

NOMENCLATURE COMMUNICATIONS

(2927) Proposal to conserve the name *Vella* (*Cruciferae*) with a conserved typeGea Zijlstra 

Marine Palynology, Vening Meinesz Building A, Princetonlaan 8A, 3584 CB Utrecht, The Netherlands

Address for correspondence: Gea Zijlstra, G.Zijlstra@uu.nlDOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12828>

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

(2927) *Vella* L., Sp. Pl.: 641. 1 Mai 1753 [Angiosp.: *Cruc.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *V. pseudocytisus* L., typ. cons. prop.

The name *Vella* L. (Sp. Pl.: 641. 1753) has long been in current use, with *V. pseudocytisus* considered as its type, thought to have been designated in May 1821 by Candolle (Syst. Nat. 2: 640, 641. May 1821). It has always appeared as such in ING, until recently, when I detected that Candolle's selection was only as a "residue typification", i.e., a case in which it was the only one of the two original species that was then considered as still belonging to this genus. This was about one month after his publication of *Carrichtera* (Candolle in Mém. Mus. Hist. Nat. 7: 244. 20 Apr 1821) that was based on the other species, *V. annua* L. Since the *Berlin Code* (Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 118. 1988), however, for a type designation to have priority the term type or an equivalent must be used (see Art. 7.11 of the *Shenzhen Code*, Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018); thus, Candolle cannot any more be considered to have typified *Vella*.

Working for *Index Nominum Genericorum* (ING), now and again I find a case in which an old "LT" cannot any longer be accepted under Art. 7.11, but usually I can find a later publication in which the same species name is cited as the type of that generic name. The typification in the later publication can then be accepted as the earliest. In the case of Linnaean generic names dating to 1753, it is almost always the case that I can accept the type designation of Hitchcock or of Green published in the nineteen-twenties. In this case, however, the type designated by Green (in Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1925: 51. 6 Apr 1925) is the other original species: *V. annua*! Her choice was confirmed by Sprague (in Bull. Misc. Inform. Kew 1926: 99. 1 Mar 1926) and is also cited by Green (in Sprague, Nom. Prop. Brit. Bot.: 170. Aug 1929). *Vella annua*, however, is the conserved type of *Carrichtera* DC. (nom. cons.)!

Green and Sprague would not consider this a problem, as a new generic name, *Pseudocytisus*, had been proposed by Kuntze (in Post & Kuntze, Lex. Gen. Phan.: 464. 1903) as a replacement for "Vella DC. 1821 non L. 1737". Post & Kuntze (l.c.) accepted 1737 as the starting date for botanical nomenclature and Kuntze (in Post & Kuntze, l.c.: 585) cited for "*Vella* L. 1737" "Typus solus: *Vella annua* L. 1738 in Hort. Cliff." This is not, however, an effective typification of *Vella*, since Kuntze referred to a pre-starting-point generic name for which there was only the single species, "*Vella*", which became *V. annua* in 1753. Kuntze's treatment was followed by Rehder (in J. Arnold Arbor. 8: 22–24. 1927), who referred to Green's and Sprague's typification of *Vella* with *V. annua*. Rehder (l.c.) published

three new combinations in *Pseudocytisus*, *P. integrifolius* replacing *Vella pseudocytisus*, and also *P. spinosus* (Boiss.) Rehder and *P. glabrescens* (Coss.) Rehder. In addition, *P. mairei* (Humbert) Maire (in Bull. Soc. Hist. Nat. Afrique N. 28: 336. 1937) was published.

There was not, however, a continuation with this decision to adopt *Pseudocytisus* for *Vella* in the sense of Candolle (l.c. May 1821) and indeed this generic name was not even in ING! [Thus, in August 2022, I added it to the ING database.] The species of this genus occur in the SW of Europe and in Morocco and Algeria. It transpired that several very important general systematic books continued with the use of *Vella*:

Among others, Schulz (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam., ed. 2, 17b: 377. 1936) adopted *Vella* (with *Pseudocytisus* Kuntze as its synonym) with four species, and he had a special comment: "Leitart: *V. pseudocytisus* L.; vgl. M. L. Green in Propos. Brit. Bot. (1929) 111, 170. — *Vella annua* L. = *Carrichtera annua* (L.) Aschers." His treatment of *Carrichtera* (nr. 61) preceded the treatment of *Vella* (nr. 62). Heywood (in Tutin & al., Fl. Europaea 1: 342. 1964) also adopted *Vella*, with only *V. pseudocytisus* and *V. spinosa* as accepted species, with, in the Index (p. 452), three synonyms: *Pseudocytisus* Kuntze, *P. integrifolius* Rehder and *P. spinosus* (Boiss.) Rehder. In the more recent book by Polunin & Smythies (Fl. S.W. Europe: 203–204. 1988), *Vella* is presented with two species and *Pseudocytisus* is not mentioned!

During the last decades of the 20th century, several more species were added to *Vella* (in the sense of *Pseudocytisus*), among others: *V. charpinii* Fern. Casas (in Fontqueria 1: 9. 1982), from Morocco, *V. lucentina* Crespo (in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 109: 370. 1992), from Spain and *V. bourgaeana* (Coss.) Warwick & Al-Shehbaz (in Novon 8: 324. 1998), from Spain and based on *Euzomodendron bourgeanum* Coss. (Notes Pl. Crit.: 145. 1852).

The publication by Warwick & Al-Shehbaz (l.c.: 321–325) contains a comparison of four genera of the *Cruciferae* ("*Brassicaceae*"), with investigation of their morphological, cytological and molecular data. Three were genera of shrubs, *Boleum* Desv. (in J. Bot. Agric. 3: 163. 1815) with a single species based on *Vella aspera* Pers., *Euzomodendron* Coss. (l.c.: 144) also now with one species, and *Vella* itself; on these they arrived at the conclusion that they clearly belong to one genus. As a result, Warwick & Al-Shehbaz (l.c. 321–325) concluded that *Vella* comprises seven species and that the fourth genus, the annual herb *Carrichtera*, although resembling taxa of *Vella* in several important characters such as the valves and veins of the fruit, must clearly continue to be separate with its only species being circum-Mediterranean, extending eastwards into Iran. They did not

mention *Pseudocytisus* – maybe they did not even know that this name ever was proposed for *Vella* in the sense of *V. pseudocytisus*; or they considered it as a superfluous substitute name.

More recently, Crespo & al. (in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 149: 121–128. 2005) published a new species, which they considered the eighth species of *Vella*: *V. castrilensis* Vivero & al., also from Spain.

Only one relatively recent use of *Pseudocytisus* could be found; this was in a phytosociological publication and was the new combination, *Pseudocytisus integrifolius* subsp. *pau*i (Gómez-Campo) Rivas Mart. (in Itin. Geobot. 15: 706. 2002) based on *Vella pseudocytisus* subsp. *pau*i Gómez-Campo (in Bot. J. Linn. Soc. 82: 174. 1981).

To conclude, it appears that the name *Pseudocytisus* is seldom in use, whereas *Vella* is applied to a distinct genus now including eight species, only three of which have names in *Pseudocytisus*. In order to

avoid disadvantageous nomenclatural change, *Vella* L. 1753 thus should be conserved with *V. pseudocytisus* as its type. If the proposal is not accepted, at least five new combinations will be needed in *Pseudocytisus*. Moreover *Vella* L. 1753 would have to be added as a second name to be rejected, as a homotypic synonym, in favour of *Carrichtera* DC. 1821 (nom. cons.).

Author information

GZ, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9894-9967>

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to John McNeill (Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh, U.K.) for his valuable comments that improved this proposal.

(2928) Proposal to conserve the name *Engelhardia roxburghiana* (Juglandaceae) with a conserved type

I.M. Turner^{1,2}

1 Singapore Botanical Liaison Officer, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond TW9 3AB, United Kingdom

2 Singapore Botanic Gardens, National Parks Board, 1 Cluny Road, Singapore 259569

Address for correspondence: I.M. Turner, i.turner@kew.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12829>

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

(2928) *Engelhardia roxburghiana* Lindl. in Wallich, Pl. Asiat. Rar. 2: 85, t. 199. 6 Sep 1831 [Angiosp.: *Jugland.*], nom. cons. prop.
 Typus: China, Hong Kong, Aug 1874, *Hance* 7433 (K barcode K000880850; isotypus: LE barcode LE00011281), typ. cons. prop.

The species name *Engelhardia roxburghiana* was first published in Wallich's *Plantae Asiaticae rariores* (Pl. Asiat. Rar. 2: 85, t. 199. 1831). Wallich's account of the species included several elements: firstly, the binomial “*Engelhardtia Roxburghiana*” and a brief Latin description that were both attributed to “Lindl. MSS.”; secondly, “*Juglans pterococca*, Roxb. Hort. Beng. p. 68” was cited as a synonym followed by names in Indian languages and details of specimens (syntypes) and distribution; after which there was a long Latin description attributed to “Roxb. MSS”. Wallich also stated that he was indebted to Roxburgh for the description and drawing from which his engraving (t. 199) was made. As the name in *Engelhardia* and the short description were both attributed to Lindley, the combination is validated and to be attributed to Lindley (Art. 46.2 of the *ICN*; Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018). *Juglans pterococca* Roxb. was a nomen nudum in the *Hortus Bengalensis*, and was not validated until the 1832 edition of *Flora Indica*.

Manning (in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 93: 34–52. 1966) published a synopsis of *Engelhardia* in the Old World that included an

interpretation of Wallich's published account. Manning (l.c.) noted that Lindley's description did not apply to the species now generally called *Engelhardia roxburghiana*, but to *Engelhardia spicata* Lesch. ex Blume (Bijdr. Fl. Ned. Ind.: 528. 1825–1826). The specimens cited were all *Engelhardia spicata* as well. Manning considered that the Roxburgh description and Wallich's plate based on Roxburgh's drawing (with the exception of the fruit) did belong to *Engelhardia roxburghiana* as that name was then understood. After consideration of two Roxburgh specimens, Manning wrote “Thus neither specimen is clearly the type of *J. pterococca* Roxburgh (1832) and in turn of *E. roxburghiana* Wall. The illustration given in Wallich (Roxburgh's plate No. 2395, in the original plate inscribed *J. pterococca*; see Hooker, 1888) with leaves and flowers is excellent and must be used as the type in conjunction with Roxburgh's full mss. description quoted by Wallich; in both cases there must be excluded the hairy fruit with the posterior bracteole enlarged and 2-lobed (in figure) as these are *E. spicata*.” The taxonomic conclusions of Manning seem sound and had already been noted by others (Hooker, Fl. Brit. India 5: 596. 1888; Jacobs in Van Steenis, Fl. Males., ser. 1, 6: 154. 1960). But nomenclaturally there is a problem because of Art. 9.12. Cited specimens (syntypes) must take precedence in lectotype selection over illustrations included in the protologue, and therefore *Engelhardia roxburghiana* is forced to be a synonym of *E. spicata* as all the syntypes belong to that species. *Juglans pterococca* Roxb. (Fl. Ind. ed. 1832, 3: 631. 1832) then becomes the earliest name available for *E. roxburghiana*.