

(2585) Proposal to conserve the name *Hesperis pendula* DC. against *H. pendula* Murr. (*Cruciferae*)

Ihsan A. Al-Shehbaz¹ & Dmitry A. German²

¹ Missouri Botanical Garden, P.O. Box 299, St. Louis, Missouri 63166-0299, U.S.A.

² Department of Biodiversity and Plant Systematics, Centre for Organismal Studies, Heidelberg University, Im Neuenheimer Feld 345, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany; and South-Siberian Botanical Garden, Altai State University, Lenin str. 61, 656049 Barnaul, Russia

Author for correspondence: Ihsan A. Al-Shehbaz, ihsan.al-shehbaz@mobot.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/671.23>

(2585) *Hesperis pendula* DC., Syst. Nat. 2: 457. Mai (sero) 1821 [*Angiosp.*: *Cruc.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: Syria, *Labillardière* (G-DC barcode G00203048).

(H) *Hesperis pendula* Murr. in *Novi Comment. Soc. Regiae Sci. Gott.* 6: 38. t. 6. 1776, nom. rej. prop.

Typus (hic designatus): [icon in] *Novi Comment. Soc. Regiae Sci. Gott.* 6: t. 6. 1776.

The name *Hesperis pendula* DC. has been widely and consistently used in the past 196 years for a well-defined eastern Mediterranean species distributed in Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Turkey. It has been accepted in all floras (e.g., Boissier, *Fl. Orient.* 1: 236. 1867; Post, *Fl. Syria, Palestine & Sinai*, ed. 2, 1: 77. 1932; Cullen in Davis, *Fl. Turkey* 1: 459. 1965; Zohary, *Fl. Palaestina* 1: 263. 1966; Mouterde, *Nouv. Fl. Liban & Syria* 2: 169. 1970; Tohmé & Tohmé, *Illustr. Fl. Lebanon*: 151. 2007), checklists (Candolle, *Prodr.* 1: 190. 1824; Steudel, *Nomencl. Bot.*, ed. 2, 1: 451. 1840; Jackson in *Index Kew.* 1: 1137. 1893; Zohary & al., *Consp. Fl. Orient.* 1: 17. 1980; Greuter & al., *Med-Checklist* 3: 120. 1986; Al-Eisawi in *Webbia* 71: 219–226. 2016), and revisions (Fournier in *Bull. Soc. Bot. France* 13: 339. 1868; Dvořák in *Spisy Přír. Fak. Univ. J. E. Purkyně Brně*, ser. L, 33: 101–124. 1969 & in *Feddes Repert.* 84: 262. 1973; Duran in *Int. J. Nat. Engin. Sci.* 2: 53–56. 2008 & in Güner, *Checkl. Fl. Turkey*: 280. 2012; Duran & Çetin in *Turk. J. Bot.* 40: 87–96. 2016) covering species of *Hesperis* L. of these countries or globally. Similar information can be found in both regional (Marhold in *Euro+Med Plantbase*. 2011, <http://ww2.bgbm.org/EuroPlusMed/>) and global databases (Warwick & al. in *Pl. Syst. Evol.* 259: 249–258. 2006; Global Biodiversity Information Facility, <https://gbif.org>; The Plant List, <http://www.theplantlist.org>; Tropicos.org, <http://www.tropicos.org>; BrassiBase, <https://brassibase.cos.uni-heidelberg.de/>).

Unfortunately, the extremely well-established *H. pendula* DC. is an illegitimate later homonym of an obscure heterotypic name *H. pendula* Murr. (in *Novi Comment. Soc. Regiae Sci. Gott.* 6: 38, t. 6. 1776) which, to our knowledge, was never subsequently accepted and was very rarely mentioned as a synonym even in old literature. Based on Murray's detailed original description and excellent plate designated above as the lectotype of *H. pendula* Murr., it is unmistakably the same species as the also heterotypic *Arabis pendula* L. (*Sp. Pl.*: 665.

1753), currently known as *Catolobus pendulus* (L.) Al-Shehbaz (in *Novon* 15: 521. 2005). The degree to which Murray's name has been neglected is illustrated by the fact that although it was synonymized with *C. pendulus* (as *Arabis pendula*) already by Meyer (in Ledebour & al., *Fl. Altaic.* 3: 25. 1831) and listed as such by Steudel (l.c.: 117, 451. 1840), Ledebour (*Fl. Ross.* 1: 122. 1841), and Jackson (l.c.: 1137), it is absent from all other relevant floras and checklists covering the huge distribution area of this species as well as in such well-known databases as The Plant List and Tropicos.

Boissier (in *Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot.*, sér. 2, 17: 66. 1842) described *Hesperis campicarpa* Boiss. and *H. aucheri* Boiss. and subsequently (Boissier, *Diagn. Pl. Orient.*, ser. 2, 3(1): 22. 1854) added the illegitimate later homonym *H. rupestris* Boiss. & Noë (non *H. rupestris* Pall.), but he (Boissier, l.c. 1867) reduced the last two names to synonymy of *H. pendula* DC. However, Dvořák (l.c.) recognized both *H. aucheri* and *H. campicarpa* as two subspecies of a polymorphic *H. pendula*, which he divided into four subspecies, three varieties, and two forms. The status of these infraspecific taxa is not fully understood and considerable discrepancy is observed among different authors. For example, Greuter & al. (l.c.) and Marhold (l.c.) accepted all four of Dvořák's subspecies, whereas Duran (l.c. 2012) left in this rank only *H. pendula* subsp. *campicarpa* (Boiss.) Dvořák and assigned *H. aucheri* to synonymy of *H. podocarpa* Boiss., and Cullen (l.c.) maintained *H. campicarpa* as a closely related species to *H. pendula*.

To resolve the illegitimacy of the name *Hesperis pendula* DC., one has two alternatives. First, resurrect one of the obscure names *H. aucheri* or *H. campicarpa* which, especially in view of the above-mentioned taxonomic difficulties, would seriously disturb and further complicate the nomenclature of this group, an action that is not recommended by the *Melbourne Code* (McNeill & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 154. 2012). Therefore, the second option to be used is conserving the widely accepted name *H. pendula* DC., an action that would remove its illegitimacy caused by the earlier homonym *H. pendula* Murr. and that would fully establish its nomenclatural stability.

Acknowledgements

The authors are profoundly grateful to John McNeill and John Wiersema for their critical review of the manuscript.