

(1139) Proposal to conserve the name *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr. (lichenized *Ascomycota*) with a conserved typeFrançois M. Lutzoni¹ & Irwin M. Brodo²

(1139) *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr., Syst. Orb. Veg. 1: 285. Dec 1825, *nom. cons. prop.*
Type: *Aspicilia chrysophana*, Sudeten, ex *Körber 12* in *Körber Typenherbar* (L), *typ. cons. prop.*

In the course of preparing a revision of the *Ionaspis-Hymenelia* complex at the generic level (Lutzoni, M. Sc. diss., Univ. Ottawa. 1990; Lutzoni & Brodo in Syst. Bot., in review), it was necessary to establish the correct typification of the names *Ionaspis* Th. Fr. and *Hymenelia* Kremp. This, in turn, led us to consider the application of such widely used names as *I. suaveolens* (Fr.) Th. Fr. and *I. odora* (Ach.) Th. Fr. We discovered that to avoid disadvantageous changes in the nomenclature of these species and to retain the names *I. suaveolens* and *I. odora*, which would best serve stability of nomenclature under the *Tokyo Code*, we need to propose conservation of the name *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr. with a conserved type under Art. 14.9.

As traditionally and currently used (see Magnusson in Acta Horti Gothob. 8: 19, 29. 1933; Ozenda & Clauzade, Lich.: 550. 1970; Santesson, Lich. Sweden Norway: 136, 137. 1984; Cannon & al., Brit. Ascomycotina: 113. 1985; Clauzade & Roux, Lik. Okcid. Eur.: 387. 1986; Purvis & al., Lich. Fl. Great Britain Ireland: 278, 279. 1992), *Ionaspis suaveolens* [= *I. chrysophana* (Körb.) Th. Fr. ex B. Stein] and *I. odora* are best characterized by their respective epihymenial pigments. *I. suaveolens* has a black apothecial disk with an epihymenium that does not react to either HNO₃ or KOH while *I. odora* has a yellowish brown to almost black apothecial disk with an HNO₃ + orange and KOH + violet epihymenium.

The protologue of *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr. mentioned "*Apotheciis immersis hyalino-incarnatis, demum margine proprio prominulo.*" Although no specimens were cited, reference was made to "*Urceol. Ach. Mscr.*" The first author examined material in the Acharian herbarium in Helsinki. The single specimen in H-ACH 66, labelled *Urceolaria suaveolens* (No. 1063) is pale-fruited, agreeing with the description by Fries (Syst. Orb. Veg. 1: 285. 1825), but it clearly corresponds to what is now called *Ionaspis odora*, the epihymenial pigment having a KOH + violet reaction. There is a possibility that Fries never examined the material in the Acharian herbarium in Helsinki and that only a duplicate of it was sent to him by Acharius (Santesson, pers. comm.). If so, this material is no longer found in UPS.

A year later, Schaerer (Lich. Helv. Spic.: 70. 1826) published *Urceolaria suaveolens*, also citing "*Urceolaria suaveolens. Ach! in litt.*", but referring to his Lichenes exsiccati No. 124 as well. Schaerer distinguished his *U. suaveolens* from Acharius's *Gyalecta odora* (holotype: H-ACH 65!; validated by Schaerer as the name of a new species in the same publication, Lich. Helv. Spic.: 80. 1826), mentioning that the former had "*discus ater*", whereas the latter was characterized by "*disco carneo-*

¹ Department of Botany, Duke University, Box 90339, Durham, NC 27708-0339, U.S.A.

² Canadian Museum of Nature, P.O. Box 3443, Station 'D', Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6P4, Canada.

rubescens”. The descriptions by Schaerer are, therefore, in agreement with the current usage of these names.

Unaware of the earlier publication of *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr., Magnusson (in Acta Horti Gothob. 8: 29, 31. 1933) incorrectly attributed the basionym of *Ionaspis suaveolens* to Schaerer (Lich. Helv. Spic.: 70. 1826). Strict application of the Code would nevertheless result in typification of *I. suaveolens*, in agreement with the Acharian concept cited by Fries (Syst. Orb. Veg. 1: 285. 1825), by the only Acharian specimen labelled *Urceolaria suaveolens* in H-ACH. Such strict application of the type principle would require that the pale-fruited species (*I. odora*) now be called *I. suaveolens*, with the dark-fruited species currently called *I. suaveolens* taking the name *I. chrysophana*.

It is clear from the writings of Schaerer (Lich. Helv. Spic.: 70, 80. 1826) that our current understanding of *Ionaspis suaveolens* and *I. odora* started only one year after the original description of *Gyalecta suaveolens* by Fries. Schaerer's concept was reinforced by Magnusson (in Acta Horti Gothob. 8: 31. 1933) who used HNO₃ and KOH to further characterize the epihymenial pigments responsible for the black and pale to dark brown apothecial disk colors of *I. suaveolens* and *I. odora*, respectively.

Rejection of the name *Gyalecta suaveolens* under Art. 56 of the Tokyo Code would maintain the current usage of *Ionaspis odora*, but would destabilize the current nomenclature by making *I. suaveolens* a synonym of *I. chrysophana* (the reverse of what has been done traditionally). With the revised Art. 14 of the Tokyo Code, it is now possible to propose conservation of a species name virtually without restriction. To retain the names *I. suaveolens* and *I. odora* in a way that would best serve stability of nomenclature, it is necessary to conserve the name *Gyalecta suaveolens* Fr. with a conserved type under Art. 14.9. Such a type would displace Acharius's specimen (in H-ACH) labelled *Urceolaria suaveolens* and cited by Fries (Syst. Orb. Veg. 1: 285. 1825) in the protologue for *Gyalecta suaveolens*, which as stated above is a specimen of *I. odora* as currently used. The material distributed by Schaerer in his exsiccata, under the number 124, is a mixture of different species including *I. odora* and *I. suaveolens*. A type choice based on this exsiccatum, even if limited to a single specimen, would still be a potential source of confusion.

In his justification for recognizing *Ionaspis chrysophana* as a synonym of *I. suaveolens* Magnusson (in Acta Horti Gothob. 8: 31. 1933) wrote: “The name *chrysophana* has caused me like many other lichenologists much trouble. The first sample of Kbr. exs 8. that I brought home (from Pavia) was an *Aspicilia*-species; it is not in the museums at Stockholm or Uppsala and a specimen from Oslo agreed well with *I. odora*. The specimen in hb. Kbr. (Leiden), too, seems to be *I. odora* as well as a small specimen from ‘Kleine Schneegrube’, the locality of the authentic specimen. In neither of these the colour of the hymenium answers the description ‘schön lauchgrün’ of Körber. The real and rather good authentic specimen examined by me agrees well with Körber's description and also perfectly with *I. suaveolens* Schaer. with its negative NO₃ reaction.”

Körber's description (Syst. Lich. Germ.: 159. 1854-1855) of *Aspicilia chrysophana* does not fit the concept of *Ionaspis odora*, despite the specimen from “Kleine Schneegrube” mentioned by him and apparently seen by Magnusson, but that we could not trace and may be missing. The epihymenial negative HNO₃ reaction recorded by Magnusson (in Acta Horti Gothob. 8: 31. 1933) on what he called Körber's “authentic specimen” of *I. chrysophana*, confirmed by the first author, clearly

indicates that *A. chrysophana* Körb. corresponds to what is currently called *I. suaveolens*. Therefore, we think it is most appropriate for the stabilization of the name *I. suaveolens* to designate Körber's type specimen of *A. chrysophana* as the conserved type of *I. suaveolens*.