

# Prospects for interspecific hybridization of *Lupinus atlanticus* Gladst. with *L. cosentinii* Guss.

N. N. Roy and J. S. Gladstones

Department of Agriculture, South Perth, Western Australia 6151, Australia

Received April 22, 1985; Accepted July 25, 1985 Communicated by J. Mac Key

**Summary.** Successful crossing is reported between *L. atlanticus* Gladst. (2n = 38) and *L. cosentinii* Guss. (2n = 32), using lines of both species selected for crossability followed by selection of relatively fertile progenies. In one cross, 82E75, from a single  $F_2$  segregating plant, 22  $F_3$  seeds were obtained. Some other less crossable combinations were completely sterile in the  $F_1$  or  $F_2$ . Backcrossing to both parent species was successful, but some crosses gave relatively more seed by using  $F_2$  plants for backcrossing rather than  $F_1$ 's. It is concluded that potential exists for introgression of useful genes in both directions.

**Key words:** Interspecific cross – Wild lupins – *L. atlanticus* Gladst. – *L. cosentinii* Guss. – Crossability

### Introduction

The rough-seeded Mediterranean-African wild lupins offer interesting prospects for future domestication (Gladstones 1984). Though fertile hybrids are reported to be common in crosses among wild species of the New World, almost complete genetic isolation exists among the Mediterranean and African species (Gladstones 1974, 1984; Williams 1984). L. atlanticus is, however, a newly described species, collected from the High Atlas foothills and Anti Atlas region of Southern Morocco (Gladstones 1974). Its chromosome number 2n = 38 (Pazy, cited by Plitmann et al. 1980) is intermediate between L. pilosus (2n=42) and L. cosentinii (2n=32). It is also morphologically intermediate in many respects. Gladstones (1984) found L. atlanticus to cross quite readily with both L. pilosus and L. cosentinii, but the F<sub>1</sub> plants produced only aborted seeds. The present investigation was carried out in an attempt to overcome hybrid sterility in such crosses by using selected lines of *L. atlanticus* and *L. cosentinii*, with the hope that some might prove more cross compatible.

### Materials and methods

A set of the selected lines of *L. atlanticus* were crossed with Erregulla-s, a soft-seeded selection from *L. cosentinii* cv 'Erregulla' (Anon 1977), in the greenhouse during the 1982 winter. The *L. atlanticus* lines were direct introductions from different parts of the species' natural range in southern Morocco, together with low-alkaloid and other artificially-induced mutants derived from them. The 'Erregulla' selection, as well as being soft seeded, carried other domestication genes artificially induced (viz., low alkaloid, white flower/seed, early flowering) or naturally occurring (viz., reduced pod-shattering). The crosses were more successful when *L. atlanticus* was used as the seed parent. In general, 8–10 buds of appropriate stage were used in making a cross.

 $F_1$  seed set was variable; 5 to 55 seeds per cross were obtained depending on the *atlanticus* lines used and the number of crosses made. In all, 14 *L. atlanticus* lines in crosses with Erregulla-s gave enough  $F_1$  seed to carry out this study. From each cross 5–6 seeds ( $F_1$ ) were sown in rows at South Perth during the 1983 winter along with *atlanticus* and *cosentinii* parents and other selections.

In the 1984 winter, one or two  $F_2$  seeds from the four successful interspecific crosses (82E13, 82E30, 82E73 and 82E75) as well as  $BC_1F_1$  seeds from the two back crosses (83E2 and 83E4) were sown in the greenhouse. From one cross only, 82E75, three extra  $F_2$  seeds were available which were planted in the field at South Perth. At flowering all these plants were manually self-pollinated and also backcrossed with pollen from both *atlanticus* (wild/mutant) and *cosentinii* (Erregulla-s).

#### Results

#### $F_1$ plants

The  $F_1$  plants when grown in the field in 1983 and 1984 showed good hybrid vigour, with profuse branching



Fig. 1. Plant growth and vigour.  $F_1$  vs.  $F_2$  and parent (*L. atlanticus*). Front row: Left atlanticus-wild; Centre 82E75 ( $F_2$ )-2 plants only; Right 82E30 ( $F_1$ )

and rapid growth compared with *atlanticus* (Fig. 1). They were intermediate in leaf and stem colour and in days to flowering.

The  $F_1$  plants produced prolific, near-normally developed pods, but at maturity these were found to contain only aborted seeds. Out of 14 crosses of *L. atlanticus* × *L. cosentinii* (Erregulla-s), only four produced a few (up to four)  $F_2$  seeds during the 1983 and 1984 seasons. Two crosses, 82E75 and 82E30, produced four  $F_2$  seeds. In spite of a large number of attempted backcrosses using pollen from *atlanticus* and *cosentinii* parents and selections, only one seed was obtained from each of two backcrosses, namely 83E2 (with *atlanticus* pollen) and 83E4 (with 'Erregulla' as seed parent).

## $F_2/BC_1(F_1)$ plants

In 1984 five single  $F_2$  plants involving the four straight inter-species crosses were raised separately in the

greenhouse, along with the two  $BC_1F_1$  plants. Apart from one backcross, 83E4, all the plants were of more or less intermediate plant type but showed evidence of segregation in flowering dates and plant height.

Variability was again evident in seed set among the  $F_2/BC_1$  plants, both in the greenhouse and in the field (Tables 1 and 2). The maximum  $F_3$  seed obtained was again from individual plants of the same two crosses, namely 82E30-1 (greenhouse) and 82E75-2 (field); the latter gave 22  $F_3$  seeds, the maximum so far recorded. Two other  $F_2$  plants from the same cross, 82E75-1 (greenhouse) and 82E75-3 (field) were completely sterile, indicating segregation for seed fertility in this cross. There was relatively more success at the  $F_2$  plant level than in the  $F_1$  in seed set through backcrosses (except in 82E75). 82E13-1 and 82E30-2 backcrossed to *cosentinii* (Erregulla-s) gave 6 and 3 seeds, respectively. Both these plants gave 2–3 seeds when backcrossed to the other parent, *atlanticus* (mutant or wild).

All these  $F_2$  plants, except 82E73-1, were bitter. 82E73-1 was sweet but failed to give any  $F_3$  or backcrossed seed, and was lost (Table 1).

Cross/backcross	Location	Seed	
		Generation	No.
82E13-1 ( $F_2$ )	GH	F <sub>3</sub>	NIL
82E13-1 × ATL (M)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	2
82E13-1 × COS (ERGS)	GH	$BC_1(F_1)$	6
82E30-1 (F <sub>2</sub> )	GH	F <sub>3</sub>	3
82E30-1 × ATL (W)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	1
82E30-1 × ATL (M)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	2
82E30-1 × COS (ERGS)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E30-2 (F <sub>2</sub> )	GH	F <sub>3</sub>	l
82E30-2 × ATL (W/M)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E30-2 × COS (ERGS)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	3
82E73-1 (F <sub>2</sub> )	GH	F <sub>3</sub>	NIL
82E73-1 × ATL (W/M)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E73-1 × COS (ERGS)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E75-1 ( $F_2$ )	GH	F <sub>3</sub>	NIL
82E75-1 × ATL (W/M)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E75-1 × COS (ERGS)	GH	BC <sub>1</sub> (F <sub>1</sub> )	NIL
82E75-2 ( $F_2$ )	FLD	F <sub>3</sub>	22
82E75-3 ( $F_2$ )	FLD	F <sub>3</sub>	NIL

**Table 1.** Seed set in 7  $F_2$  plants of four interspecific crosses (*atlanticus* × *cosentinii*) through self-pollination and backcrosses

M = Mutant, W = Wild, ERGS = Erregulla Selection, GH = Greenhouse, FLD = Field, ATL = *atlanticus*, COS = *cosentinii* 

**Table 2.** Seed set in two  $BC_1F_1$  plants of 83E2 and 83E4 through self-pollination or second backcrosses

Backcrosses	Seed		
	Generation	No.	
$ \frac{83E4 (BC_1F_1)}{83E4 (BC_1F_1) \times COS (ERGS)} \\ 83E4 (BC_1F_1) \times ATL (M/W) $	$\frac{BC_1 (F_2)}{BC_2 (F_1)}$ $\frac{BC_2 (F_1)}{BC_2 (F_1)}$	12 1 NIL	
83E2 (BC <sub>1</sub> F <sub>1</sub> ) 83E2 (BC <sub>1</sub> F <sub>1</sub> )×COS (ERGS) 83E2 (BC <sub>1</sub> F <sub>1</sub> )×ATL (M/W)	$BC_{1}(F_{2}) BC_{2}(F_{1}) BC_{2}(F_{1})$	1 NIL NIL	

COS = cosentinii, ERGS = Erregulla Selection, ATL = atlanticus, M = Mutant, W = Wild

Among the two backcrosses, 83E2 gave only  $1 F_2$ seed (Table 2). 83E4, which was Erregulla-s×(*atlanticus*×Erregulla-s), looked essentially like Erregulla-s in plant type (green stem and leaf), flower colour (white, small) and seed character (sweet, white, small). It was, however, largely infertile due apparently to poor pollen, and produced only  $12 BC_1F_2$  seeds. When backcrossed a second time with profuse, fertile pollen from 'Erregulla', 83E4 did not set good seed, indicating possible differences at the chromosomal level.

#### Discussion

As a previously undescribed species, little is known about the agronomic possibilities of L. atlanticus. Limited trials and nursery row observations (Roy and Gladstones 1983; Gladstones 1984) indicate that it could be a species of considerable potential for arid and other problem environments of Australia and perhaps elsewhere. Further work on the improvement or domestication of this species therefore appears to be justified.

Mutation has played an important role in the domestication of several lupin species. Similar improvement through mutation should be possible in *L. atlanticus*. Already some chemically-induced mutants selected by Gladstones (unpublished) are available, including lines with white flowers and seeds and freedom from alkaloids. Recently, a soft-seed type has also been isolated (Roy, unpublished). These mutant lines as well as the wild *atlanticus* selections are rather slow growing and late in maturity under Western Australian conditions and need further improvement. A possible approach is the introgression of useful genes through interspecific crosses, particularly involving *L. cosentinii* which is easily crossable.

The present work has shown that despite the difference in chromosome number, there are grounds for thinking that the genetic gap between *L. cosentinii* and *L. atlanticus* may not be so wide as to preclude the introgression of useful genes from one species to the other. Each has useful genes to contribute, i.e. the 'domestication' genes (already enumerated) in *L. cosentinii* and possibly genes for greater cold resistance, adaptation to heavy soils and more determinate growth habit from *L. atlanticus*.

The use of colchicine to overcome the sterility barrier by doubling  $F_1$  chromosomes appears to hold little promise, because of lupins' already high chromosome number. Many attempts to obtain tetraploids in Mediterranean Lupins using colchicine have failed (Kazimierski and Kazimierska 1981). In the present study the use of colchicine was not therefore considered for improvement of  $F_1/F_2$  seed set.

The alternative approach used has been to identify genotypes in the involved species which, when hybridised, are more likely to set seed than usual. This method has been used with some success in *Hordeum/ Secale* crosses (Fedak 1977), in interspecific crosses of *Phaseolus* species (Mok et al. 1978), and in *Brassica* species (Roy 1977, 1980). In the present study there were definite signs of such differences, together with some recovery of fertility with selection in the progeny of one cross. One  $F_2$  plant, 82E75-2, alone gave 22  $F_3$  seeds, the highest recorded in any true interspecific cross among Mediterranean lupins. As in interspecies crosses of *Brassicas* (Roy 1980) there was more success using  $F_2$  plants for backcrossing than with  $F_1$ 's (Tables 1 and 2).

## References

- Anon (1977) Lupinus cosentinii Guss. (sandplain lupin) cv. 'Erregulla'. J Aust Inst Agric Sci 43:87-89
- Fedak G (1977) Haploids from barley×rye crosses. Can J Genet Cytol 19:15-19
- Gladstones JS (1974) Lupins of the Mediterranean region and Africa. Dept Agric W Aust, Tech Bull 26
- Gladstones JS (1984) Present situation and potential of Mediterranean/African lupins for crop production. In: Proc 3rd Int Lupin Conf, La Rochelle (in press)

- Kazimierski T, Kazimierska EM (1981) Polyploids of Lupinus Rothmaleri Klink. Genet Pol 22:433-436
- Mok DWS, Mok MC, Rabokoarihanta A (1978) Interspecific hybridisation of *Phaseolus vulgaris* with *Phaseolus lunatus* and *Phaseolus acutifolius*. Theor Appl Genet 52:209-215
- Plitmann U, Heyn ČC, Pazy B (1980) Biological flora of Israel. 7. Lupinus palaestinus Boiss and L. pilosus Murr. Isr J Bot 28: 108-130
- Roy NN (1977) Interspecific cross-compatibility and  $F_1$  sterility in oilseed Brassicas. In: Proc 3rd Int SABRAO Congr, vol 2 (a), pp 31–33
- Roy NN (1980) Species crossability and early generation plant fertility in interspecific crosses of *Brassica*. SABRAO J 12:43-54
- Roy NN, Gladstones JS (1983) Species variability of yieldcomponent in lupins under stress condition. Aust Plant Br Genet Newslett 33:48-51
- Williams W (1984) Lupins in crop production. Outlook on Agriculture 13:69-76