

Glycosmis lucida (Rutaceae) – an unwanted guest?

V. Sampath Kumar✉

Central National Herbarium, Botanical Survey of India, B. Garden (P.O.), Howrah – 711 103, West Bengal, India
✉Corresponding author: vskumar10@rediffmail.com

ग्लाइकोसमिस लूसिडा (रूटेसी) – एक अवांछित अतिथि

वी. संपत कुमार

सारांश

इस पादप जाति का नाम ग्लाइकोसमिस लूसिडा वाल. एक्स हुआंग, जिसे 1987 में हुआंग ने मान्यता दी, यह नाम अमान्य है एवं इस टेक्सोन के लिए इसका मान्य नाम ग्लाइकोसमिस काइमोसा निर्धारित किया गया।

ABSTRACT

The name *Glycosmis lucida* Wall. ex C.C. Huang, validated by Huang in 1987, is an invalid one and the name *G. cymosa* is considered here as valid name for this taxon.

Keywords: Rutaceae, *Glycosmis lucida*, nom. illeg.

INTRODUCTION

While going through the taxonomic account of the family 'Rutaceae' dealt in 'Flora of China' (vol. 11, 2008) in connection to a study on the nomenclatural aspects of some Indian citrus species, it was noticed that *Glycosmis lucida* Wall. ex C.C. Huang, the name validated only in 1987, has been considered as an accepted name against the century old validly published names!

Narayanaswami (1941: 30) opined that *G. cyanocarpa* (Blume) Spreng., is different from the Indian plant, and he named the Indian one as *G. cymosa* (Kurz) V. Naray., by elevating a variety of *G. cyanocarpa*. In the same work,

Narayanaswami transferred the other variety, *G. cyanocarpa* var. *simplicifolia* Kurz under *G. cymosa*, and cited *G. longifolia* (Oliv.) Tanaka as synonymy of the variety *simplicifolia* and by which *G. cymosa* lost its priority at species level. In other words, Narayanaswami should have opted the already extant specific epithet *G. longifolia*, rather elevating the variety and making a new combination of *G. cymosa* (Kurz) V. Naray.

As stated by Stone (1985), the combination made by Narayanaswami would stand, only if the variety *simplicifolia* was treated under a different species. Huang (1987) although considered variety *simplicifolia* under *G. cyanocarpa* (original concept of Kurz [J. Bot. 14: 34. 1876], type

from Assam), but validated Wallichian epithet *G. lucida* with a notion that *G. cymosa* (Kurz) V. Naray. is a later homonym of Zippelius ex Spanoghe (*Linnaea* 15: 178. 1841). Indeed, *G. cymosa* Zipp. ex Span. is also a *nomen nudum* and the validation of *G. lucida* Wall. was totally unwanted.

Glycosmis tetraphylla Wall. ex Voigt was considered as a *nomen nudum* by Narayanaswami (*l.c.*), Stone (*l.c.*) and Huang (1987, 1997), but a careful assessment of every individual name under *Glycosmis* Corrêa dealt by Voigt (1845) reveals that the specific epithet *tetraphylla* was validly published (Gandhi, pers. comm.), the nomenclatural remark on the name at International Plant Name Index (IPNI) also deliberates the same. When the implied leaf character of the epithets (*tetraphylla* vs *pentaphylla*), geographical distribution, and phenology are added, the species *G. tetraphylla* can easily be distinguished from *G. pentaphylla* (Retz.) DC., which was also described by Voigt as “Fl. small, white”.

Stone (*l.c.*) as well as Nair & Nayar (1997), however adopted the broader concept and treated all the above discussed taxa as varieties under *G. cyanocarpa* and in total recognised 10 and 4 varieties from Malesian region and India, respectively. Press & al. (2000) also followed the same broader concept in the checklist of flowering plants of Nepal, in contrast to Flora of Bhutan, where Grierson (1991) accepted *G. cymosa*.

If this taxon has to be treated as in *Flora of China* (Huang, 1997; Zhang & al., 2008), the nomenclature provided below has to be followed:

Glycosmis tetraphylla Wall. ex Voigt, Hort. Suburb. Calcutt. 139. 1845. *G. oxyphylla* Wall. ex Voigt, Hort. Suburb. Calcutt. 139. 1845, *nom. nud.* *G. pentaphylla* var. β , subvar. 5 Oliv. in J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 5(Suppl. 2): 37. 1861. *G. pentaphylla* var. 2, subvar. 4 Hook.f., Fl. Brit. India 1: 500. 1875. *G. cyanocarpa* var. *cymosa* Kurz in J. Bot. 14: 34, pl. 175, f. 5–7. 1876. *G. cymosa* (Kurz) V. Naray. in Rec. Bot. Surv. India 14(2): 26. 1941, *excl. var. simplicifolia*. *G. lucida* Wall. ex C.C. Huang in Guihaia 7: 119. 1987 & Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 43(2): 122. 1997, *nom. illeg.*; D.X. Zhang & al. in Z.Y. Wu & P.H. Raven, Fl. China 11: 81. 2008.

However, as mentioned above, the name *Glycosmis tetraphylla* was considered as *nomen nudum* by many authors including Huang (*l.c.*) and Zhang & al. (2008) in their Chinese account, probably description provided by Voigt (*l.c.*) was too short, describes only the floral characters, which is insufficient to distinguish *G. tetraphylla*

from other species dealt under *Glycosmis*. Already debate is going on among the nomenclatural authorities, whether such kind of short description has to be accepted and continued or to be avoided. Indeed, most of them are not particular about it and like to avoid this kind of problems! Even if due to ICN authorities' decision, the name *G. tetraphylla* becomes invalid and disqualified, Huang's validated epithet, *G. lucida* cannot be used, as *G. cymosa* Zipp. ex Span. is a *nomen nudum* and thus the name, *Glycosmis cymosa* (Kurz) V. Naray., has to be accepted.

Glycosmis cymosa (Kurz) V. Naray. in Rec. Bot. Surv. India 14(2): 26. 1941, *excl. var. simplicifolia*. *G. cyanocarpa* var. *cymosa* Kurz in J. Bot. 14: 34, pl. 175, f. 5–7. 1876. *G. tetraphylla* Wall. ex Voigt, Hort. Suburb. Calcutt. 139. 1845, *nom. nud.* *G. oxyphylla* Wall. ex Voigt, Hort. Suburb. Calcutt. 139. 1845, *nom. nud.* *G. pentaphylla* var. β , subvar. 5 Oliv. in J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 5(Suppl. 2): 37. 1861. *G. pentaphylla* var. 2, subvar. 4 Hook.f., Fl. Brit. India 1: 500. 1875. *G. lucida* Wall. ex C.C. Huang in Guihaia 7: 119. 1987 & Fl. Reipubl. Popularis Sin. 43(2): 122. 1997, *nom. illeg.*; D.X. Zhang & al. in Z.Y. Wu & P.H. Raven, Fl. China 11: 81. 2008.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is thankful to the Library staff of Royal Botanical Gardens, Kew, England for kindly permitting him to consult the literature and to Dr. Kanchi N. Gandhi, Senior Nomenclatural Registrar, Harvard University Herbaria, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA for nomenclatural clarifications.

REFERENCES

- GRIERSON, A. J. C. 1991. Rutaceae. In: A. J. C. Grierson & D. G. Long (eds.), *Flora of Bhutan* 2(1): 6–22. Royal Botanic Garden, Edinburgh and Royal Government of Bhutan.
- HUANG, C. C. 1987. New taxa and notes on *Glycosmis* Corr. (materials for Chinese Rutaceae IV). *Guihaia* 7(2): 115–124.
- HUANG, C. C. 1997. Rutaceae. In: C.C. Huang (ed.), *Flora Reipublicae Popularis Sinicae* 43(2): Science Press, Beijing.
- NAIR, K. N. AND M. P. NAYAR. 1997. Rutaceae. In: P. K. Hajra, V. J. Nair & P. Daniel (eds.), *Flora of India* 4: 259–408. Botanical Survey of India, Calcutta.
- NARAYANASWAMI, V. 1941. A revision of the Indo-Malayan species of *Glycosmis* Correa. *Rec. Bot. Surv. India* 14(2): 1–72.

- PRESS, J. R., K. K. SHRESTHA AND D. A. SUTTON. 2000. Rutaceae. In: *Annotated checklist of the flowering plants of Nepal*, pp. 279–281. The Natural History Museum, London and Central Department of Botany, Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu.
- STONE, B. C. 1985. A conspectus of the genus *Glycosmis* Correa: studies in Malesian Rutaceae. III. *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia* 137(2): 1–27.
- VOIGT, J. O. 1845. *Hortus suburbanus Calcuttensis; A Catalogue of the Plants which have been cultivated in the Hon. East India Company's Botanical Garden, Calcutta, and in the Serampore Botanical Garden*. Printed under the superintendence of W. Griffith. Bishop's College Press, Calcutta.
- ZHANG, D. X., T. G. HARTLEY AND D. J. MABBERLEY. 2008. Rutaceae. In: Z.Y. Wu & P.H. Raven (eds.), *Flora of China* 11: 51–97. Science Press, Beijing and Missouri Botanical Garden Press, St. Louis.