

Campanula corcontica, a superfluous name

Nadbytečné jméno *Campanula corcontica*

Miloslav Kovanda

KOVANDA M. (1975): *Campanula corcontica*, a superfluous name. — Preslia, Praha, 47 : 262—266.

Evidence is presented that the name *Campanula corcontica* ŠOUREK 1953 is synonymous with *Campanula bohémica* HRUBY 1928. The latter name is shown to have been validly published two years earlier than hitherto assumed.

Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences, Botanical Institute, 252 43 Průhonice, Czechoslovakia.

The heterophyllous *Campanula* of the Krkonoše Mountains, described as *Campanula corcontica* ŠOUREK in this Journal 22 years ago (see ŠOUREK 1953), has been challenging Central European botanists since the end of the 18th century. Early authors of Silesian floras (MATTUSCHKA 1776, KROCKER 1787) did not recognize it. It entered botanical literature in the two earliest floras of Bohemia (SCHMIDT 1793, PRESL et PRESL 1819), where it is referred to as *C. linifolia* JACQ. This doubtful name has been successively applied to no less than four different taxa within the subsection *Heterophylla* of the genus *Campanula*. In JACQUIN'S circumscription (or, in fact, HAENKE'S, who was the author of the name) it appears referable to the Alpine *C. Scheuchzeri* VILL. Descriptions provided by SCHMIDT (1793) and PRESL et PRESL (1819) may well refer to *C. rotundifolia* var. *sudetica* HRUBY also; this variety is taxonomically distinct from *C. corcontica*. Indeed, in herbarium material from that period these two taxa are invariably named *C. linifolia* JACQ. even though they are readily recognized by the type of hairiness and other characters. Still, the brothers Presl (or at least one of them) seem to have been aware of these differences and intended to separate the present *C. corcontica* at species level. One sheet deposited in the Herbarium of the Charles University in Prague is labelled as follows:

"*Campanula sudetica* PRESL. *C. linifolia* PRESL Fl. čech. Habitat in Sudetis ad Rennerbaude. Jul. 1810".

The collection is a typical *C. corcontica* and is the oldest one seen by the present author. The name does not appear to have been validly published and has never been used by later authors. HRUBY (1930), apparently unconscious of PRESL'S concept, applied the epithet *sudetica* to a variety which he considered closely related to *C. rotundifolia*.

The first authors to distinguish between these two taxa were WIMMER et GRABOWSKI (1827); their *C. rotundifolia* β *linifolia* HAENKE, though vaguely diagnosed ("caule firmo subunifloro, flore multo majore, foliis caulinis lato-lanceolatis"), clearly refers to the later *C. corcontica*. WIMMER (1840) renamed this taxon *C. rotundifolia* δ *grandiflora* WIMMER but also failed to provide an accurate description. His classification has never been accepted but is crucial because it is here that the *Campanula* in question is directly linked to the Alpine *C. Scheuchzeri* VILL. which is listed as a synonym. Subsequent authors unanimously preferred the rank of species to

that of variety and referred to the Krkonoše plant as *C. Scheuchzeri* VILL. (see for instance OTT 1851, OPIZ 1852, WILLKOMM 1863, ČELAKOVSKÝ 1871, 1879, FIEK 1881, POLÍVKA 1901, 1912, SCHUBE 1904, LAUS 1908, HAYEK 1918). It is interesting to note that none of these authors contrived to render the distinguishing characters exactly. ČELAKOVSKÝ (1871) noticed only the broadened calyx teeth and POLÍVKA (1912) the stiff, often one-flowered stem. However, characters separating this taxon from the Alpine *C. Scheuchzeri* VILL. passed unnoticed until recently.

The well known Brno florist Johann Hruby (1882—1964) tried to rectify this evident error of earlier authors and reclassified *C. Scheuchzeri* of the Krkonoše Mts. as a new species *C. bohémica* HRUBY. His concept seems to have developed gradually and might be difficult to interpret solely on the basis of the published evidence. It becomes quite clear and consistent, however, if the pertinent herbarium material is consulted.

The name is usually cited as *C. bohémica* HRUBY in Magy. Bot. Lap. 29 : 221, 1930. However, on examination it proved to have been validly published in the first excursion flora of Czechoslovakia (DOMIN et PODPĚRA 1928 : 534). The Czech description provided [Translation: "Plants with a rich, though lax raceme; corollas broad and open (similar to those of *C. rotundifolia*), dark violet. Leaves mostly falcately secund, distinctly petiolate, slightly denticulate. Calyx teeth often as long as corollas, relatively broad. Plant up to 1/2 m tall"] was apparently compiled by Domin and Podpěra from data supplied by Hruby. No synonymy is provided. Oddly enough, the name *C. Scheuchzeri* is here transferred to the variety of *C. rotundifolia*.

A more detailed description of *C. bohémica* is found in Hruby's subsequent monographic study (HRUBY 1930). It runs as follows:

"Stengel sehr kräftig, steif, 20 cm bis 1/2 m lang (und darüber), scharfkantig, im oberen Teile (manchmal schon im unteren Drittel) reich und weitschweifig verzweigt (gegabelt). Grundblätter nierenherzförmig, fast ausgebissen gezähnt, bald zugrunde gehend. Stengelblätter besonders unten am Stengel stark genähert (bis gehäuft), lanzettlichlineal (1 bis 2 cm breit), in den (deutlichen) Blattstiel verschmälert, z. T. deutlich entfernt gezähnt. Oberste Stengelblätter schmallineal. Kelchzipfel *fast so lang als die Blumenkrone*, ziemlich breit und kräftig. Blüten dunkelviolet, mitteltgross, meist in einer reichblütigen zusammengesetzten Traube, oft einseitwendig".

There follow observations on taxonomic relationships (somewhat confused, though), variation and infraspecific taxonomy. Three new forms are described, of which two, f. *genuina* and f. *humilis*, are said to be widespread. The third, f. *exaltata* (including subf. *flexuosa*) is localized and is clearly based upon aberrant plants ("Abnormale Exemplare", HRUBY l.c.). No synonyms nor distinguishing characters of the new species are given but the two widespread varieties are identified with *C. Scheuchzeri* of earlier authors.

It would appear that Hruby's taxonomic intention was clear enough to gain immediate recognition. Such was not the case, however. Both the descriptions are vague to such a degree that they might well be applied, partly or totally, to a wide variety of Campanulas. This holds true particularly of the second description which indubitably came from Hruby's pen. It is not only inaccurate but entirely wrong in a number of features, such as the height and branching of stem, width of cauline leaves, shape and size of inflorescence and length of calyx teeth. These characters, as defined by Hruby, do not normally occur in natural populations of the Krkonoše plant. Stems profusely branched in the lower part and broadened cauline leaves are occasionally found in *C. rotundifolia* L. and some other species, especially in shady and/or moist habitats, but are extremely rare in "*C. Scheuchzeri*"

of the Krkonoše Mts. Hruby's f. *exaltata* is obviously based upon this modification and it is perhaps most unfortunate that its characters were comprised in the second description of the new species and even prevailed. The characteristic features of the two other varieties are virtually ignored in the description. Hruby's improbable data on secund inflorescence and calyx teeth almost equalling corollas may refer to hastily prepared herbarium specimens.

Inevitably, florists attempting to make use of Hruby's two descriptions to identify the Krkonoše material ran into trouble. Indeed, they could hardly fail to do so, because a plant matching either of these descriptions is most unlikely to occur in those mountains. Few only of the post-1928 collections are labelled *Campanula bohémica* HRUBY, even though this name has been accepted in floras and manuals (see DOMIN et PODPĚRA 1928, DOMIN 1935, HENDRYCH 1950, SZAFER, KULCZYŃSKI et PAWŁOWSKI 1953).

It was these glaring discrepancies that made the ardent explorer of the Krkonoše flora, Colonel Josef Šourek (1891—1968) come out against *C. bohémica* HRUBY in 1953. In his sweeping criticism of HRUBY's 1930 account he totally rejects *C. bohémica* as doubtful and unidentifiable and redescribes the plant as *C. corcontica* ŠOUREK. His main argument is the blunders in the second description, which make it impossible for the plant to be recognized in nature; he also objects to the absence of a type specimen designated as such by Hruby.

As far as taxonomy is concerned, Šourek's study is extremely useful, providing not only the first accurate description of the species but also a survey of morphological characters and important information on variation, hybridization, ecology and geographical distribution. Hruby's description is meticulously analyzed and an attempt is made to account for all its inaccuracies. Indeed, few plant species have been described in more detail by their authors. But alas, Šourek's proposals concerning nomenclature are fallacious, being at variance with the provisions of the Code. It is deplorable that his *C. corcontica* was accepted by DOSTÁL (1954, 1958; for a discussion, see also DOSTÁL 1957) and has been in common use among Czech botanists for the past 20 years, even though PODLECH (1965) attempted to resurrect Hruby's correct name.

Irrespective of the fact that Šourek failed to distinguish between taxonomy and nomenclature (it is actually the species, not the name, which is being assailed), the following objections must be raised:

1. The criticism is directed against the 1930 description which is irrelevant for nomenclatural purposes, the name having been validly published in 1928.

2. The inaccuracy of a description or diagnosis cannot invalidate the publication of a name. Should this criterion of validity be adopted, most present nomenclature would probably collapse inasmuch as a great many plant species cannot be at all recognized on their original descriptions.

3. Nothing whatever obliged an author describing a new species in 1930 to designate the type, the type method having not been established until the 1935 Code.

4. Šourek's assertion that Hruby's *C. bohémica* cannot be identified is not entirely fair. Herbarium material revised by Hruby has survived in BRNM, PR, PRC and other Central European herbaria and indicates beyond any

doubt that the name *C. bohémica* HRUBY was proposed to accommodate *C. Scheuchzeri* of earlier students of the Krkonoše flora. [This does not necessarily follow from the text provided in the Excursion Flora (DOMIN et PODPĚRA 1928) but might be inferred, though with some difficulty, from the 1930 account.] Šourek himself saw the BRNM specimens named *C. bohémica* by Hruby and labelled all of them as *C. corcontica* ŠOUREK, thus contradicting his own statements.

This last point alone makes Šourek's specific name superfluous, relegating it to the synonymy of *C. bohémica* HRUBY. The correct name of the Krkonoše plant is therefore as follows:

Campanula bohémica HRUBY in DOMIN et PODPĚRA, Klíč úplné květ. Rep. českosl. 534, 1928

Syn.: *C. rotundifolia* L. *β grandiflora* WIMMER, Fl. Schles. 241, 1840. — *C. corcontica* ŠOUREK, Preslia 25 : 8, 1953. — *C. linifolia* auct. non HAENKE, e.g.: F. W. SCHMIDT, Fl. böhm. 2 : 66, 1793; PRESL et PRESL, Fl. čech. 49, 1819. — *C. Scheuchzeri* auct. non VILL., e.g.: ČELAKOVSKÝ, Prodr. Fl. Böhm. 2 : 183, 1871.

The above account ensued from my taxonomic and nomenclatural revision made in 1967 but remained unpublished, in view of Colonel Šourek's condition. The name *C. bohémica* HRUBY has however been preferred in my paper on polyploidy and variation in the *Campanula rotundifolia* species aggregate (see KOVANDA 1970). A taxonomic study of *C. bohémica* will follow.

SOUHRN

Krkonošský zvonek z příbuzenstva alpského druhu *Campanula Scheuchzeri* VILL. odlišil brněnský botanik J. Hruby pod jménem *C. bohémica* HRUBY. Jméno bylo platně publikováno v knize DOMIN et PODPĚRA: Klíč k úplné květeně Republiky československé v roce 1928, nikoliv jak se až dosud soudilo v časopise Magyar Botanikai Lapok roku 1930. Oba publikované popisy jsou nevěstižné (druhý z nich dokonce přihlíží spíše k odchýlkám vyvolaným prostředím než k typickým rostlinám), takže nový druh nebylo možno v přírodě jednoznačně identifikovat. Tuto skutečnost považoval J. Šourek za důkaz dubiosní povahy jména *C. bohémica* HRUBY a zavedl proto v roce 1953 nové pojmenování *C. corcontica* ŠOUREK. Jeho práce je taxonomicky velice cenná, protože přináší vůbec první přesný popis tohoto taxonu a důležité údaje o jeho ekologii, rozšíření, variabilitě a hybridizaci, po stránce nomenklatorické je však v rozporu s platným kódem botanické nomenklatury. Hrubým revidovaný herbářový materiál totiž jasně nasvědčuje, že jméno *C. bohémica* se vztahuje k rostlině považované staršími autory za *C. Scheuchzeri*, nikoliv k abnormitě, jak by bylo možno usuzovat z druhého popisu. Šourek sám revidoval Hrubyho materiál uložený v herbáři Moravského muzea v Brně jako *C. corcontica*. Proto je jím navržené jméno *C. corcontica* ŠOUREK nadbytečné a je nutno je považovat za synonymum jména *C. bohémica* HRUBY.

REFERENCES

- ČELAKOVSKÝ L. (1871): Prodrum der Flora von Böhmen. Tom. 2. — Prag.
— (1879): Analytická květena česká. — Praha.
DOMIN K. (1935): Plantarum Českosloviae enumeratio. — Preslia, Praha, 13–15 : 1–305.
DOMIN K. et J. PODPĚRA (1928): Klíč k úplné květeně Republiky československé. — Olomouc.
DOSTÁL J. (1954): Klíč k úplné květeně ČSR. Ed. 1. — Praha.
— (1957): Botanická nomenklatura. — Praha.
— (1958): Klíč k úplné květeně ČSR. Ed. 2. — Praha.
FIEK E. (1881): Flora von Schlesien preussischen und österreichischen Antheils. — Breslau.
HAYEK A. (1918): Campanulaceae. — In: HEGG G.: Illustrierte Flora von Mitteleuropa. Tom. 6/1, p. 328–394. — München.
HENDRYCH R. (1950): Campanulaceae. — In: DOSTÁL J. et al.: Květena ČSR, p. 1418–1436. — Praha.
HRUBY J. (1930): Campanulastudien innerhalb der Vulgares und ihrer Verwandten. — Magy. Bot. Lap., Budapest, 29 : 152–276.

- KOVANDA M. (1970): Polyploidy and variation in the *Campanula rotundifolia* complex. Part I. (General.) — Rozpr. Čs. Akad. Věd, ser. math.-nat., Praha, 80/2 : 1–95.
- KROCKER A. I. (1787): Flora silesiaca. Tom. 1. — Vratislaviae.
- LAUS H. (1908): Schulflora der Sudetenländer. — Brünn.
- MATTUSCHKA H. G. (1776): Flora silesiaca. Tom. 1. — Leipzig.
- OPIZ F. M. (1852): Seznam rostlin květeny české. — Praha.
- OTT J. (1851): Catalog der Flora Böhmens. — Prag.
- PODLECH D. (1965): Revision der europäischen und nordafrikanischen Vertreter der Subsect. *Heterophylla* (Witas.) Fed. der Gattung *Campanula*. — Feddes Rep., Berlin, 71 : 50–137.
- POLÍVKA F. (1901): *Názorná květena zemí koruny české*. Tom. 3. — Olomouc.
- (1912): *Klíč k úplné květeně zemí koruny české*. — Olomouc.
- PRESL J. S. et C. B. PRESL (1819): Flora čechica. — Pragae.
- SCHUBE T. (1904): Flora von Schlesien preussischen und österreichischen Anteils. — Breslau.
- SCHMIDT T. W. (1793): Flora boëmica inchoata. Tom. 1. — Pragae.
- SZAFER W., S. KULCZYŃSKI et B. PAWŁOWSKI (1953): *Rośliny polskie*. — Warszawa.
- ŠOUREK J. (1953): *Campanula corcontica* sp. nov. — Preslia, Praha, 25 : 1–24.
- WILLKOMM M. (1863): *Führer ins Reich der deutschen Pflanzen*. — Leipzig.
- WIMMER F. (1840): Flora von Schlesien preussischen und österreichischen Antheils. Ed. 1. — Breslau, Ratibor et Pless.
- WIMMER F. et H. GRABOWSKI (1827): Flora silesiaca. Tom. 1. — Vratislaviae.

Received September 28, 1974

Reviewed by Z. Pouzar

M. E. Hale:

The Biology of Lichens

Second edition. — E. Arnold, London 1974, 181 str., 58 obr., 12 čísel. tabulek, 16 fotogr. tabulí, cena £2.75, váz. £5.50. (Kniha je v knihovně ČSBS.)

Tato publikace je druhým vydáním stejnojmenné knížky, vyšlé od téhož autora v témže nakladatelství r. 1967 a v dotisku r. 1970 jako jeden z titulů sbírky *Contemporary Biology*. Posláním uvedené sbírky, kterou redigují profesori Barrington a Willis, je poskytnout studentům moderní texty z různých biologických disciplín, takže sbírka vlastně představuje sérii moderních učebnic (nikoliv příruček).

Měl jsem příležitost užívat ve své didaktické práci na přírodovědecké fakultě UK v Praze prvního vydání recenzované učebnice. Učebnice se mi velmi dobře osvědčila. Také studenti ji hodnotili vysoce kladně, a to hlavně z toho důvodu, že je poměrně stručná, přitom se velmi dobře čte (a také studuje), má četné ilustrace a pojednává o lišejnících z nejrůznějších hledisek. Druhé vydání má stejnou koncepci jako vydání první; její text se rovněž člení na 11 kapitol. Respektuje však navíc 50 pozdějších publikací, přináší nové ilustrace (včetně snímků z elektronového a rastrovacího mikroskopu), má přepracované partie jednající o ekologii, o fytoecologii, o ultrastruktuře a hlavně o chemii lišejníků, jakož i o vlivu znečištěného ovzduší na tyto komplexní organismy. Zachovává si své výlučné postavení mezi obecnou lichenologickou literaturou, přestože vyšly později další práce s tímto širokým zaměřením (srov. např. *Preslia* 46 : 378, 1974). Vřele ji čtenářům *Preslie* doporučuji, pokud se o lišejníky zajímají.

Zd. Černohorský