




(2012) Proposal to conserve the name *Thymus microphyllus* (*Micromeria microphylla*) (*Lamiaceae*) with a conserved type

Emanuele Del Guacchio,¹  Salvatore Brullo²  & Sandro Bogdanović³ 

1 Department of Biology, University of Naples “Federico II”, Botanic Garden, via Foria 223, 80139 Naples, Italy

2 Department of Biological, Geological and Environmental Sciences, University of Catania, via A. Longo 19, Catania, Italy

3 Department of Agricultural Botany, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Zagreb, Svetošimunska 25, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia

Address for correspondence: Emanuele Del Guacchio, emanuele.delguacchio@unina.it

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12782>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2012) *Thymus microphyllus* d’Urv. in Mém. Soc. Linn. Paris 1: 327. Apr 1822 [Angiosp.: Lab.], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: “*Thymus melitensis*, Malte”, d’Urville (P barcode P04231225), typ. cons. prop.

The name *Thymus microphyllus* d’Urv. (in Mem. Soc. Linn. Paris 1: 327. 1822) was proposed to indicate a plant very common on the island of Malta. Nowadays, it is regarded as the basionym of the widely accepted name *Micromeria microphylla* (d’Urv.) Benth. (Labiata. Gen. Spec.: 377. 1834) (= *Satureja microphylla* (d’Urv.) Guss., Fl. Sicul. Prodr. 2: 120. 1828). Dumont d’Urville (l.c.) provided a Latin description and reported also at least two specimens preserved in the herbaria of Vaillant and Tournefort under the polynomial “*Calamintha minima*, annua, thymi-folia”. These specimens are obvious syntypes and have priority in lectotypification over other original material (Art. 9.12 of the *Shenzhen Code*, Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018). Meikle (Fl. Cyprus 2: 1276. 1985) cited as type an unseen specimen from P: “In collibus aridis insulae Melitae copiosissime”, which is merely a citation from the protologue, as observed by Bräuchler & al. (in Willdenowia 38: 393–394. 2008). Therefore, Bräuchler (in Bräuchler & al., l.c.: 393) formally proposed as lectotype a d’Urville specimen of *Micromeria microphylla* from Malta preserved at P and revised by Bentham himself, but labelled as “*Thymus melitensis*”, an unpublished name (cf. Gussone, Fl. Sicul. Syn. 2: 91–92. 1844, sub *Satureja*), with the synonym “*Micromeria melitensis* Tineo”, also not validly published (Chodat in Bull. Soc. Bot. Genève, sér. 2, 15: 245. 1924, pro syn.) (image of the specimen available at <http://mediaphoto.mnhn.fr/media/1441371311625rOvxZMszBN1rjdc5>). Bräuchler & al. (l.c.) justified this choice arguing that the title itself of the article by d’Urville (l.c.), i.e., “Enumeratio Plantarum quas in insulis Archipelagi aut littoribus Ponti-Euxini, annis 1819 et 1820, collegit atque detexit J. Dumont d’Urville”, would imply that, for each plant described there, linked specimens were also prepared; therefore, the proposed lectotype (obviously collected by d’Urville on that occasion) is not only original material, but indeed a further syntype. Against this latter interpretation, Ferrer-Gallego & al. (in Phytotaxa, 446: 265–267. 2020) observed that there is neither a direct link to this specimen nor to the name “*Thymus melitensis*” in the protologue, where still extant syntypes are clearly cited, and therefore the proposed lectotype designation by Bräuchler must be regarded as ineffective (Turland & al., l.c.). In addition, Ferrer-Gallego & al. deduced that “*Thymus melitensis*” was not employed in the printed text because d’Urville became aware that the plant was widespread elsewhere than in Malta. Both of the preserved syntypes are kept at P, and images of them

are available at <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p04049884> (Vaillant’s herbarium) and <https://science.mnhn.fr/institution/mnhn/collection/p/item/p00652340b> (Tournefort’s herbarium). The latter specimen is not mentioned by Ferrer-Gallego & al. (l.c.), who proposed the Vaillant one as the lectotype, stating that such a choice supports the current usage of the name.

Although we agree about the necessity of superseding the proposal by Bräuchler, the new lectotype does not support current use at all, as the specimens in the Vaillant and Tournefort herbaria are not referable to the species currently known as *Micromeria microphylla*, but instead to *M. sphaciotica* Boiss. & Heldr. ex Benth. endemic to Crete (POWO, <http://www.plantsoftheworldonline.org/>, accessed 05 May 2022). This is not surprising, as apparently neither Tournefort nor Vaillant ever visited Malta (Sommier, Fl. Melit. Nova: 25–31. 1915), except for a brief stopover by Tournefort, who indeed famously visited Crete (Tournefort, Relat. Voyage Levant 1: 21–115. 1717). Presumably, also the specimen in Vaillant’s herbarium originated from Tournefort’s travels (cf. Rees, Cycl. 36: “Vaillant”. 1817).

It would appear that d’Urville included under *Thymus microphyllus* both of the taxa mentioned above, and this circumscription has sometimes been adopted (e.g., Boissier, Fl. Orient. 4: 572–573. 1879; Šilić, Monogr. *Satureja*: 253. 1979; Bräuchler & al., l.c.). Nevertheless, most scholars disagree and keep *Micromeria microphylla* and *M. sphaciotica* as separate species (for the morphological differences, see Chater & Guinea in Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 3: 168. 1972): e.g., Pignatti (Fl. Italia 2: 479. 1982), Greuter & al. (Med-Checklist 3: 336. 1984, sub *Satureja*), Tan & al. (in Phytol. Balcan. 16: 237–242. 2010), Euro+Med PlantBase, <http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/> (accessed 29 Apr 2022), WCSP, https://wmsp.science.kew.org/namedetail.do?name_id=127310 (accessed 29 Apr 2022).

More importantly, the names based on *Thymus microphyllus* have been consistently employed for the plant occurring in Malta and Italy and later identified in Spain (Balears), Croatia and possibly North Africa (e.g., Sommier, l.c.: 227, sub *Satureja*; Borg, Descr. Fl. Malt. Isl.: 491. 1927, sub *Satureja*; Chater & Guinea, l.c.; Ali & al., Fl. Libya 118: 110. 1985; Gianguzzi & al. in Webbia 61: 359–402. 2006; Morales, Fl. Iber. 12: 429. 2010; Tabone in Pardo-de-Santayana & al., Ethnobot. New Europe: 84–87. 2010, sub *Satureja*; Loidi, Veg. Iber. Peninsula 2: 14. 2017; Pignatti & al., Fl. Ital., ed. 2, 3: 265. 2018; Nikolić, Fl. Croat. 4: 408. 2019; Brullo & al., Veg. Malt. Isl.: 64. 2020; Portal to the Flora of Italy, <http://dryades.units.it/floritaly> [accessed: 29 Apr 2022]; African Plant Database (v.3.4.0), <http://africanplantdatabase.ch> [accessed: 29 Apr 2022]; World Plants, www.worldplants.de [accessed: 5 May 2022]).

Therefore, this case falls within the provisions of the Art. 57.1 (Turland & al., l.c.) because the name *Micromeria microphylla* “has been widely and persistently used for a taxon or taxa not including its type”, and to adopt it now for the Cretan species would be extremely confusing.

Consequently, it seems appropriate to propose the conservation of the name *Thymus microphyllus* with a conserved type to allow its continued application to the Maltese species. For this purpose, conservation with the type already proposed by Bräuchler (l.c.) seems a parsimonious and appropriate choice because the specimen

represents original material and fully supports the current use of the name, in its generally accepted narrow sense.

Author information

EDG: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9349-1328>

SBR: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2568-7278>

SBo: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1952-6059>

Acknowledgment

We kindly thank J. McNeill for his suggestions.

(2913) Proposal to conserve the name *Anethum segetum* (*Umbelliferae*) with a conserved type

P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego^{1,2} 

1 *Servicio de Vida Silvestre y Red Natura 2000, Centro para la Investigación y la Experimentación Forestal (CIEF), Generalitat Valenciana, Avda. Comarques del País Valencià 114, 46930 Quart de Poblet, Valencia, Spain*

2 *Bodega Ferrer-Gallego, 46311 Jaraguas, Valencia, Spain*

Address for correspondence: P. Pablo Ferrer-Gallego, flora.cief@gva.es

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12783>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2913) *Anethum segetum* L., Mant. Pl.: 219. Oct 1771 [Angiosp.: *Umbell.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: Portugal, Beja, Cabeça Gorda, 23 Jun 1979, *Malato-Beliz & Guerra 16283* (MA barcode MA-01-00310950!; isotypi: MA barcodes MA-01-00311369!, MA-01-00325392!, MA-01-00357096! & MA-01-00357130!), typ. cons. prop.

The present proposal deals with the situation surrounding the name *Anethum segetum* L. (Mant. Pl.: 219. 1771) (*Umbelliferae*), which has long been applied to a species in a sense not including its type. *Anethum segetum*, *Meum segetum* (L.) Guss. (Fl. Sicul. Prodr. 1: 346. 1827), or *Ridolfia segetum* “(L.) Moris” (but see below) (Enum. Sem. Hort. Taur. 1841: 43. 1841; see <https://seedlists.naturalis.nl/content/ridolfia-moris>) are the traditional and currently accepted names of a species distributed throughout the Mediterranean region, extending to Portugal, the Azores, the Canary Islands, and the Arabian Peninsula (Tutin & al., Fl. Eur. 2: 352. 1968, sub “*Ridolfia segetum* Moris”; Plants of the World Online [POWO], <https://powo.science.kew.org/taxon/urn:lsid:ipni.org:names:837543-1>). This species shows glabrous leaves finely divided into filiform leaflets, the upper often reduced to the inflated petiole, umbels with 10–60 slender, nearly equal rays, bracts and bracteoles absent, fruit 1.5–2.5 mm, ovoid-cylindrical, compressed laterally, ridges slender, scarcely prominent, vittae solitary, slender (Tutin & al., l.c.; Aedo in Castroviejo & al., Fl. Iberica 10: 282. 2003; Tison & al., Fl. France Médit.: 1837. 2014; Pignatti, Fl. Ital., ed. 2, 3: 592. 2018). The seeds and leaves contain an essential oil, and the plant has a strong odor. This species has been cultivated in Peru, where it has also escaped

to waste places (Mathias & Constance in Publ. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Bot. Ser. 13(5A/1): 92. 1962). It is used as an herb in the pickle industry, can be eaten in its raw form or cooked, and is also used for medicinal purposes.

Linnaeus (l.c.) published *Anethum segetum* providing a short diagnosis “ANETHUM foliis caulinis tribus, fructibus ovalibus” followed by two synonyms: “*Anethum sylvestre minus*” cited from Bauhin (Pinax: 147. 1623; Prodr.: 76. 1620) and “*Foeniculum lusitanicum minus annuum, anethi odore*” from Tournefort (Inst. Rei. Herb., ed. 3: 312. 1719), and a complete description of the plant. No illustrations were provided in the protologue and none of the synonyms cited by Linnaeus from Bauhin and Tournefort are accompanied by an illustration. However, a potential syntype was mentioned, as “*Habitat in Lusitania. D. Vandelli. H. U. [Hortus Upsaliensis]*”. In this sense, if Vandelli’s material of Portugal exists, this material should have preference in a lectotype designation according to Art. 9.12 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018). Reduron (in Taxon 55: 208. 2006) mentioned that this name was evidently based on material cultivated in the Hortus at Uppsala, the seeds reported as having come from Portugal via Domenico Vandelli (1730–1816). [From Lisbon, Vandelli corresponded with one of the most renowned Bolognese naturalists, Ferdinando Bassi (1710–1774), a convinced “Linnaean” (Cristofolini & Biagio, Linneo a Bologna. 2007; Puerto Sarmiento, Ciencia de Cámara: Casimiro Gómez Ortega (1741–1818) el Científico Cortesano: 35. 1992). Linnaeus also exchanged letters with Vandelli, and both Bassi and Vandelli received career advice from him (correspondence cited by João Brigola in Coleções, Gabinetes e Museus em Portugal no Seculo