Proposal to conserve the name *Echinocactus williamsii* Lem. ex Salm-Dyck (*Lophophora williamsii*) against *E. williamsianus* Lem. (*Cactaceae*)
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Typus: Mexico, San Luis Potosí, near El Huizache, 2 Jul 1958, *Anderson 1079* (POM No. 298103 [RSA barcode RSA0008867]).


Prince Joseph Salm-Reifferscheidt-Dyck, in his description of *Echinocactus williamsii* (Salm-Dyck in Allg. Gartenzeitung 13: 385. 1845), added after the name “Lem. Cat. Cels 1845 sine descriptione”. Salm-Dyck had very good relations with cactus growers in France, and one can conclude that he acquired his plant from the company Frères Cels. *Echinocactus williamsii* had been offered for sale by them several times: Cels, Cat. Cultures 1843: 19., Cat. Cact. 1844: 5., and Extr. Cat. Cultures 1845: 28. In each case only the name appeared without any description but, in the two latter, it was ascribed to “Lem.”.

In the absence of any description of the species by the Celses, Salm-Dyck (i.c.) validly published *E. williamsii* with a Latin description and a rather fuller description in German. No original material is known to exist. In consequence, *Anderson* (in Brittonia 21: 304–305. 1969) designated as neotype the specimen cited above as “Typus”.


*Echinocactus williamsianus* Lem. was published two years before *E. williamsii* Salm-Dyck. The source of the plants is not known, but it is very likely that they were also from the Cels nursery. The name has never been in use. Lemaire, himself, later used the epithet of Salm-Dyck (Lemaire, Cactées: 49. 1868). It appears in only two publications: Monville, Cat. Pl. Exot.: 22. 1846 and Weber in Bois, Dict. Hort.: 90. 1893 but in the latter only as a synonym of *Anhalonium williamsii*.

Here I propose that *Echinocactus williamsii* Lem. ex Salm-Dyck be conserved against *E. williamsianus* Lem. in accordance with Art. 14.2 of the *ICN* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018).

The non-acceptance of the proposal would have the consequence that a hitherto unknown name should be used for a very popular and well-known plant, resulting in the drug legislation of many countries around the world having to adopt the new name.
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