(2435) Proposal to conserve the name *Selinum microphyllum* (*Mulinum microphyllum*) (*Apiaceae*: *Azorelloideae*) with a conserved type

Martina Fernández,[1] Susana Martínez[2] & Carolina I. Calviño[1]

1 *Instituto de Investigaciones en Biodiversidad y Medioambiente, CONICET-Universidad Nacional del Comahue, Quintral 1250, 8400 Bariloche, Argentina*

2 *Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Author for correspondence: *Martina Fernández, mfernandez@comahue-conicet.gob.ar*

DOI http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/652.28

(2435) ***Selinum microphyllum*** Cav., Icon. 5: 59, t. 486, fig. 2. Apr 1799 [*Angiosp.*: *Umbell.*], nom. cons. prop.
Typus: Argentina, Río Negro, Dpto. Bariloche, Parque Nacional Nahuel Huapi, Co. Challhuaco, mirador pedregoso, 1579 m, 26 Feb 2010, *Calviño & Fernández 750* (SI; isotypus: BCRU), typ. cons. prop.

Mulinum microphyllum (Cav.) Pers. (Syn. Pl. 1: 309. 1805) is one of the oldest binomials within *Mulinum* Pers.; it is one of the four specific names included in the protologue of the genus, and one of the two that are still in use, together with *M. spinosum* (Cav.) Pers. (l.c.). The name *M. microphyllum* is commonly applied to a Patagonian species that grows in the provinces of Neuquén, Río Negro, and

northern Chubut, Argentina, in the Andes, between 800 and 1800 meters above sea level.

The name is based on *Selinum microphyllum* Cav. (l.c.). The analysis of Cavanilles's original specimen (Argentina, Santa Cruz, Puerto Deseado, *Née s.n.*, MA No. 476256) and his published illustration reveals that both are identifiable as *M. hallei* Skottsb. (in Kongl. Svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl. 56: 278–280. 1916), another Patagonian species with a more southern distribution, in the provinces of Chubut and Santa Cruz, Argentina, from the Andes to the Atlantic coast, between 50 and 1200 meters above sea level. Both entities are very similar morphologically and their distributional ranges are contiguous and with some overlap. However, despite their close affinities, the two species are diagnosed by habit, leaf, and inflorescence characters. In fact, *M. hallei* and *M. microphyllum* were always treated as separate species, and this criterion is also supported by molecular phylogenetic studies (Fernández & al., in press).

As a result of considerations of typification and application of the principle of priority, *Mulinum microphyllum* would become the correct name for *M. hallei*, while the entity commonly called "*Mulinum microphyllum*" would become *Mulinum morenonis* (Kuntze) Speg. (in Anales Mus. Nac. Buenos Aires 7: 295. 1902), based on *Huanaca morenonis* Kuntze (Revis. Gen. Pl. 3(2): 113. 1898), the earliest legitimate name applicable. To avoid the confusion generated by the strict application of the rules and to conserve the current usage of these names, we propose the conservation of the basionym *Selinum microphyllum* from its place of valid publication with a different type (*ICN*, Art. 14.9; McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012).

Schlechtendal (in Linnaea 28: 479–480. 1856) was the first to misapply the name *Mulinum microphyllum*, but the error was probably incorporated into common use from its inclusion in the "Flora de Chile" (Reiche in Anales Univ. Chile, I. Mem. Ci. Lit. 104: 800. 1899), a work of great diffusion at the time. The same concept of Schlechtendal and Reiche has been used widely and persistently in subsequent floristic, genetic, anatomical, chemical, ecological and phylogenetic studies (e.g., Reiche in Engler & Drude, Veg. Erde. 8: 250. 1907; Skottsberg, l.c.: 279; Constance & al. in Amer. J. Bot. 58: 582. 1971; Constance in Correa, Fl. Patagónica 8(5): 357–362. 1988; Forcone & Ayestarán in Darwiniana 34: 121–132. 1996; Ferreyra & al. in Darwiniana 36: 65–79. 1998; Zech in Brittonia 51: 416. 1999; Quatrini & al. in Rev. Chil. Hist. Nat. 74: 640. 2001; Elissalde & al., Invent. Eval. Pastiz. Nat. Zona Árida Semiárida Patagonia: 38. 2002; Ferreyra & al., Fl. Alta Mont. Andes Patag.: 40. 2006; Martínez in Zuloaga & al., Cat. Pl. Vasc. Cono Sur 2: 1056–1090. 2008; Martínez & Kutschker in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 103: 339. 2011; http://www.eecrg.uib.no/projects/AGS_BotanyExp/NorthernPatagonia/NorthernPatagonia.htm; Nicolas & Plunkett in Taxon 61: 826–840. 2012; Green & Ferreyra, Flor. Estepa Patagónica: 40. 2012). On the other hand, the application of *M. microphyllum* in its original sense is recognized in the following publications: Candolle, Prodr. 4: 79. 1830; Hieronymus in Bol. Acad. Nac. Ci. Republ. Argent. 3: 24. 1880; Lista in Anales Soc. Ci. Argent. 41: 391. 1896; Macloskie in Hatcher, Rep. Princeton Univ. Exped. Patagonia, Bot. 8: 633–635. 1903.

The *ICN* states under Art. 57.1 that "a name that has been widely and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type is not to be used in a sense that conflicts with current usage unless and until a proposal to deal with it under Arts. 14.1 or 56.1 has been submitted and rejected". In this case we believe that the conservation of *Selinum microphyllum* with a conserved type would maintain in use *Mulinum microphyllum*, one of the oldest names of the genus, conserving the sense that has been consistently and widely used in the literature and in herbarium practices, as well as the current use of *M. hallei*. The lectotype of *M. hallei* will be designated in a taxonomic revision of the genus *Mulinum* (Fernández & al., in press).

Acknowledgements

We thank Cecilia Ezcurra for useful discussions on this proposal, and John H. Wiersema and John McNeill for helpful comments. We also acknowledge financial support from ANPCyT-FONCyT PICT 2011-1036, CONICET PIP 112-201301-00357 and Universidad Nacional del Comahue PIN B180 to CC, and from CONICET for a Doctoral fellowship to MF.