



Note on the Nomenclature of Fungi and, Incidentally, of *Ganoderma lucidum*

Author(s): R. L. Steyaert

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 10, No. 8 (Oct. - Nov., 1961), pp. 251-252

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1216350>

Accessed: 05/04/2014 08:03

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>

since *Drosophila* is used only in a single book in flagrant violation of the International Code, i.e. after and before an acceptance of that name by conservation had been or will be rejected. All other authors use other generic names, most of them *Psathyrella*. There is not a large number of species to be transferred if *Drosophila* is not conserved, on the contrary, transfers would become necessary for all extra-European species once *Drosophila* were legalized. And furthermore

neither *Drosophila* nor *Psathyrella* are threatened by an older synonymous generic name like *Acurtis* in the case of *Rhodophyllus* which makes action necessary and urgent.

Our proposal is therefore the following: To enter in the list of Genera Conservanda: *Rhodophyllus* Quél., Enchiridion p. 57, 1886 with the nomenclatorial type *Rhodophyllus parkensis* (Fr.) Quél.

Proposed by: ROLF SINGER (Tucumán).

NEWS AND NOTES

JOHANNES ÅSKELSSON 1902—1961

The Icelandic geologist and paleobotanist Jóhannes Áskelsson died of a heart attack in Reykjavík on January 16. He was the first Icelandic scientist to study the remarkable plant fossils that had previously only been preliminarily investigated by Oswald Heer, and he was able to demonstrate that though most of these fossils are older than thought by Heer and probably from early Eocene, some are younger and may form an almost complete series reaching up through the interglacials. Áskelsson was an inspiring teacher and enthusiastic traveller and the author of more than forty well-composed papers, mainly on Icelandic paleobotany.

ÅSKELL LÖVE

NOTE ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF FUNGI AND, INCIDENTALLY, OF GANODERMA LUCIDUM

Vassilkov's note on the proposals concerning the nomenclature of fungi (Taxon 9(9): 265-266, 1960) merits careful meditation, specially in what concerns the deletion of Recommendations 46A and 50D.

Before suggesting or approving such a deletion one should consider what it would imply and the consequences entailed.

It is fitting to draw attention, I feel, to the fact that the position in regard to non-phanerogamous plants is very different from that of the phanerogams. Whilst for the latter Linnaeus' publications were real starting points, because he invented the latin binomial system, or at least officialized it, with Fries the position is entirely different.

Many authors applying the binomial system had preceded him and many valuable contributions to the nomenclature of fungi,

excellently illustrated, had been published, and of these Fries took full advantage. It then appears that the deletion of the above recommendations would run counter the aims of taxonomy and typification, inasmuch as Fries has not left types of many of the names he adopted. If his publications have been adopted, for good or . . . debatable reasons, as one of the starting points in the nomenclature of fungi, the application of the binomials he has used needs sometimes, indeed often, to be precised.

To support my contention I would like to point out a case in point. In the study of the genus *Ganoderma*, on which I have been working for the last 7 or 8 years, I have been able to determine the type of *G. lucidum*. This type is plate no. 224 of William Curtis's *Flora Londinensis* published in 1781. The latter published the binomial *Boletus lucidus* accompanied by a diagnosis written in latin and english. From the text that follows it is patent that Curtis intended publishing a new binomial. Von Leysser, referring to Curtis, took up the name and published it in *Flora Halensis* no. 1245, p. 300, 1783. It is indeed worth remarking that no mention is made of the binomial in the first edition of the *Flora Halensis* published in 1761.

This establishes definitely that the publication by Von Leysser of *Boletus lucidus* is nothing else than a citation.

Subsequent authors have lost sight of the original author and the binomial *Polyporus lucidus* (VON LEYSSER) FRIES has come to be used exclusively. I have not seen Curtis's name mentioned in connection with this binomial, except in Fries and pre-Friesian authors, and in one later case, that of Murrill. This is undoubtedly a very regrettable omission and it is indeed a mistake to confer

on Von Leysser the authorship of the binomial for this conceals several facts: 1°) Curtis coined the name 2°) Curtis' plate is an excellent holotypus 3°) The region of London is the type locality. The citation of authors' name accompanying the binomial should therefore be: *Ganoderma lucidum* (W. CURTIS ex FRIES) KARSTEN:

I feel, that in this case and in similar ones when the type is implied it is essential that the pre-Friesian author be mentioned.

In cryptogamy we are beset with greater difficulties in the typification of taxa than in phanerogamy. Therefore, every rule or recommendation that helps towards the fixation of a holotypus should be kept. Even further, I am strongly in favour of suggesting that the provisions of recommendation 46A and 50D be embodied in a rule.

This, of course, takes for granted that Fries' *Systema Mycologicum* 1821 remains the starting point for the nomenclature of the *Fungi caeteri*. But, perhaps a better conclusion might be reached, and that would be to harken to what G. W. Martin suggested in "Starting points for fungi" (*Taxon* 9(1): 1-3, 1960).

Finally a remark concerning Vassilkov's suggestion of discarding the word *ex*. My feeling is that the fact that this word has been misapplied or used wrongly by a group of modern authors is not a good reason for discarding it. To do so would be to open the door to sanctioning many other malpractices. In taxonomy we must be guided by the principle that precision is paramount to all other considerations and I feel strongly that dropping the name of pre-starting point authors would be going against this principle.

R. L. STEYAERT (Bruxelles)

THE GENERIC NAME SCHIMA

The action of the General Committee (*Taxon* 9: 22, 1960) in refusing to accept the majority finding of the Committee for Spermaphyta (*Taxon* 9: 15, 17, 1960) in regard to the generic name *Schima* Blume (*Theaceae*) (1825) indicates a lack of appreciation of Article 41 (I.C.B.N. 1956).

There can be no doubt that the article is intended to cover those numerous cases in which authors have described either a new genus with one new species, or one new species in a new genus, by means of a combined description covering both categories. New genera with more than one new species are implicitly excluded and there is no provision in it for any situation outside its

explicit terms. Certainly there is no provision for the case of a genus in which one species only is described (and its name published) whilst the author at the same time admits the existence of another species in the same genus.

Prior to 1823, Reinwardt had listed without description a new genus and species under the name *Schima noronhae* Reinw. and in 1823 Blume (*Cat. Gew. Buitenzorg* 80) also listed this species and added a second new species *S. excelsa*, the latter being provided with a brief description which is entirely specific* and contains no word or phrase which might serve to distinguish the genus. It is evident that Blume did not regard the genus as new, since he provided no generic description; all the new genera listed in his catalogue were given descriptions (pp. 8-27), but new species in old genera were given specific diagnoses in footnotes. It is therefore clear that Blume was not describing a "monotypic new genus" when he gave his diagnosis of *Schima excelsa*. Article 41 cannot be applied, and the generic name *Schima* was not validly published.**

In 1825 the position changed. Blume realized that his *Schima excelsa* of 1823 in fact belonged to the genus *Gordonia* Ellis (1770), to which he transferred it, and he then described Reinwardt's *Schima*, with *S. noronhae*. These names were validly published in *Bijdr. Fl. Ned. Ind.* 3: 129 (1825).

The conclusion that *Schima* Reinw. ex Blume (1825) is not a later homonym is inescapable and the name is perfectly safe without conservation. The original proposal to conserve the name was made by van Steenis (*Taxon* 2: 115, 1953) and two Spermaphyta committees have (by majority votes) refused to admit the necessity for conservation. It must be clearly understood that the terms of Article 41 do not limit the meaning of the term "monotypic genus" to "genus in which only one species of two or more has been described". It must be liter-

* *Schima excelsa* Bl. — S: arbor egregia; foliis alternis breviter petiolatis oblongo-lanceolatis acuminatis inferne attenuatis denticulatis laurinis; floribus in extremis foliorum axillis solitariis, gemmis subulatis sericeis.

** Since the generic name *Schima* was not validly published, it may be noted that the specific name *Schima excelsa* Blume (1823) also was not validly published (Art. 42, I.C.B.N. 1956).