Zur Nomenklatur der Lichenes
Author(s): Fritz Mattick
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 3, No. 2 (Feb., 1954), pp. 60-61
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217366
Accessed: 01/03/2014 08:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon.*

http://www.jstor.org

This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:39:15 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Recombination of Names of Infraspecific Taxa

by

LYMAN BENSON (Claremont, Calif.)

Use of the taxa subspecies and variety is inconsistent from one author to the next. Subspecies may mean a taxon of higher rank than variety and composed of one or more varieties as specified in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, but it may be the only taxon employed by an author for any infraspecific taxon. Variety may be employed for taxa below the rank of subspecies, but as with subspecies, it may be employed as the only recognized taxon below the rank of species. This inconsistency in usage of either subspecies or variety as the only recognized infraspecific category leads to many nomenclatural shifts in rank from subspecies to variety and vice versa.

In the writer's recent treatment of the North American species of *Ranunculus* (American Midland Naturalist, 40: 1-261. 1948) ninety-six species were recognized. Besides typical varieties, seventy-eight varieties were included. Only four or five of these have equivalent name combinations in subspecific rank, all these having been published recently. The same situation exists in innumerable genera. Varietal rank has been employed for many years when only one taxon below the rank of species has been recognized, but recently many botanists have adopted the practice of assigning the rank of subspecies to all varieties even though no reclassification was involved. Under the present rules, in a new rank a new epithet, once it is published, has priority over all others. Varieties should not be left vulnerable to changes of epithets because of differences in priority on transfer to subspecific rank. A similar situation in reverse exists in genera which have received full and careful monographing in recent years by those who use exclusively the rank of subspecies.

Proposal no. 142

New Art. 70bis

The priority of an epithet in all infraspecific ranks dates from its earliest valid publication in any infraspecific rank.

The name of a published infraspecific taxon is changed to any other infraspecific rank without change of author's citation. For example, *Ranunculus orthorhynchus* Hook. var. *platyphyllus* A. Gray becomes in subspecific rank *Ranunculus orthorhynchus* Hook. subsp. *platyphyllus* A. Gray. In formal monographic work the name of the original author may be followed by an indication of emended status by a later author and a reference to the place of publication. In manuals of local flora this is not necessary, but a statement of emended status may be included.

Note: In the first line of Article 70, insert after "infrageneric", "but not infraspecific".

Zur Nomenklatur der Lichenes

von

FRITZ MATTICK (Berlin-Dahlem)

Artikel 76 des International Code 1952 betrifft zwei ganz verschiedenartige Dinge, die nicht das geringste miteinander zu tun haben, nämlich 1.) Namen von Taxa, die sich als ein Gemisch nicht zusammengehöriger Elemente herausstellen, und 2.) die Nomenklatur der Lichenes. Es wäre daher zweckmässig, den Artikel 76 in zwei getrennte Artikel aufzulösen.

Der zweite die Flechten betreffende Absatz des Artikels 76 besagt Folgendes: "In der Nomenklatur sollen den Flechten gegebene Namen als sich auf ihre Pilzkomponente beziehend betrachtet werden". — Dies kann nicht unwidersprochen hingenommen werden, denn die Vertreter der Anschauung von der Selbständigkeit der Flechten sind bei der Abfassung dieser Regel offenbar gar nicht zu Worte gekommen. Da die Flechte nicht dasselbe ist wie der eine ihrer Symbiosepartner, kann der das Flechtenganze bezeichnende Name nicht auf den einen Teil übertragen werden (siehe Mattick 1951 a und b sowie 1953). Genauso wie die in Reinkultur gezogene Flechtenalge (die sich freilich verhältnismässig leicht mit einer frei

This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:39:15 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

lebenden identifizieren lässt) ihren eigenen Namen hat, muss auch der Flechtenpilz den seinen erhalten. Als Beispiel: *Xanthoria parietina* ist die ganze Flechte; der aus ihren Sporen erhaltene algenfreie Pilz kann nicht auch *Xanthoria parietina* heißen. Man kann ihn höchstens, wie es schon vielfach geschehen ist, *Xanthoriomyces parietinae* nennen. Im Verhältnis zu der riesigen Zahl der Flechten, deren Pilz niemals frei lebend beobachtet worden ist, sind die Fälle, in denen ein Pilz sowohl frei lebend wie auch zusammen mit einer Alge als Flechte vorkommen kann, ganz wenige. Und in diesen Fällen hat ja der Pilz schon seinen eigenen Namen. Ich schlage daher vor, dass die obige Regel wie folgt abgeändert wird:

Proposal 143

Art. 76(2)

"In der Nomenklatur gelten die Flechtennamen immer für die Flechte als Ganzes. Will man die Flechtenkomponenten getrennt bezeichnen, so bekommt die Flechtenalge den Namen, den sie im frei lebenden Zustand trägt, während dem Pilz (falls er nicht auch frei vorkommt und schon seinen eigenen Namen hat) der Gattungsname der Flechte mit der angehängten Endung *-myces* gegeben wird, unter Zufügung des in den Genitiv gesetzten Artnamens der Flechte".

Zitierte Literatur:

MATTICK, FR.: Wuchs- und Lebensformen, Bestand- und Gesellschaftsbildung der Flechten. — Botan. Jahrbücher, 75 (3): 378-424. 1951.

——: Alte und neue Probleme der Lichenologie. — Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 64: 93-107. 1951.

——: Lichenologische Notizen. — Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Ges. 66: 263-276. 1953. — Darin: 5. Zur Nomenklatur der Flechten, S. 275-276.

Various Proposals

Proposal no. 144

Rec. 19B

Delete Rec. 19B and insert a *new Article* 19 bis:

"On and from 1 Jan. 1955 the original material, especially the holotype must be scrupulously conserved and be deposited in a permanent responsible institution. Living material cannot be designated as a type".

Art. 21 (note 1)

Modify as follows:

Up to and including 31 Dec. 1954 the type may be a figure and/or a description for plants of which no type specimen exists.

Argument: New species of cacti and other succulent plants are often described from living specimens in botanical gardens or private collections. When such a plant dies nothing guarantees the preservation of the material. This will cause errors in the future as it did in the past (types of Salm-Dyck, etc.).

Proposed by: P. A. Florschütz, Utrecht.

Proposal no. 145

Art. 23

Delete paragraph f; in paragraph e for the enumeration of groups substitute "**Fungi caeteri**". The provision concerning the starting-point for the Fungi other than Myxomycetes will then read: "e. **Fungi caeteri**, 31 Dec. 1801 (Persoon, *Synopsis Methodica Fungorum*").

Argument: The system of multiple starting-points for Fungi has long been a source of confusion, and in its application has led to unusual bibliographic difficulties and labor. The confusion has been eliminated by the unambiguous formulation adopted at Stockholm; but the other difficulties remain. As an example, there are sound bases for differences of opinion whether certain Fungi are Agaricales (1821) or Gasteromycetes (1801). As a second, widely-accepted names published in excellent works a little earlier than the *Systema Mycologicum* or contemporary with it are displaced, or, what is worse, altered in their application, by the manner in which they were compiled for the *Systema*. Adoption of a starting-point later than 1821 can serve only to consign to limbo still more of the often admirable work (and generally-employed names) of early-nineteenth-century authors. The *Synopsis* of Persoon bears the same relation to the taxonomy of the Fungi that the *Species Plantarum* bears to that of seed-plants: it is the first ordered and comprehensive treatment of all the generally recognized taxa known at the time of publication. Its adoption

This content downloaded from 212.238.12.29 on Sat, 1 Mar 2014 08:39:15 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions