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Resumen


Malva angustifolia Cav. fue nombre publicado sin referirse a tipo ninguno. Kearney (1935) indica la existencia de un tipo en Madrid, pero sin darnos detalles del ejemplar, si es que lo vio, ni tipificar en uno de los previsiblemente varios ejemplares. Por el hecho de que residía en París Cavanilles cuando publicó su binomen, mientras que Kearney habla de un tipo en Madrid, hubimos de replantearnos todo el problema. Se presenta aquí una discusión de los ejemplares disponibles y se señala lectotipo madrileño.
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Abstract


Malva angustifolia Cav. was published without the explicit citation of a type. Kearney (1935) refers to a type at Madrid but does not indicate details of this specimen, if he ever saw a specimen, or which particular specimen is the type. Owing to the fact that Cavanilles was in Paris at the time of publication, whereas Kearney indicated a type at Madrid, we sought to resolve this problem. Discussion of the available specimens and choice of a lectotype is provided.
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Cavanilles (1785) described and illustrated Malva angustifolia Cav. (fig. 1) without explicit designation of a type. Following the description, Cavanilles states: "Vidi S. communicatam a D. Palau, cultam in R. h. Matriitensis." ("I have seen it in a dried state communicated by Mr. Palau, cultivated at the Royal garden in Madrid.") The growth of material at Madrid and its transfer to Paris was reaffirmed by Álvarez López (1946). Antonio Palau was a Professor of Botany at the Madrid Botanical Garden during this time. The communication of a specimen from Palau for the description is referred to again by Cavanilles in 1791. He apparently grew material in the gardens at Paris, possibly from seed, because he refers to plants of Malva angustifolia growing the following summer and not appearing like those he described in 1786. Two specimens are present in the Paris (P-LA) collec-
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Fig. 1.—Copy of plate 20 #3 of *M. angustifolia* from Cavanilles (1785).

Fig. 2. — Labels of *M. angustifolia* specimens from P-LA. (see text for further information).

Kearney (1935) indicated a type at Madrid, but did not elaborate about the specimen. He indicated that the type was collected by Palau. Upon inquiry to
Fig. 3.—Specimen of *M. angustifolia* from MA. Lectotype.
Fig. 4.—Specimen of *M. angustifolia* with handwriting by Cavanilles.
Antonio M. Regueiro, the Keeper of the Herbarium at Madrid, concerning Palau or Cavanilles collections of this species, we received information on six specimens that were possible choices as the type. Three of these were collections by Luis Née and were obtained after *M. angustifolia* was described, and thus may be eliminated from consideration. A fourth specimen is labeled “*M. angustifolia* Cav ic. Ex H. M. Aug 1799” in the handwriting of J. D. Rodríguez (A. M. Regueiro, personal communication). Since the specimen is dated thirteen years after the date of publication and bears no indication of Cavanilles having seen it, this specimen must also be disregarded.

The remaining two specimens (figs. 3, 4) present an interesting problem in lectotypification. The specimen in figure 3 has two labels. The rectangular, printed label was written by C. Vicioso (A. M. Regueiro, personal communication). In addition to the plant name, C. Vicioso indicates that the other label was written by J. D. Rodríguez. Antonio Regueiro (personal communication) disagrees and has determined the writing to be that of A. Palau. In comparing the writing on the second label with authentic handwriting samples of A. Palau, we conclude that handwriting of the word “Malva” is that of Palau, while the rest of the label seems to have been written by another hand. Cavanilles handwriting does not appear on this specimen. The specimen in figure 4 has a number of typewritten labels and one handwritten label. The handwritten label is of interest in that it is in the hand of Cavanilles.

Since in the original description, Cavanilles cited a specimen received from Palau, and since one specimen bears the label “Malva” in Palau’s hand (fig. 3, MA 266267), we believe this specimen to be the most logical to designate as lectotype. The specimen in fig. 4 was probably sampled in a subsequent season from the same plant as that in fig. 3, grown in the Madrid Botanical Garden, and was presumably labelled by Cavanilles after his return to Madrid in 1789. This specimen (fig. 4) and one at BM should be considered isolecotypes.
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