



(1254) Proposal to Conserve the Family Name Helotiaceae (Fungi)

Author(s): Richard P. Korf, Teresa Iturriaga and Pavel Lizoň

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (Nov., 1996), pp. 683-684

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1224255>

Accessed: 15-04-2015 20:59 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

(1254) Proposal to conserve the family name *Helotiaceae* (Fungi)Richard P. Korf¹, Teresa Iturriaga^{1,2} & Pavel Lizoň¹

The aim of the following proposal is to restore the legitimacy of the family name *Helotiaceae* which was previously rejected on purely nomenclatural grounds since its type, *Helotium* Pers., is an illegitimate name.

- (1254) *Helotiaceae* Rehm in Rabenh. Krypt.-Fl., ed. 2, 1(3): 647. Jul 1892 [*Fungi*], *nom. cons. prop.*
 Type: *Helotium* Pers., non Tode : Fr. [= *Cudoniella* Sacc.].
- (=) *Bulgariaceae* Fr., Summa Veg. Scand.: 357. 1849, *nom. rej. prop.*
 Type: *Bulgaria* Fr. : Fr.
- (=) *Cenangiaceae* Bail in Nees & Henry, Syst. Pilze 2: 59. Jan-Feb 1858, *nom. rej. prop.*
 Type: *Cenangium* Fr. : Fr.
- (=) *Heterosphaeriaceae* Rehm in Rabenh. Krypt.-Fl., ed. 2, 1(3): 191, 198. Aug 1888, *nom. rej. prop.*
 Type: *Heterosphaeria* Grev.
- (=) *Cordieritidaceae* (Sacc.) Sacc., Syll. Fung. 8: 810. 20 Dec 1889, *nom. rej. prop.*
 Type: *Cordierites* Mont.

A brief historical summary will clarify some of the confusion that has arisen. Korf (in Sci. Rep. Yokohama Natl. Univ., Sect. 2, Biol. Sci. 7: 16-17. 1958) recognized that *Leotia* Pers. was unrelated to other members of the *Geoglossaceae* Corda 1838 and, in concert with Sanshi Imai, transferred the subfamily *Leotioideae* S. Imai to the *Helotiaceae*. In preparing his general treatment of discomycetes, Korf (in Ainsworth & al., Fungi 4A: 249-319. 1973) realized that the name *Helotiaceae*, typified by the illegitimate generic name *Helotium* Pers., a later homonym of *Helotium* Tode : Fr., is illegitimate (Art. 18.3), and adopted the almost forgotten family name *Leotiaceae* Corda 1842 in a very broad sense, so that many younger family names disappeared. Prior to 1973 the family name *Leotiaceae* had rarely been used, and then only to include a single genus, *Leotia*. In all other pre-1973 treatments known to us *Leotiaceae* had been submerged under the older family name, *Geoglossaceae*. Most authors accepted Korf's decision and only few (Bellemère & al. in Bull. Soc. Bot. France, Lett. Bot. 134: 217-246. 1987; Pérez-Froiz & al. in Stud. Bot. 13: 231-233. 1995) continued to use the family name *Helotiaceae*. The mounting evidence, both morphological (Chadefaud in Rev. Mycol. (Paris) 9: 3-13. 1944; Verkley in Persoonia 15: 405-430. 1994; Verkley, Ascal Appar. Leotiales: 1-209. 1995) and molecular (S. Landvik, pers. comm.), is that *Leotia* is very likely far distant from the remainder of the inoperculate discomycetes. This forces us at this time to look for an appropriate family name for the bulk of the genera apparently unrelated to *Leotia*. Unfortunately, the one name, *Helotiaceae*, that had consistently been used for these is illegitimate. Though there are several other family names that we could adopt, none of them

¹ Plant Pathology Herbarium, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, U.S.A.

² Permanent address: Departamento de Biología de Organismos, Universidad Simón Bolívar, Caracas, Venezuela.

except *Cenangiaceae* has seen use for anything but a very few genera of the discomycetes, and emending the circumscription of any such family name to include all of the genera remaining in the “*Leotiaceae sensu lato*” after exclusion of *Leotia* seems unwise. Our proposal calls for conservation of *Helotiaceae*, typified by *Helotium* Pers. [non Tode : Fr.] (= *Cudoniella* Sacc.), against *Bulgariaceae*, *Cenangiaceae*, *Heterosphaeriaceae*, and *Cordieritidaceae*. These four family names would, of course, still be available to mycologists accepting smaller families, provided the genus *Cudoniella* is not included in such circumscriptions. Even after such conservation, the family name *Helotiaceae* will still be a synonym of the *Leotiaceae* for those workers who believe that *Leotia* and *Cudoniella* are confamilial, since it has priority. We find it unnecessary to propose conservation of *Helotiaceae* against *Leotiaceae*, since that family name will surely remain in use for the distantly related genus *Leotia* and perhaps a few allies.

If *Helotiaceae* is not conserved, four family names proposed for inoperculate discomycetes based on genera possibly related to *Cudoniella* (= *Helotium* Pers.) are older than *Helotiaceae*, and all are available. The oldest of these, *Bulgariaceae*, originally contained 10 genera of widely differing fungi, but has never been adopted by other authors in that sense. Rehm (l.c.: 467. 1891), for example, used it in a different sense for 5 genera, with only *Bulgaria* in common. Most other authors have ignored the family name and Lindau (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1(1): 232. 1896) incorrectly assigned *Bulgaria* to the younger family *Cenangiaceae*. The second name, *Cenangiaceae*, has been used to encompass many genera by at least two authors (Lindau in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1(1): 231-232. 1896, who accepted 21 genera; Seaver in N. Amer. Cup-fungi, Inoperc.: 295-372. 1951, who accepted 13 genera). The next family name, *Heterosphaeriaceae*, was proposed for three genera widely separated in modern classifications, and has apparently never been adopted by other authors. The fourth family name, *Cordieritidaceae*, when used at all, has been restricted to one or two genera. To observe strict priority we would be obliged to adopt one of these family names and to greatly expand its concept. Under most taxonomic circumscriptions, that family name would be *Bulgariaceae*, but under other taxonomic schemes it could be any one of the other three that would need expansion. For example, we currently recognize *Bulgariaceae* for *Bulgaria* alone, since we do not believe it is closely related to *Leotia*, *Cudoniella*, or any other genus in this order. In our future treatments, the family name we would be forced to adopt for the remainder of the genera under consideration is *Cenangiaceae*.

Acknowledgements

We are deeply indebted to Dr Ove Eriksson (University of Umeå), Dr Walter Gams (CBS, Baarn), Dr Werner Greuter (Botanical Garden and Botanical Museum, Berlin) and Dr Lennart Holm (Uppsala University) for their significant help in our analysis and solution of this problem.