



QK  
507  
.F27  
c.2

Farlow, W. G. (William Gilson)

A consideration of the species  
plantarum of Linnaeus as a basis  
for the starting point of the  
nomenclature of cryptogams







NEW YORK BOTANICAL  
GARDEN, LIBRARY,  
Given by MRS. A. L. BRITTON

A CONSIDERATION OF THE SPECIES PLANTARUM OF  
LINNAEUS AS A BASIS FOR THE STARTING  
POINT OF THE NOMENCLATURE  
OF CRYPTOGAMS.

W. G. FARLOW.

---

[Privately Printed.]

THE LIECHNER T. NERTZ LIBRARY  

---

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

THE LESTER T. MERTZ LIBRARY  

---

THE NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN

A CONSIDERATION OF THE SPECIES PLANTARUM OF  
LINNAEUS AS A BASIS FOR THE STARTING  
POINT OF THE NOMENCLATURE  
OF CRYPTOGAMS.

W. G. FARLOW.

---

[Privately Printed.]

GK

507

.F27

2.2



A CONSIDERATION OF THE SPECIES PLANTARUM OF  
LINNAEUS AS A BASIS FOR THE STARTING  
POINT OF THE NOMENCLATURE OF  
CRYPTOGAMS.

W. G. FARLOW.

At the Congress held in Vienna in 1905 it was voted to adopt Linnaeus' Species Plantarum, 1753, as the starting point of the nomenclature of flowering plants and the question of the starting point for that of cryptogams was referred to the Congress to be held at Brussels in May, 1910. The adoption of the Species Plantarum was endorsed practically by so large a proportion of phaenogamic botanists that its acceptance came as near being universal as could ever be expected in such a case. It may be assumed therefore that the Species Plantarum is well adapted to serve as a basis for the nomenclature of phaenogams. Were it true that it is as well, or nearly as well, adapted to serve as a basis for the nomenclature of cryptogams, there would be no hesitation on the part of cryptogamists in adopting it also. If it is not, there is no reason why they should feel under any obligation, for the sake of a merely formal uniformity in nomenclature, to follow in the steps of other botanists.

In the first place we may ask why it is that the Species Plantarum should be considered to be well adapted to the requirements of phaenogamic botanists. The fact that it was the first work in which the binomial nomenclature was methodically applied is a sufficient reason why no work issued prior to 1753 should have been adopted as a basis of nomenclature but that fact alone is not a sufficient reason for the adoption of the Species Plantarum itself. An examination of that work shows also other merits which should recommend it. It is an admirable summary by the leading systematist of his day of several hundred genera and some thousands of species found not only in Europe but also in North America and other more remote parts of the world. In fact on glancing over its pages one is surprised at the large field covered by Linnaeus and the large number of exotic species which are included in the work. In the numerous editions of the Species issued at intervals of a few years until as late as 1830, some under the

1.30.01 GIFT ANON TORONTO 52

title of *Systema Vegetabilium* and *Systema Plantarum*, the Linnaean traditions were handed down with additions and annotations by well known botanists, so that there is no gap separating the original edition from the date of the appearance of the first volume of De Candolle's *Prodromus* in 1824. It should also be borne in mind that under the careful guardianship of the Linnaean Society of London, the Linnaean herbarium is still in existence and accessible to botanists. It is therefore not difficult to see that for a basis of nomenclature of flowering plants the *Species Plantarum* was well chosen.

If we turn now to the Cryptogams of the *Species* we find a very different state of things. To those who have not examined the *Species* with reference to this point it might seem that the cryptogamists for the sake of uniformity might be willing to make some sacrifice. For such persons a comparative examination of the phaenogams and cryptogams in the *Species* may be of interest. For this purpose I have prepared a table showing the number of genera and species in the two groups. The number of genera can be determined without difficulty. The counting of the species is less easy since in some cases it is not quite certain whether under a given name Linnaeus intended to indicate a species properly speaking or merely a form or variety. In my enumeration I have included only those forms clearly designated as species, omitting subspecific forms. That the enumeration here given is conservative is shown by the fact that, while according to the *Codex Linnaeanus* the total number of species in the *Species Plantarum* is 5938, the total of my list is 5247, divided as follows.

	Genera	Species
Phaenogams	1049	4630
Cryptogams	50	617
Total	1099	5247

Of the 50 genera and 617 species, 16 genera and 189 species are Filices and there are in addition 24 species of the genus *Lycopodium* which was placed by Linnaeus in *Musci*. Among the Filices are to be found numerous characteristic species of America and the tropics and in this respect the treatment of the group by Linnaeus is quite comparable with his treatment of phaenogams. For nomenclatorial purposes the Filices and *Lycopodium* are even at the present day

treated in the same manner as phaenogams, and it is a well known fact that it is the custom to unite the vascular cryptogams and the phaenogams in floristic works. So far as we are now concerned the higher cryptogams need not enter into the discussion, but from the nomenclatorial standpoint must be classed with phaenogams and there is therefore left 404 species and 33 genera for all the Bryophytes and Thallophytes described in the *Species Plantarum*. But even in this small number is included the genus *Spongia* under Algae with 11 species of which at least the greater part are not even plants in any sense. Furthermore, among the Bryophytes and Thallophytes there are almost no extra-European species and of the European species a great proportion are Northern. In short, although as far as phaenogams are concerned the *Species Plantarum* includes characteristic representatives of different parts of the world, as far as the Bryophytes and Thallophytes are concerned it represents only a limited European flora.

The question may perhaps be asked by those who have not studied specially any group of non-vascular cryptogams; Although the number of non-vascular cryptogams in the *Species Plantarum* is very much smaller than that of Phaenogams, is it not perhaps the case that the ratio represents approximately the relative size of the two groups in nature? It has been the custom to state that the phaenogams outnumber the cryptogams, some even saying that they are much more numerous. Such statements are based solely on an enumeration of described species and fail to give information as to the probable actual number of species. It is not possible to give figures on the subject which are up to date and the statistics of even a few years ago are of slight value for it is only within a few years that the study of cryptogams has been pursued in other parts of the world than Europe or, to a less extent, North America. We can probably obtain a more correct opinion if we consider probabilities. The number of known species of Musci and Hepaticae has been very much increased in the last few years and although the bryological flora of Europe and North America is now so well known that no very large number of new species is to be expected there, in other parts of the world and especially in the tropics, it is evident that the work of exploration conducted by trained specialists will bring to light a very large number of new species. The same is true of lichens. In algae a very great increase of

species is less to be expected partly for the reason that the region of growth of marine algae, pelagic species excepted, is more limited than that of land plants. But even in algae, it is probable that the known species will be considerably increased.

The fungi offer a better field for comparison than other groups. It is certainly true that the number of described species is decidedly smaller than that of phaenogams. Are we then to conclude that there are fewer fungi in the world than there are phaenogams? By no means, for there is a possible inference which may be drawn from a knowledge of the distribution of fungi to which, it seems to me, great weight should be given. Year by year the number of known parasitic fungi goes on increasing and, although we cannot assume that probably every phaenogam has its parasite, the proportion which have is constantly increasing. We also know that some species have not only one but many parasites and, as a rule, the species which from their economic value have been most carefully studied are the hosts of many fungi. As an instance I may mention the species of the genus *Vitis* on which several hundred species of fungi are known to grow, some to be sure found also on other plants, but a large number peculiar to this genus. When all genera have been studied as carefully as *Vitis*, we shall undoubtedly find that the number of parasitic fungi in existence is enormous. If to the parasitic we add the thousands of saprophytic fungi, it may well be asked whether eventually it will not prove to be true that the number of species of fungi is as great as that of phaenogams. It seems to me that it should be plain to every one that if in the *Species Plantarum* the proportion of phaenogams to cryptogams is about ten to one, we must admit that although the work is sufficiently comprehensive to serve as a basis for the nomenclature of the former, it is entirely inadequate in the case of the latter.

I have referred to the restricted range of the species of cryptogams described by Linnaeus and to their small number. If we go farther and examine the character of the descriptions themselves we find that they are in many cases vague and unintelligible, which is nothing more than might have been expected in that day before the scientific study of the group had really begun. The algae in particular are from the modern point of view a strange medley. The genera *Jungermannia*, *Targionia*, *Marchantia*, *Blasia*, *Riccia* and *Anthoceros* I have in my

enumeration included in Bryophytes where they properly belong, although they were placed by Linnaeus in algae as well as the genus Lichen with 80 species. The genus Tremella\* with 7 species was also included in algae although as far as the scant descriptions can be identified, 3 are species of fungi, 3 algae and one a lichen. Some of the 12 species of Byssus are algae but the majority it is impossible to recognize. Of the 11 species of Spongia nearly all are animals.

Of the later editions of the *Species Plantarum* the fourth, according to some the fifth, has a partial revision of the fungi by Link and of the mosses by Schwaegrichen, but as these parts were not published until 1824-30 and do not follow in any way the original edition of Linnaeus, so far as priority of nomenclature is concerned, they need not be considered here. Of the *Systema Plantarum*, Reichard 1780 and the *Systema Vegetabilium* by Gmelin, 1796, by Persoon 1797 and Sprengel 1827, it can be said that although they include more species than the original edition of Linnaeus they are open to the same objections and, as will be seen later, the dates of their publication are so near those of far better works that their nomenclatorial value is of trivial importance. If I have dwelt at what may seem too great length on a consideration of the value of the *Species Plantarum* as a basis of nomenclature it has been for the purpose of trying to make clear to those to whom uniformity in nomenclature seems to be of the first importance, why it is that to expect cryptogamists to adopt the *Species* on the same basis as do phaenogamists is unreasonable. To the latter the *Species* represents a fundamental treatise; to the former a very meagre and unsatisfactory list of plants belonging to groups of which, in the time of Linnaeus, there was really no exact knowledge.

One would be glad to adopt as a basis of nomenclature some one work which bears the same relation to cryptogams as does the *Species Plantarum* to phaenogams, but there has never been any such work and there never will be for a very good reason. The phaenogams form a homogeneous group. The cryptogams do not, but consist of a number of different groups and the fundamental works relating to them appeared at different dates, all, however, considerably later than 1753. The specialists who study Bryophytes, Lichens, Algae and Fungi are entirely justified in adopting different works as a basis of nomenclature.

---

\* See note at end of this paper.

The question they should ask is: what was the first work on Bryophytes, on Lichens, on Algae, on Fungi, in which those groups were scientifically and comprehensively treated.

It is not possible to enter at this time on a general consideration of this point. Although that part of Linnaeus' *Species* which related to Bryophytes appears to have greater value than that which relates to Thallophytes, since for one reason his citations of Dillenius' figures help one to understand to what plants the brief descriptions were applied, it must certainly be admitted that Hedwig's *Species Muscorum*, of which the first volume appeared in 1801, is the fundamental work on mosses and that Hedwig with whom the scientific study of mosses begun may be called the Linnaeus of Bryology. Acharius stands in the same relation to lichenology and it is a question to be settled by lichenologists whether the *Lichenographia Universalis* of 1810 or the earlier *Methodus* is to be given the preference. For algae, the *Systema Algarum* of C. A. Agardh has been suggested. It is, however, out of the question to refer more in detail to the groups just mentioned but it will be sufficient if we consider the case of fungi somewhat more minutely although the subject is perplexing and complicated even to those more particularly interested in this group and probably to others wearisome.

In the *Species Plantarum* 1073 pages are given to phaenogams; 15 pages only are given to fungi, including *Agaricus* 27 species, *Boletus* 12, *Hydnum* 4, *Phallus* 2, *Clathrus* 3, *Elvela* 2, *Peziza* 8, *Clavaria* 8, *Lycoperdon* 9, and *Mucor* 11. To these must be added 3 of the species of *Tremella* placed by Linnaeus in algae, making 89 fungi in all. Of these not one is extra-European and only 8 are cited as growing in Italy or Southern Europe. To consider that a work of such a limited scope should serve as a basis of nomenclature of a group whose species are numbered by thousands seems to me preposterous. All that we can say of the fungi in the *Species Plantarum* is that they show plainly that in 1753 next to nothing was known of that large group and one may be pardoned for saying that in what Linnaeus wrote about fungi he was not a Linnaeus. We must search elsewhere for a fundamental work on the subject. In the later editions of the *Species* and the *Systema Vegetabilium*, as I have said, the treatment of fungi is

not in any way satisfactory, and it was not until about fifty years after the publication of the *Species* that there appeared anything which could be called a general and comprehensive work on the species of fungi. If mycologists were asked who exerted the greatest influence in placing systematic mycology on a firm basis they would say Elias Fries and the *Systema Mycologicum*, of which the first volume appeared in 1821, had an influence in shaping the study as no other work had had. In saying this I do not wish in any way to underrate the value of the *Synopsis Methodica Fungorum* of Persoon, issued in 1801, but of the two I think that the *Systema* is the one which has had decidedly the greater influence in shaping the progress of descriptive mycology. In its three volumes together with the two volumes of the *Elenchus* which is a part of the *Systema*, we find for the first time an account of the Mycological flora of a considerable portion of the world rather than an account of certain orders of fungi mainly of Europe. In the *Epicrisis* of 1836-38, the *Summa Vegetabilium Scandinaviae* 1849, and the *Hymenomycetes Europaei* 1874, we have important revisions and commentaries by Fries of his earlier work. The *Icones Selectae Hymenomycetum* include 200 plates executed under his supervision of species which cannot well be studied by dried specimens alone. The herbarium of Fries is still at Upsala and the *Scleromyceti Sueciae*, a collection of 450 small parasitic species, is to be found in herbaria in Europe and this country and has been the subject of critical commentaries by several botanists. The fact that the volumes of the *Systema* did not appear in the same year does not appear to me to present a serious practical difficulty, as Volume I containing *Hymenomycetes* appeared in 1821 and Volume II with *Discomycetes* and *Pyrenomycetes* in 1822-23. Volume III, which did not appear until ten years later, includes *Gasteromycetes* and *Fungi Imperfecti*.

The *Synopsis* of Persoon, although to be preferred to any previous work, is considerably less extensive in the number and range of the species given than the *Systema*, the number being about two and a half times as great and, in general, the *Systema* presents a decidedly more modern way of treating the group. A fuller consideration of the comparative merits of the *Systema* and the *Synopsis* is out of the question in this place as it would require more time than can be

allowed and because the details are such that they could not readily be followed except by mycologists who have studied the question minutely. I have no right to encroach further on your patience and need only, in conclusion, repeat that the *Species Plantarum* is quite unfit to serve as a basis for the nomenclature of fungi, and that the *Systema* of Fries seems to me to be better adapted for the purpose than any other work. In any case to go back earlier than the *Synopsis* of Persoon would only tend to perpetuate the present uncertainty and confusion and would open the door to those who, regarding nomenclature as an end in itself and not merely a means by which the necessary evil of naming plants can be reduced to a minimum, devote time and labor to the undesirable task of unearthing names which are at the best uncertain, at the sacrifice of names which have been in universal use for many years, and whose meaning is perfectly clear. To my mind the object should be, not to attempt to seek perfection in authority and priority — a hopeless task — but rather to select the best solid basis in some comprehensive work. Even then, there is the question of *genera conservanda*\* and I believe that, whatever work or date is adopted, it will be most desirable to adopt a list of *genera conservanda*. There is nothing illogical in this and practically there are great advantages unless one believes in the theory that mere changing of names is a merit in science. That theory I certainly do not accept, but hold that the fewer changes of names the better.

It has been my misfortune never to have found anything perfect. Some of my friends have perfect systems of classifications of books, of herbaria or of plants. In trying to apply perfect methods I always recall a visit in company with Sir Joseph Hooker to an establishment not a thousand miles from here. The person in charge said, "we think we have a perfect museum-case which we would like to show you." "Yes" said Sir Joseph, "I am always glad to see what I have never seen. But what do you keep in the case?" A key was produced, but by no amount of coaxing and forcing could the case be opened.

---

\*From a paper by Austin H. Clark in *Science* of Jan. 28, 1910, entitled *The strict Application of the Law of Priority to Generic Names*, we are apparently warranted in believing that the principle of adopting *genera conservanda* is approved by a large number of zoologists.



“Yes,” said Hooker, “I presume that it is perfect but I prefer cases which open.” The same remark would apply to a good many systems. They are perfect until we try to find out what is in them.

**Note.** The genus *Tremella* affords a good illustration of the advantage in adopting Fries' *Système* as a basis for the classification of fungi and avoiding the futile attempt by searching through the complicated and obscure writings which appeared between 1753 and the early part of the 19th century to replace names in general use at the present day by names in regard to which it is almost impossible to say what was meant by the authors. *Tremella* has for many years been treated as a genus of fungi and the greater part of the species of the genus given in Fries' *Systema* are still recognized as valid species while those which have since been separated generically are still regarded as closely related to *Tremella*. The attempt to revive the *Tremella* of Linnaeus has resulted only in adding a number of superfluous synonyms to mycological literature without affecting the stability of the genus as it has been interpreted by mycologists for nearly a hundred years.

In the discussion following the reading of the present paper at the meeting of the Botanical Society of America at Boston, Dec. 29, 1909, one of the speakers stated that he was inclined to regard *Tremella* L. as belonging to algae and it was later remarked that it might be well to abandon the name *Tremella* as a genus of fungi. This opinion appeared to be based on the fact that *T. Nostoc* L. is an alga but there is no reason for believing that Linnaeus regarded *T. Nostoc* rather than any other of his seven species as the type of the genus. In the case of older writers we have no means of knowing what species they regarded as types, and even if we accept the opinion of some botanists that the first species named should be regarded as the type, a view entirely arbitrary and unwarranted it seems to me, *Tremella* could not be placed in algae since the first species named was *T. juniperina*, a fungus belonging to the genus *Gymnosporangium*. As *Tremella* has entirely disappeared from algological literature and is still recognized as the type genus of the Tremellinaceae of fungi what possible good could be accomplished by overturning names generally accepted and replacing them by names at the best very doubtful.

Attempts to revive *Tremella* L. as a genus of fungi have not been fortunate. Prof. Arthur as a conscientious advocate of the view that the first named species should be regarded as the type, in his paper on “Generic Nomen-

clature of the Cedar Apples" in 1901 transferred the known species of Gymnosporangium to Tremella. Had his view been accepted it would have necessitated giving other names to the species of Tremella as now recognized. But only two years previously, in 1889, Prof. Arthur in his paper, "Indiana Plant Rusts listed in Accordance with the Latest Nomenclature" had reached the conclusion that the name Puccinia must be abandoned for the large genus of rusts to which it was usually applied and transferred to the species of Gymnosporangium and again in his recent writings he returns to Gymnosporangium as a valid genus. Evidently, even when made by those whose ability and conscientious aim are beyond question the search for older names in the confusing literature following 1753 and previous to Fries has not resulted in that permanence of nomenclature which it was hoped would be attained. It would have been far better to have retained Tremella in the Friesian sense as is done by most modern mycologists and to have accepted Gymnosporangium as it has long been understood by mycologists and thus have avoided adding to the large number of synonym names which have quickly disappeared except as curiosities of botanical literature. By adopting a work like Fries' Systema as the basis of nomenclature the dreary and unnecessary labor of trying to account for all the vague names given by older writers and the perpetual changing of names long in use and well understood in consequence of what are often no more than conjectures as to what the older species were would be avoided.

New York Botanical Garden Library



3 5185 00228 1192







4/01

