

# THE CITATION OF AUTHORS OF REVALIDATED NAMES

M. A. Donk (The Hague)\*

The citation of an author who revalidated a name is only very summarily treated in the Paris Code (1956).

RECOMMENDATION 50D.—“The citation of an author who published the name before the starting point of the group concerned is indicated, when considered useful or desirable, preferably between square brackets or by the use of the word *ex*. This method is especially applicable in mycology when reference is made to authors earlier than Fries or Persoon.

“Examples: *Lupinus* [Tourn. ...] L. ..., or *Lupinus* Tourn. *ex* L. — *Boletus piperatus* [Bull. ...] Fr. ..., or *Boletus piperatus* Bull. *ex* Fr.”

The generous provision of two different kinds of notation is somewhat surprising: one of two methods would appear superfluous if the two examples (of *Lupinus* and *Boletus piperatus*) are really strictly comparable. This they are not and I have suggested recognizing this fact by proposing the following new recommendation (Donk *in* Taxon 6: 255-256. 1957).

RECOMMENDATION 50D.—“The citation of an author who published the name before the introduction of the binomial system of Linnaeus is indicated, when considered useful or desirable, preferably between square brackets.

“Example: ... *Lupinus* [Tourn.] L.”

In the mean-time this proposal was accepted by the Congress at Montreal, which leaves ‘*ex*’ to connect the post-Linnean author of a not validly published name dating from after 1753 with the author who validly published it. Because the only kind of pre-Linnean names that can be taken up in Linnaeus’s binomial system are generic ones, one will find the use of the square brackets restricted to the category of the latter.<sup>1</sup>

Originally Linnaeus’s “Species Plantarum” was accepted as the general starting-point for the nomenclature of all plants, but in 1910 and afterwards ‘later’ starting-points were introduced for certain groups of cryptogamic plants. This amounted to a whole-sale reduction of validly published names to the status of not validly published names; such names are now sometimes called *devaliated names*.

Discussions with other mycologists have indicated that there is still one difficulty which has to be cleared in relation to Art. 13 (f), part of which runs:

“Names of FUNGI CAETERI published in other works between the dates of the first (vol. 1) and last (vol. 3, part 2 and index) parts of Fries, *Systema* [*Mycologicum*] which are synonyms or homonyms of names of any of the FUNGI CAETERI included in the *Systema* do not affect the nomenclatural status of names used by Fries in this work.”

It has become customary also to follow the example of ‘*Boletus piperatus* Bull. *ex* Fr.’ in all cases that Fries accepted a validly published name in the “Systema”, but this is not defensible because the use of this notation is not only faulty but may also obscure some basic information that author’s citations are supposed to offer. For instance, ‘*Peziza minima* Fr.’ indicates that the name was validly published by Fries (in 1828); and ‘*Thelephora viticola* Schw. *ex* Fr.’ would mean that the invalidly

\* Rijksherbarium, Leiden.

<sup>1</sup> Quite recently square brackets were used in still a different way: compare Dennis, Orton, & Hora (New Check List Brit. Agar. Boleti 10. 1960): “Square brackets are used to enclose a pre-Friesian author when that author used the specific epithet in question attached to a different generic name or a different rank from that of the validating author.”

published name *Thelephora viticola* Schw. was validly published by Fries (1828). Yet, the actual situation in the latter case is that *Thelephora viticola* Schw. (Syn. Fung. Car. sup. in Schr. naturf. Ges. Leipzig 1: 107. 1822) was already validly published by von Schweinitz himself, and Fries took it up in a volume of the starting-point book (Elench. 1: 205. 1828): in matters of priority and homonymy the name *Thelephora viticola* counts already from the date of its publication by von Schweinitz and not from the date that Fries took it up. What Fries did (according to Art. 13) was merely to 'sanction' the name: if it could be demonstrated that the species received another and earlier validly published name, in this case, between January 1, 1821 and the publication of von Schweinitz's "Synopsis" in the second half of the year 1822, von Schweinitz's name is to be maintained because it was accepted by Fries in the starting-point book. For cases of this kind it is suggested that Fries's name be connected with that of the validating author by means of a colon: '*Thelephora viticola* Schw.: Fr.' In this way a notation like '*Thelephora episphaeria* (Schw.) ex Fr.' becomes unambiguous again: Fries validly published a not yet validly published name, "*H[imantia] episphaerium*. Schwein.! in litt."

As far as mycology is concerned the colon is always followed by 'Fr.' because, of the two starting-point authors (Persoon, 1801; Fries, 1821-32), only Fries's starting-point book was published at intervals. The use of ': Fr.' indicates that Fries accepted a name in the starting-point book that was previously validly published. A few additional applications of the proposed notation may now be given.

1. *Favolus canadensis* Klotzsch: Fr.

*Favolus canadensis* Klotzsch in Linnaea 7: 197. 1832; Fr., Syst. mycol. 3 (Ind.): 90. 1832.

2. *Guepinia helvelloides* (DC. ex Pers.: Fr.) Fr.

*Tremella helvelloides* DC., Fl. franç. 2: 93. 1805 (devaluated name). — *Tremella helvelloides* DC. ex Pers., Mycol. europ. 1: 100. 1822; Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 211. 1822. — *Guepinia helvelloides* (DC. ex Pers.: Fr.) Fr., Elench. 2: 31. 1828.

3. *Cenangium pulveraceum* (A. & S. ex Pers.) Fr.

*Peziza pulveracea* A. & S., Consp. Fung. nisk. 342 pl. 8 f. 2. 1805 (devaluated name). — *Peziza pulveracea* A. & S. ex Pers., Mycol. europ. 1: 267, 327. 1822. — *Cenangium pulveraceum* (A. & S. ex Pers.) Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 181. 1822.

4. *Peziza stipata* Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 106. 1822 is a later homonym of *Peziza stipata* Pers. ex Pers., Mycol. europ. 1: 270. 1822, but being published in the starting-point book it is legitimate, and Persoon's name the illegitimate one.

There is no end if one wants to make the author's citation more cumbersome in connection with revalidated names. Thus one may come across the notation *Amanita muscaria* (L. ex Fr.) Pers. ex S. F. Gray, which is supposed to express: that the name *Agaricus muscarius* L. (devaluated name) was altered into *Amanita muscaria* (L.) Pers. before the starting-point date; was validly published (revalidated) as *Agaricus muscarius* L. ex Fr.; and, finally, that Persoon's pre-starting-point recombination was validly published after January 1, 1821: *Amanita muscaria* (L. ex Fr.) Pers. ex S. F. Gray. In my opinion the mention of Persoon is superfluous here: *Amanita muscaria* (L. ex Fr.) S. F. Gray.

One simplification that is already currently and silently applied is not to insist on an extra pair of brackets if an epithet has been used in three different combinations by the three authors following the name. For instance one does not write *Amplariella rubescens* {(Pers.) ex Fr.} E. J. Gilb., but simply *Amplariella rubescens* (Pers. ex Fr.) E. J. Gilb.; synonymy, *Amanita rubescens* Pers. 1797 (devaluated name) ≡ *Agaricus*

*rubescens* (Pers.) ex Fr. 1821 ≡ *Amplariella rubescens* (Pers. ex Fr.) E. J. Gilb. 1940.<sup>2</sup>

The notation '*Agaricus muscarius* L. ex Fr.' does not show whether Fries (re)validated the name in the starting-point book or in one of his other publications. One may be tempted to provide somehow for this omission in all those cases in which the notation ': Fr.' is not represented in the authors' citation and yet Fries accepted the name in some form in the starting-point book. For instance, one may suggest marking the starting-point book revalidations in such cases by a special sign, like a dagger: '*Agaricus muscarius* L. ex †Fr.' However, it seems wise to plead for simplification once more and leave out from the authors' citation any special indication that Fries himself (re)validated a name in the "Systema". The number of revalidations made by Fries in other publications than the "Systema" are relatively few and hardly make it worth while to mark all the cases where the revalidations occurred in the starting-point book.

From the pertinent Rules and Recommendations one has to conclude that author's citations represent important clues, viz. (i) to the date of the original description of a name, and, in recombinations and similar names, to the date of the isonym, dates being all important in matters of priority and homonymy; and (ii) to the place of the original description which may inform us about (iii) the type and other questions. The formula '*Caldesiella viridis* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Pat.' directs us to the original publication of the name *Sistotrema viride* by von Albertini & von Schweinitz in 1805; it eventually will lead us also to the revalidated name *Hydnum viride* (A. & S.) ex Fr. (1821) and to the information that in this form the name was validly published by Fries in a volume of the starting-point book; and, moreover, to the date (1900) from which Patouillard's recombination starts to count in matters of priority and homonymy. If one considers the authors' citation of *Caldesiella viridis*, as given above, correct, then it also informs us that the type of *Sistotrema viride* A. & S. (the devaluated name), of *Hydnum viride* Fr. (the revalidated name), and of *Caldesiella viridis* Pat. is one and the same for all three names and inevitably the type of *Sistotrema viride*. In the case of a revalidated fungus name an additional clue is needed (iv) in case a name was validly published before it was 'sanctioned' by Fries in the "Systema": this is the notation ': Fr.' suggested above (but which is thought to be superfluous in the present case).

Author's citations are a cumbersome addition to plant names. If one uses the name repeatedly on the same occasion and if one has somewhere on that occasion given the author's citation, it seems unnecessary to repeat it each time as many authors do. I do not believe that Art. 46 of the Code implies that the author's citation has to be carried on and on if a name is used more than once.

At this point I may be permitted to return to what I still consider an improvement. In order to differentiate between validly published names derived from devaluated names and from other not validly published names, I further proposed the following recommendation (Donk in *Taxon* 6: 256. 1957). Although it did not succeed in obtaining a majority at Montreal, it nevertheless may still be useful to mention it and to discuss it briefly. There is no harm in using it.

"RECOMMENDATION 50D (bis).—The citation of an author who would validly have published the name if the starting point of a later date than 1 May 1753 of the group concerned and listed in Art. 13 had not been adopted, is connected by the word *per* with the citation of the author who actually validly published the name.

"Example: ... *Boletus piperatus* Bull. per Fr."

<sup>2</sup> Dennis & al. (see footnote 1) would write *Amplariella rubescens* ([Pers.] Fr.) E. J. Gilb.

The substitution of 'ex' by 'per' in connection with revalidated names is not intended to get rid of 'ex'; it is simply a recognition of the fact that revalidated names deserve some special treatment. Compare,

RECOMMENDATION 46A.—“When a name has been proposed but not validly published by one author and is subsequently validly published and ascribed to him by another author, the name of the former author followed by the connecting word *ex* may be inserted before the name of the publishing author. . . . If it is desirable or necessary to abbreviate such a citation, the name of the publishing author, being the more important, should be retained.

“Examples: *Havetia flexilis* Spruce *ex* Planch. & Triana . . .”

If one admits 'per' in addition to 'ex', the notation *Havetia flexilis* Spruce *ex* Planch. & Triana means that Planchon & Triana took up a name not validly published which is not a devaluated name; and the notation *Boletus piperatus* Bull. *per* Fr., that Fries revalidated a name. If, moreover, my interpretation of the Code as to the typification of revalidated names is deemed acceptable, then 'per' gets still more meaning (Donk *in* Taxon 6: 245-256. 1957).

Let us once more take into consideration the above mentioned case of *Amanita muscaria*. The notation *Amanita muscaria* (L. *ex* Fr.) Pers. *ex* S. F. Gray, and its shortened form *Amanita muscaria* (L. *ex* Fr.) S. F. Gray convey incorrect information. Neither Persoon nor Gray recombined the epithet of *Agaricus muscarius* L. *ex* Fr.; Persoon recombined the epithet 'muscarius L.' and nothing else; and Gray merely applied the already made combination '*Amanita muscaria* (L.) Pers.' The latter author was unaware of the existence of Fries's "Systema" when he used the recombination.

By the substitution of 'ex' by 'per' and the precise formulation of what 'per' stands for, such incorrect information is avoided. *Amanita muscaria* (L. *per* Fr.) S. F. Gray carries all essential information that is required—and no incorrect statements. It states (i) that Linnaeus introduced the devaluated name [*Agaricus*] *muscarius*; (ii) that the latter name starts counting in priority considerations when Fries accepted it; and (iii) that Gray was the first to use the combination *Amanita muscaria* after the later starting-point date.

If one accepts 'per' another of the above examples gains in exactness: '*Thelephora episphaeria* (Schw.) *ex* Fr.' then means that Fries validly published a not yet validly published name—not even a devaluated one.

The following remark has no bearing on the subject as indicated in the title of this note, but in connection with the loose use of 'ex' in the Code (1956) attention may be drawn to the next item.

RECOMMENDATION 50B.— . . . When an author has published as a synonym a manuscript name of another author, the word *ex* should be used in citations to connect the names of the two authors.

“Example: . . . *Myrtus serratus* Koenig *ex* Steudel . . . pro syn.”

Why the use of 'ex' at all (according to Recommendation 46A indicating that the name was validly published by the second author) if it expresses something that is palpably not true, and, therefore, must promptly be rendered null and void again by adding 'pro syn.'? Perhaps in these cases a semicolon will do? Example, *Myrtus serratus* Koenig; Steudel (pro syn.).