

Buek and Steudel's conflicting names for species of Compositae described in De Candolle's Prodrumus

Autor(en): **Stearn, William T.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Candollea : journal international de botanique systématique = international journal of systematic botany**

Band (Jahr): **15 (1954-1956)**

PDF erstellt am: **03.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-880481>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

**Buek and Steudel's conflicting names for species of Compositae
described in De Candolle's Prodrromus**

by

William T. STEARN

British Museum (Natural History), London

On a few occasions AUGUSTIN PYRAMUS DE CANDOLLE (1778-1841) inadvertently used the same name for two different species in his *Prodrromus Systematis Regni vegetabilis*, vols. 5 (1836), 6 (1838) and 7 (1838-39). When indexing the *Prodrromus* HEINRICH WILHELM BUEK (1796-1879) set out to rectify this double employ by giving a new name to one of each pair of species. Unfortunately ERNST GOTTLIED STEUDEL (1783-1856) did the same about the same time when compiling the second edition of his *Nomenclator botanicus*. Their new names conflict. Thus through ignorance of each other's work BUEK and STEUDEL replaced the original problem of having two species with one name by the new problem of having two names for each species! *Cirsium polycephalum* DC., non Willd., for example, was renamed *C. byzantinum* by STEUDEL but *C. candolleanum* by BUEK; *Eupatorium pinnatifidum* DC., non Elliott, was renamed *E. pinnatisectum* by STEUDEL but *E. pinnatifissum* by BUEK. *Blumea chinensis* Hooker & Arn., non DC., became *B. arnottiana* at STEUDEL's hands but *B. hookeriana* at BUEK's. To *Baccharis microphylla* DC., non Kunth, both STEUDEL and BUEK independently gave the new name of *B. candolleana*. Sometimes one member of the pair was renamed by STEUDEL and the other by BUEK; thus *Hieracium gracile* Hooker received the new name of *H. hookeri* from STEUDEL while BUEK gave the new name of *H. froelichianum* to *H. gracile* Froelich ex DC. CANDOLLE simultaneously applied the name *Baccharis semi-serrata* to two species, one Brazilian (no. 38), the other Peruvian

(no. 149). BUEK renamed the Brazilian species, calling it *B. hemiprionodes*, and retained the name *B. semiserrata* for the Peruvian species, thereby in effect designating Peruvian material as the type of the name *B. semiserrata*. STEUDEL, on the other hand, renamed the Peruvian species as *B. sternbergiana* and kept the name *B. semiserrata* for the Brazilian species, BUEK's *B. hemiprionodes*. The *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (1952) contains a direct rule for the separation of homonyms of the same date in Article 74 and covers this through implication by Articles 32 and 67. Under Article 32, when a species is divided into two or more species, the specific epithet must be retained for one of them; when no type was originally designated, one must be chosen. Under Article 67, the author who first unites taxa bearing names or epithets of the same date has the right to choose one of them, and his choice must be followed. Under Article 74, *when the same new name is simultaneously published for more than one taxon the first author who adopts one of them rejecting the other, or substitutes another name for one of them, must be followed*. The question is: — who published first, BUEK or STEUDEL?

To ascertain the exact dates of publication of their works is probably no longer possible. It accordingly seems reasonable to accept as evidence of relative dates of issue the order of their being listed in the German book-trade journal *Allgemeine Bibliographie für Deutschland* (Leipzig) of 1840 as new publications for sale, the date of advertisement and record here coming close to the actual date of issue.

BUEK's *Genera, Species et Synonyma Candolleana alphabetico Ordine disposita seu Index generalis et specialis*, pars 2, is dated "1840" on the title page and "Hamburgi, mense Augusti 1840" at the end of the preface (p. vi), from which it would appear that BUEK corrected the last proofs at Hamburg and returned them to his Berlin printers in August 1840. The *Index* was listed in *Allgemeine Bibliographie für Deutschland* 1840: 613 (16 Oct. 1840). Hence early October 1840 can reasonably be taken as its date of publication.

STEUDEL's *Nomenclator botanicus*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart & Tübingen) was published in parts as follows: —

Vol. 1, parts 1-2 (*Abalon-Calendula*), pp. 1-256, listed in *Allgemeine Bibliographie für Deutschland* 1840: 446 (14 Aug. 1840); part 3 (*Calimeris-Clidemia*), pp. 257-384, listed in *A.B.D.* 1840: 625 (16 Oct. 1840); part 4 (*Cliffortia-Diosma*), pp. 385-512, listed in *A.B.D.* 1840: 625 (16 Oct. 1840); parts 5-6 (*Diospyros-Hippia*), pp. 513-768, listed in *A.B.D.* 1840: 747 (4 Dec. 1840), hence probably issued in November 1840; part 7 (*Hippobroma-Kyrtanthus*), pp. 769-852, dated "1840", listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 15 (8 Jan. 1841), hence probably issued in December 1840.

Vol. 2, part. 8 (*Labatia-Linaria*), pp. 1-48, dated "1840", listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 15 (8 Jan. 1841), hence probably issued in December 1840; part 9 (*Linaria-Myrsine*), pp. 49-176, listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 106 (5 March 1841); part 10 (*Myrsiphyllum-Ranunculus*), pp. 177-432, listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 178 (23 April 1841); part 11 (*Ranunculus-Senecio*), pp. 433-560, listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 246 (11 June 1841); parts 12-13 (*Senecio-Zyrphelis*), pp. 561-810, listed in *A.B.D.* 1841: 430 (10 Sept. 1841).

BUEK claimed in his *Index* pars I: IX-X (1842) that his new names had priority over STEUDEL'S. From the evidence above it is clear that, if BUEK'S *Index* pars 2 was published in October 1840, then vol. 1, pp. 1-384, of STEUDEL'S *Nomenclator*, 2nd edition, were published earlier than this, pp. 385-512 about the same time as this and pp. 513-852 later than this. Thus BUEK'S claim can only be partly upheld.

If the species concerned are maintained on taxonomic grounds, their correct names will be as follows:

Baccharis semiserrata DC. *Prodr.* 5: 404 no. 38. 1836. Type at Geneva: — "in Brasiliae prov. Rio-de-Janeiro ad Serra dos Orgaos legit cl. Vauthier (pl. exs. n. 338)".

SYN. *B. hemiprionodes* Buek *Index* 2: v. Oct. 1840.

Baccharis sternbergiana Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 179. Aug. 1840.

SYN. *B. semiserrata* DC. *Prodr.* 5: 419 no. 149. 1836. Type at Geneva: — "in Peruviae Andium vallibus legit cl. Haenke *** (v.s. comm. in h. Haenke à cl. de Sternberg miss.)".

Baccharis candolleana Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 177, 178. Aug. 1840.

SYN. *B. microphylla* DC. *Prodr.* 5: 406. 1836; non Kunth 1820. Type at Geneva: — "in Peruvia legit cl. Haenke *** (v.s. in h. Haenk. à cl. de Sternberg comm.)".

B. candolleana Buek *Index* 2: v. Oct. 1840.

Blumea arnottiana Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 206. Aug. 1840.

SYN. *B. chinensis* Hooker & Arnott *Bot. Beechey's Voy.*: 195. July-Aug. 1837; non *B. chinensis* (L.) DC. 1836. Type not found at Kew or Glasgow: — "received from Canton *** from Mr. Millett and Mr. Vachell."

B. hookeriana Buek *Index* 2: vi. Oct. 1840.

Cirsium byzantinum Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 367, 369. Sept. 1840.

SYN. *C. polycephalum* DC. *Prodr.* 6: 639. 1837; non Willd. ex Sprengel, 1826. Type at Geneva: — "circa Constantinopolim legit cl. Aucher-Eloy, pl. exs. n. 3392."

C. candolleianum Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

BOISSIER *Fl. Orient.* 3: 526. 1875 retained the name *C. polycephalum* for this species.

Eupatorium pinnatifissum Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *E. pinnatifidum* DC. *Prodr.* 5: 149. 1836; non Elliott, 1822-1824. Type at Geneva: — "in America austr. legit cl. Née."

E. pinnatisectum Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 608. Dec. 1840.

Helichrysum caespitosum (Lam.) DC. *Prodr.* 6: 173. 1838.

SYN. *Gnaphalium caespitosum* Lam. *Encycl. Méth. Bot.* 2: 742. 1786. Type at Paris: — "cette plante croît à l'Isle de France: Commerson l'a trouvée sur la montagne des trois mamelles à Palma".

H. barbellatum Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

Helichrysum conglobatum (Viviani) Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 738. Nov. 1840.

SYN. *Gnaphalium caespitosum* Presl *Del. Prag.*: 98. 1822; non Lam. 1786. Type at Prague: — "in apricis montium ad S. Martinum prope Panormum Siculum".

G. conglobatum Viviani *Fl. Lib.*: 54, t. 3, f. 5. 1824. Type at Genoa: — "in Magnae Syrteos aggeribus arenosis"; cf. ILLARIO in *Archivio Bot.* 14: 147. 1938.

H. caespitosum (Presl) DC. *Prodr.* 6: 182. 1838; non *H. caespitosum* (Lam.) DC. 1838.

Helichrysum candolleianum Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *H. leptolepis* DC. *Prodr.* 6: 170 n. 9. 1838; non DC. no. 136. 1838. Type at Geneva: — "in Madagascar legit cl. Bojer".

H. detersum Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 738. Nov. 1840.

Hieracium gracile Hooker *Fl. Bor. Amer.* 1: 298. 1834. Type at Kew: — "on the more elevated Rocky Mountains. Drummond".

SYN. *H. hookeri* Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 1: 763. Dec. 1840.

Hieracium froelichianum Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *H. gracile* Froelich ex DC. *Prodr.* 7: 231. 1838. Type not found at Geneva: — "in summis jugis Alpium Tyr. austr."

Senecio andinus Buek *Index* 2: VI. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *S. adscendens* DC. *Prodr.* 6: 423, no. 492. 1838; non Bojer ex DC. no. 217. 1838. Type not found at Geneva: — "in Peruvianis montibus legit cl. Haenke".

S. floccoso-araneosus Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 2: 560. June 1841.

Senecio subnudus DC. *Prodr.* **6** : 405, no. 381. 1838. Type at Geneva: — “ in Africa Capensi in territorio cesso et in distr. Stellenbosch legit cl. Ecklon ”.

SYN. *S. subpellatus* Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, **2** : 565. Sept. 1841.

HARVEY in *Fl. Cap.* **3** : 377. 1865, united CANDOLLE's *Senecio* species nos. 379-382 (i.e. *S. oxyriaefolius*, *S. peltatus*, *S. subnudus*, *S. peltiformis*) and if this view of their taxonomy is accepted then the name *S. oxyriifolius* stands as the correct name for the combined species.

Senecio cymbalarioides Buek *Index* **2** : vi. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *S. subnudus* DC. *Prodr.* **6** : 428 n. 522. 1838 ; non DC. no. 381. 1838. Type at Geneva : — “ in Americae bor. ora occid. ad Columbia-river legit cl. Douglas.”

ASA GRAY *Synopt. Fl. N. Amer.* **1** (2) : 391. 1884 united this with *S. aureus* as var. *subnudus* (DC.) A. Gray.

Senecio tripartitus A. Rich. *Sertum Astrolab. (Voy. Astrolabe, Bot.)* : 114. 1834. Type at Paris : — “ crescit in Novae-Hollandiae locis vulgo dictis Port-Jackson et Détroit d'Entrecasteaux ”.

SYN. *S. triplipartitus* Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, **2** : 566. Sept. 1841.

BENTHAM *Fl. Austral.* **3** : 667. 1867, united *S. tripartitus* with the earlier described *A. lautus* Forster ex Willd. of New Zealand.

Senecio megapotamicus Buek *Index* **2** : vi. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *S. tripartitus* DC. *Prodr.* **6** : 418. 1838 ; non A. Rich. 1834. Type at Geneva : — “ in Brasiliae prov. Rio-Grande (h. mus. imp. Bras. n. 921).”

Senecio pilquensis Buek *Index* **2** : vi. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *S. heterophyllus* DC. *Prodr.* **6** : 414. 1838 ; non Thunb. 1800. Type at Geneva : — “ in Chili australis silvis montanis Andium de Antuco ad Pico de Pilque alt. 5000 ped. legit cl. Poeppig.”

S. phyllomorphus Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, **2** : 564. Sept. 1841.

For further literature, see CABRERA *El genere Senecio en Chile*, no. 58, in *Lilloa* **15** : 170. 1949.

Senecio swartzianus Buek *Index* **2** : vi. Oct. 1840.

SYN. *Cineraria laciniata* Swartz, *Fl. Ind. Occid.* **3** : 1352. 1806. Type in British Museum, London : — “ habitat in montibus Jamaicae.”

S. laciniatus (Swartz) DC. *Prodr.* **6** : 411. 1838 ; non Bertol. 1813.

The name *S. laciniatus* is used for this species in FAWCETT & RENDLE *Fl. Jam.* 7: 275. 1936.

Senecio lacinifolius Steudel *Nom.* ed. 2, 2: 562. Sept. 1841.

SYN. *S. laciniatus* Kunth *Nova Gen. Sp.* 4: 175. 1820; non Bertol. 1813. Type at Paris: — "in collibus siccis juxta Loxa et Gonzanama Quitensium, alt. 1060 hex."

The conflict of names detailed above provides a good example of how much the solution of many nomenclatural problems depends upon fairly precise dating of publications. As J. H. BARNHART wrote in *Torreyia* 6: 97. 1906, "the novice usually accepts without question the date printed on a title-page. ... Few even of experienced botanists realize what a large percentage of the literature of our science is labeled with misleading dates." Few botanists moreover appreciate the extent to which natural history bibliographers have remedied this by critical investigation although their results have been published in a variety of works and journals. Hence librarians would do well to insert references to papers on dates of publication at the beginning of the books concerned. Attention is accordingly directed to the catalogue of such papers in *J. Soc. Bibl. Nat. Hist. (London)* 1: 1-30. 1936 and its supplements in *op. cit.* 2: 1-18. 1943 and 3: 5-12. 1954, and to the summary of much of their information in *Flora Malesiana* ser. I, 4 (5): clxiii-ccxix. 1954.