

REINWARDTIA

BEING A CONTINUATION OF THE
BULLETIN DU JARDIN BOTANIQUE DE BUITENZORG
(*BULLETIN OF THE BOTANIC GARDENS, BUITENZORG*)

EDITORS

M. A. DONK
(Herbarium Bogoriense)

AND

C. G. G. J. VAN STEENIS
(Flora Malesiana)

• Price U.S. \$ 0.75
or equivalent in other currency

Published by
HERBARIUM BOGORIENSE
KEBUN RAYA INDONESIA

ON GENERIC TYPE SPECIES INDICATED BY MISAPPLIED NAMES

M. A. DONK*

When the type method was introduced in the "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature," it was stated that "a nomenclatural type is that constituent element to which the name of a group is permanently attached" and, further, that "the type of . . . a generic name is a species and that of a species . . . is usually a specimen or preparation. In some species, however, the type is a description or figure given by a previous author" (Art. 18).¹ No doubt, the type of a generic name is a *species* and that of a specific name a *specimen* (or its substitute).

A species may be variously interpreted as to its limits; it may be narrowly or broadly conceived. It may receive a name, but it remains a species even if it has no name. It frequently occurs that a specific name is misapplied to a quite different species. Hence it is also evident that a *species* and a *specific name* are two intrinsically different notions, not at all identical and interchangeable. As quoted above, Art. 18 positively says that the type of a generic name is a species and does not refer to specific names. I believe this article really states what it wanted to convey in this respect, and is not an instance of unfortunate wording.

A species comprises a vast number of 'individuals plants' and of these some are preserved often only in part, or are subject to taxonomic study without preservation, and represent the 'specimens' of the Rules; when the species is given a name, one of these is or afterwards becomes the 'type specimen.' Thus a (type) species and a (type) specimen are different notions.

In the binomial system a specific name is a combination of two words. The first part, or generic appellation, stands for a *generic description*, the second part, or specific epithet, for a *specific description*²: a specific name roots in two different descriptions. Far more often than not these two are published on different occasions by different authors.

*Keeper of Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia.

¹'Group' has now become 'taxon.'

²Only exceptionally one description is permitted under heavily restricted circumstances to represent both the generic appellation and the specific description (Art. 43).

Rogers, in addition, concluded: "Ergo, *Cristella* = *Sebacina*."⁶

Patouillard published, first, a new generic name, *Cristella*, for a new taxon accompanied by a description drawn up from the specimens he actually studied; among these the type specimen of *Merisma cristatum* Pers. was not represented. Secondly, he published a new combination ("*Crist, cristata*") for an 'old' species, basonym, *Merisma cristatum* Pers.⁶; this recombination has to be treated as a synonym of Persoon's name given to the species of *Sebacina*. These two simple and easily extricable facts would seem a very slender basis for confusion.

EXAMPLE 3.—Following the same unsupportable line of reasoning, Rogers identified the species he selected as the type of *Soppittiella* Mass. (Brit. Fung. Fl. 1: 106. 1892) not according to what Masee understood by that name, but what he, Rogers, understood by it, and so *Soppittiella* became to him another synonym of *Sebacina* Tul.

The fungus described and illustrated by Masee as *Soppittiella cristata* Mass. ("*Thelephora cristata*, Fr.") is presumably also the same as *Corticium fastidiosum* (*Cristella cristata sensu* Pat.), although some allowances for errors in his description should be made: for instance, the spores are not "pale vinous." The generic diagnosis of *Soppittiella* does not agree well with Masee's description of this selected type. It states that the fruit-body is "soft, fleshy, and subgelatinous when growing, collapsing when dry" and (in the general discussion) "soft, fleshy, and subgelatinous when moist." On the other hand, Masee's accounts of the genus and the species he attributed to it are so confused, inaccurate, and even evidently erroneous that the proper selection of a different species agreeing more closely with the generic description would be a complicated matter with a subjective and debatable result. I, therefore, wholeheartedly support Rogers' choice of the indicated species, which makes, to me, *Soppittiella* a later synonym of *Cristella*, but not of *Sebacina* as was concluded by him!

⁶He proceeds to draw attention to the later name *Phlebiella* P. Karst. which he considers the correct one for the genus in an emended circumscription. There are signs that some other mycologists are inclined to accept this view; compare H. S. Jackson (*in* Canad. J. Res. 26 C: 144, 155. 1948) and John Eriksson [*in* Symb. bot. upsal. 10 (5): 6. 1950]. This unexpected development induced the present note.

⁷Rather than *Thelephora cristata* (Pers.) ex Fr. Whether or not the new recombination *Cristella cristata* was validly published is again a different matter.

NOTES ON MALESIAN FUNGI—II*

On the genera *Auricularia*, *Hirneola*, and *Laschia*

M. A. DONK**

SUMMARY

1. After discussing the outer characters of the three genera *Auricularia* Bull, ex Merat, *Hirneola* Fr. (1848), and *Laschia* Fr., now often combined into a single genus, the author concludes that there is every reason to follow Bresadola and to keep *Auricularia* and *Hirneola* apart as distinct genera, and to enter *Laschia* into *Hirneola*.
2. It is pointed out that in *Hirneola* the hymenophore is not invariably inferior.
3. The author once more discusses the desirability of conserving the name *Hirneola* Fr. 1848. He withdraws his previous proposal for conservation of *Auricularia* Bull, ex Brongn. 1824.
4. The new combination *Hirneola nigricans* (Sw. ex Fr.) Donk is proposed.
5. It is possible that the correct name for the Judas' ear is *Hirneola auricula* (L. ex Mexat) H. Karst.

HISTORICAL OUTLINE.—The three auriculariaceous genera *Auricularia* Bull, [ex Merat 1821], *Laschia* Fr., and *Hirneola* Fr. (1848), kept apart by Fries, are now often combined into a single genus under the name of *Auricularia*. When introduced, the earliest of these three names, *Auricularia*, covered various fungi now considered not closely related, among which *Auricularia mesenterica* (Dicks, ex Fr.) Fr. (as *Au. tremelloides* Bull.) and *Stereum hirsutum* (Willd. ex Fr.) S. F. Gray (as *Au. reflexa* Bull.) were the most noteworthy representatives. Bulliard did not include *Tremella auricula* L. = *T. auricula-judae* Bull. = *Hirneola auricula* (L. ex Merat) H. Karst. (see p. 499), the well-known Judas' ear. In fact there was not much difference between *Auricularia* Bull, and *Thelephora* Ehrh. as the latter genus was emended by Persoon. Certain authors even replaced the name *Thelephora* by *Auricularia*, retaining the Persoonian genus unaltered (Merat, see p. 498).

The first to combine *Au. mesenterica* and *H. auricula* into one genus, exclusive of other species (like *Stereum hirsutum*), was Link (1809), who was followed by a respectable line of mycologists such as Persoon, Duby, Secretan, Link himself, and others. This genus, too, was called *Auricularia*;

*The first part appeared in Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 473-482, 1948.
**Keeper of Herbarium Bogoriense, Kebun Raya Indonesia.