

Report of the Committee for Bryophyta: 7

Gea Zijlstra, Secretary

Nationaal Herbarium Nederland, Utrecht University branch, Heidelberglaan 2, NL-3584 CS Utrecht, Netherlands. E-mail: g.zijlstra@bio.uu.nl

The previous report of this Committee appeared in *Taxon* 48: 815–816. 1999. The Committee started with the 12 members elected in St. Louis, and had a very brief exchange of opinions on the revisions to the Appendices required for the St. Louis Code. In the spring of 2000, we were shocked by the sudden death of Patricia Geissler. It occurred on March 28 in a traffic accident near her home in Geneva. She had been a very active and enthusiastic member of the Committee since the Tokyo Congress in 1993. The Committee invited Lars Hedenäs from Stockholm to fill the vacancy, and we were glad that he agreed. Votes were taken in two ballots, each with all members voting: R. Grolle (Germany, Chairman), L. Hedenäs (Sweden), J. Heinrichs (Germany), P. Isoviita (Finland), R. E. Magill (U.S.A.), S. M. Perold (South Africa), R. D. Seppelt (Australia), R. E. Stotler (U.S.A.), B. C. Tan (Singapore), J. Váňa (Czech Republic), D. H. Vitt (U.S.A.) and G. Zijlstra (Netherlands, Secretary). A minimum of eight votes is required to recommend action on a proposal (adoption or rejection). The votes are recorded in the order yes : no : abstention.

The Committee considered the editorial Note at the end of proposal 1382 (*Taxon* 48: 139–140. 1999) to conserve *Pylaiella* Bory (Algae). Shortly before the St. Louis Congress, the Committee cut the “Gordian knot” of two names that were in current use for one moss genus, and decided that *Pylaisia* should be conserved against *Pilaisaea* (*Taxon* 48: 815. 1999). The acceptance of the proposal and subsequent inclusion of *Pylaisia* in App. IIIA implies that the homotypic substitute name *Pylaisiella* is no longer available for use. Therefore we see no risk of confusion between *Pylaisiella* and *Pylaiella* should the latter be conserved.

(1304). Conserve *Jungermannia exsecta* Schmidel [*Hepat.*] with a conserved type (proposed by Grolle in *Taxon* 46: 545–546. 1997). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

When *Jungermannia exsecta* was published in 1796, *Jungermannia globulifera* Pollich 1777 was listed as a synonym, hence *J. exsecta* is illegitimate under Art. 52 of the *ICBN* (Greuter & al., *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000). For several decades, *J. exsecta* was considered to be validly published by Schrader 1797; the Committee agrees, how-

ever, that Schmidel already validly published it in 1796. For the conserved type, the Committee concluded that the specimen designated by Grolle 1973 for “*J. exsecta* Schrader” provides the most suitable type—this is a neotype because it is not included in the protologue of Schmidel; it is not known where Schmidel specimens of *Jungermannia exsecta* could be found. The proposer agrees that this specimen is preferable to the atypical Schiffner specimen that was distributed in the beginning of the 20th century. *Jungermannia exsecta* is the basionym of *Tritomaria exsecta* (Schmidel) Loeske, a well-known European hepatic, and the Committee recommends acceptance of the proposal as amended with the following type:

Typus: (designated here by Grolle): Sine loco (probably from Central Europe), *Schrader*, Syst. Samml. Crypt. Gew. No. 98 (M, isoneotypes G, KIEL, L); *typ. cons. prop.*

(1387). Conserve *Calliargon megalophyllum* against *Hypnum moldavicum* [Musci] (proposed by Hedenäs, Váňa & Isoviita in *Taxon* 48: 149–150. 1999). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

This proposal concerns two taxonomic synonyms of which the older one and *Calliargon moldavicum*, the combination based on it, have been used a few times only. *Calliargon megalophyllum*, on the other hand, is a generally adopted, widely used name. The Committee recommends acceptance of the proposal, with two details changed: “34” must be deleted from the place of publication of *C. megalophyllum*, the precise date of which was 28 Sep 1908.

(1412). Conserve *Braunia* Bruch & Schimp. against *Braunia* Hornsch. [Musci] (proposed by De Luna in *Taxon* 48: 385–386. 1999). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

This is a case of two moss homonyms of which the older one has never been in use, and until recently completely overlooked, whereas the younger one, occurring on several continents, is widely accepted. The Committee does not consider *Braunia* likely to be confused with *Braunea*, a rejected heterotypic synonym of *Tiliacorea* in the spermatophytes, not only because the

latter is not in use, but also because the names commemorate different persons, A. Braun and F. von Braune, respectively. The Committee recommends acceptance of the proposal, with one change: the type citation of the rejected name should be replaced by “≡ *Neckera* Hedw. 1801 (*nom. cons.*)”.

(1435). Conserve *Bryum* Hedw. [*Musci*] with a conserved type (proposed by Spence & Ramsay in *Taxon* 48: 827–828. 1999). Votes: 0 : 12 : 0 (not recommended).

At the beginning of the discussions, the opinions within the Committee were rather divergent, some members having some sympathy with the proposal. We soon agreed, however, that this large genus is in great need of revision, with use of morphological and molecular data. Considerable doubt arose to whether *B. caespititium* would indeed provide a better type. Several members think that *B. argenteum* and *B. caespititium* might be closely related. Some recent investigations (not yet published) support this, and moreover it seems that these two species are not closely related with *Anomobryum*. The Committee thinks it is premature to decide which species name would be the most appropriate to typify *Bryum*. If conservation appears to be necessary, there is a good chance that the choice of *B. caespititium* would prove to be a bad choice, causing new problems. Therefore we conclude that the proposal is best rejected.

(1448). Conserve *Staurophora* Mereschk. [*Algae*] against *Staurophora* Willd. [*Hepat.*] (proposed by Prasad & Silva in *Taxon* 49: 283–284. 2000). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

The name of the hepatic *Staurophora*, is illegitimate because it includes the only original species of *Lunularia* Adans., a name that is in use. Therefore the Committee does not have any problem with rejection of *Staurophora* Willd. In our opinion, two points can be improved in the nom. rej. prop. entry: the date of publication can be made more precise by addition of “Apr–Jun”, and instead of a type paragraph, the entry would be better as “≡ *Lunularia* Adans. 1763”.

(1450). Conserve *Grimmia poecilostoma* Cardot & Sebille against *Grimmia crassifolia* Lindb. ex Broth. and *Grimmia gymnostoma* Culm. [*Musci*] (proposed by Muñoz in *Taxon* 49: 287–288. 2000). Votes: 0 : 12 : 0 (not recommended).

When considering this proposal, the Committee encountered several problems. *Grimmia poecilostoma* was not validly published by Cardot & Sebille (the combination did not occur in their publication); the name must be ascribed to Cardot & Sebille ex Limpr. (in *Rabenh. Krypt.-Fl.*, ed. 2. 4(3): 713. Dec 1902), and typification should therefore be from material studied by

Limpricht.

With respect to *G. crassifolia*, it appears that part of the information given by Muñoz is incorrect; e.g., in the Savich-Lyubitskaya & Smirnova (1970) flora mentioned in the proposal, *G. crassifolia* was used, whereas *G. poecilostoma* was treated there as a variety of *G. tergestina*. We did not see a problem in *G. gymnostoma*; with the present uncertainties about *G. poecilostoma*, however, we think the entire proposal should be rejected.

(1451). Conserve *Grimmia crinita* Brid. against *Dicranum phascoideum* P. Beauv. [*Musci*] (proposed by Muñoz in *Taxon* 49: 289–290. 2000). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

This is a case of two moss synonyms of which the older one had been synonymized in several different ways, and for a long time has been treated as a synonym of the younger *G. crinita*. The Committee recommends acceptance of the proposal, with a few details added: publication of *G. crinita* was on 20 Apr 1906, of *Dicranum phascoideum* on 10 Jan 1805, and the type of the nom. cons. prop. should more precisely be cited as “Typus: [Switzerland] Avril 02. Roger (B, herb. Bridel No. 119)”.