic Islands, ignored Dandy's typification, selecting as lectotype a Loefling collection (Loefling 461, S-LINN: IDC 256.12), made near Madrid, probably the basis for the locality “Hispania” cited by Linnaeus in the protologue. This new typification, also arrived at independently by Fischer (in Feddes Repert. 108: 114. 1997), unfortunately changed the traditional application of *S. auriculata*, since the new type is identifiable with the species widely known as *S. lyrata*. Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (l.c.) therefore took up *S. auriculata* in this sense, and adopted *S. balbisii* Hornem. (Hort. Hafn. 2: 577. 1815) as the next available name for *S. auriculata* sensu Dandy (based on 773.4 LINN).

Although in older treatments a broader species concept was accepted for *S. auriculata*, frequently including *S. lyrata* as a synonym probably due to difficulties in clearly separating the two taxa (e.g., Candolle, Prodr. 10: 309. 1846; Stiefelhagen in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 44: 466. 1910), there is also in some of the classical works recognition of *S. lyrata* as distinct from *S. auriculata*, either at the species (Wydler in Mém. Soc. Phys. Genève 4: 155–156. 1828; Don, Gen. Syst. 4: 509–510. 1837–1838) or the subspecies level (Lange in Willkomm & Lange, Prodr. Fl. Hispan. 2: 551–552. 1870 distinguished *S. auriculata* subsp. *major*, which corresponds to *S. lyrata*, and *S. auriculata* subsp. *minor*, which corresponds with *S. auriculata*). More recently, *S. auriculata* (sensu *S. balbisii*) has been used by Richardson (in Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 3: 219. 1972), Grau (l.c.), Dalgaard (l.c.: 31–32), Pignatti (Fl. Italia 2: 537. 1982), Clapham & al. (Fl. British Isles: 374. 1987) and Gamisans (in Jeanmonod & Burdet, Compl. Prodr. Fl. Corse, Scrophul.: 123–126. 1992). Likewise, although Richardson (l.c.) considered *S. lyrata* to be a taxon of

obscure status, Grau (l.c.) clarified its differentiating characters with respect to *S. auriculata*, and it has been recognized as an independent taxon under that name by various authors including Valsecchi (in *Webbia* 34: 275–277. 1979), Franco (*Nova Fl. Portugal* 2: 221. 1984) and Valdés (in Valdés & al., *Fl. Andalucía Occid.* 2: 496. 1987).

In the classical literature, *S. auriculata* was often treated under the name *S. aquatica* L. (*Sp. Pl.*: 620. 1753). The ambiguous history of this latter name was reviewed by Turland (*Taxon* 45: 561–562. 1996) and it is now listed as a *nomen utique rejiciendum* in Appendix IV of the ICBN (Greuter & al., *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000), with *S. auriculata* having been indicated by Turland (l.c.) as the correct name for the taxon involved.

The use of the name *S. auriculata* has therefore a fairly long history, with there being many classical and modern authors who segregate it from *S. lyrata*. This argues against preserving the typification made by Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (l.c.) which significantly alters the application of the name. An alternative to the present proposal, to reject *S. auriculata* under Art. 56 of the ICBN, would cause the species with the Mediterranean distribution to recover its old name, *S. lyrata*, and the species with the more Atlantic distribution to acquire the next available name, *S. balbisii*. This measure would involve more drawbacks than advantages given the widespread use by European botanists of *S. auriculata* over *S. balbisii*. Consequently, we believe that nomenclatural stability would be best served through conservation, under Art. 14.9, of *S. auriculata* with a different type from that determined by a strict application of the Code. We therefore propose a return to the type designated by Dandy (l.c.), which preserves recent usage of both *S. auriculata* (sensu *S. balbisii*) and *S. lyrata*.

The nomenclatural consequences of adoption of this proposal can be summarized as follows:

S. lyrata Willd., *Hort. Berol.* t. 55. 1805.

(=) *S. auriculata* sensu Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa, *Ruizia* 11: 49. 1993.

(see Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (l.c.: 49, 51) for additional synonymy)

S. auriculata L., *Sp. Pl.* 620. 1753.

(=) *S. balbisii* Hornem., *Hort. Bot. Hafn.* 2: 577. 1815.

(see Ortega-Olivencia & Devesa (l.c.: 58) for additional synonymy)

If this proposal is declined, there will likely be dual usage of the name *S. auriculata*. In the Iberian Peninsula and in those territories inhabited by both species, the names *S. auriculata* (for *S. lyrata*) and *S. balbisii* will be

used, while in other European territories *S. auriculata* will be used in its traditional sense (for *S. balbisii*). We believe this would be highly undesirable.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present work was partially financed by the Dirección General de Investigación Científica y Técnica of Spain through project Flora Iberica V (PB96-0447). The authors are especially grateful to Dr. C. E. Jarvis for his suggestions and advice.