

## Bryological Nomenclature

INTERNATIONAL BOTANICAL CONGRESS, AMSTERDAM, 1935.

The following letter has been sent out to the members of the International Bryological Subcommittee on Nomenclature :

Northampton, 13 dec. 1934.

Certain questions have arisen, principally on Nomina Generica Conservanda, which it is desirable to decide at the forthcoming Congress at Amsterdam. I am enclosing a statement with regard to these, with a Reply Sheet, and shall be very grateful if your replies on these points may be sent to me as quickly as possible, in order that they, with the proposals already agreed upon, may be printed for submission to the Secretariat of the Congress.

As I understand the position, the decision of a majority of the members will go as the recommendation of the Subcommittee to the Congress, but it will still be open for any dissentient member of the Subcommittee, or others present at Amsterdam, to vote against any of the proposals.

H. N. DIXON.

### LEPTODON MOHR.

The genus *Leptodon* was created by Mohr in his *Observationes Botanicae, Kiliae, 1803, p. 27*, in the following terms :

*Leptodon mihi.*

E *Pterigynandris* Hedwigii eas species hoc novo sub genere complector quibus calyptra est sic dicta *sursum pilifera*, uti Pr. *trichomitrium*, Pt. *subcapillatum*, nec non Hypn. *Smithii* Dicks. (cf. Swartz in *Diar. botan. Schrader. T. IV, p. 173*).

*Orthotrichi* polymorphum genus, si retineatur solum modo ob calyptram paraphysibus ex ipsa ortis, erectis investitam, nescio cur non

eodem modo sit per se ponandum hocce a me primum propositum genus, peristomate gaudens *Grimmiae*, *Orthotrichi* calyptra...

Subsequent authors have agreed that *L. trichomitrius* and *L. Smithii* belong to two different genera, but there has been and is a difference of opinion as to which should be retained as the type of *Leptodon*, and which placed in a new genus. For the most part authors have considered *L. Smithii* the type. The authors of the Bry. Eur. (Vol. V, tab. 438) distinctly state that the type of *Leptodon* Mohr is the *Hypnum Smithii* Hedw., but this would appear to represent their own opinion rather than any judgment expressed by Mohr. Generally speaking most bryological works, European and Asiatic at least, have retained *L. Smithii* as the type of the genus.

On the other hand some of the leading American bryologists, e. g. Sullivant, and Lesqueureux et James, have treated *L. trichomitrius* Mohr as the type, basing this treatment on the fact that it is the first species mentioned by Mohr. It is desirable that this divergence of treatment should be cleared up.

By the authors retaining *L. Smithii* as the type, the species *L. trichomitrius* has been placed, or retained, under several genera, but that generally adopted has been *Forsstroemia* Lindb. in Oefv. af K. Sv. Vet. Akad. Foerh., 1862, p. 605, and if *L. Smithii* is to be retained *Forsstroemia* would be retained for *L. trichomitrius* and its allies.

The pros and cons may be briefly summed up :

For *L. Smithii*.

(a) As already mentioned it has been adopted by practically every bryological work from the time of Mohr, dealing with mosses of every part of the globe with the exception of N. America, where the species does not occur.

(b) The adoption of *L. trichomitrius* would involve the creation of an entirely new generic name for *L. Smithii* Mohr.

(c) The genus *Forsstroemia*, which includes some 20 species, and which has been in general use for at least forty years, would be retained. It is a genus distributed over practically the whole of the globe, with the exception of the arctic and antarctic.

For *L. trichomitrius*.

(a) It is the first species mentioned by Mohr, and therefore has a claim to be considered as the « type » species. There is at present no Rule to that effect, but it is a reasonable principle to be adopted in the selection of a type, and *other things being equal* would undoubtedly be the natural course to adopt.

(b) Three or four species of *Forsstroemia* have already been treated as *Leptodon*, and would therefore not involve new combinations, as would be the case with the other 16 or so.

(c) With North American bryologists the name *Leptodon* is already associated with *L. trichomitrius* and with its allies, not with *L. Smithii*.

It is pretty clear that *Leptodon* as defined by Mohr (i. e. separated from *Pterigynandrum* Hedw. only by a hairy calyptra) can hardly be considered as adequately defined, and it should be cited as either *Leptodon* Mohr emend. Bry. eur., if for *L. Smithii*, or *L. Mohr* emend. Sull. if for *L. trichomitrius*.

If on the above considerations one or another be adopted, it would seem desirable that this should be placed on the list of *Nomina Generica Conservanda* either as —

*Leptodon* Mohr emend. Sull., or

*Leptodon* Mohr emend. Bry. eur.

#### PAPILLARIA C. MULL.

*Papillaria* was published by C. Müller in Oefv. af K. Sv. Vet. Akad. Foerh. 1876, No. 4, p. 34, as a genus of *Meteoriaceae*. It embraces some 70 species widely distributed in the tropical regions of the old and new worlds, and has been practically universally adopted for the past half century or more. It is however antedated by *Papillaria* Dulac, Fl. Hautes-Pyrénées, 45 (1867). This however is simply a synonym of *Scheuchzeria* Linn.; it is not recognized as a genus of flowering plants, and it is understood that the Phanerogamists would raise no objection to its being treated as a *nomen rejiciendum*. It is therefore proposed to place *Papillaria* C. Müll. on the list of *Nomina Generica Conservanda*.

#### HAPLOHYMENIUM

The genus *Haplohymenium* is cited by Brotherus (Engler et Prantl Pflanzenfam., Musci) as of Doz. et Molk. in Ann. Sc. nat., 1844, II, p. 310. That reference, however is incorrect; the citation refers to *Leptohymenium Sieboldii* Doz. et Molk. As far as these authors are concerned the name *Haplohymenium* dates from the Musc. Frond. Ined. Arch. Ind., between 1845 and 1848. There a full generic description is given, based upon *Leptohymenium Sieboldii* Doz. et Molk. as cited above (1844). The authors however give Schwaegrichen, Suppl. III, 2, 1, Tab. 271, as the author of the generic name, citing as a synonym « *Leptohymenium* Schwaegr. in indice supplementi tertii ».

But the true facts about *Haplohymenium* Schwaegr. appear to be thus. Schwaegrichen *loc. cit.* in both text and plate named his moss *Haplohymenium microphyllum*, but by error entirely; and in his index to that part he asks (in two places) that for *Haplohymenium* should be read *Leptohymenium*. In the text to Tab. 271, *Haplohymenium microphyllum*, he refers the reader, for the generic character, to Tab. 246 « sub *Haplohymenio repente* ». As is indicated under *Leptohymenium tenue*, Tab. 246c, the peristome had been previously thought to be single (whence the name *Haplohymenium*), but Arnott had shown him that it was double; and under Tab. 246b, *Neckera striata* et *repens*, he distinctly states that these species do not appear to him to differ from *Neckera* sufficiently to be separated as a genus by the name of *Haplohymenium*.

It seems clear that Schwaegrichen, whatever his intentions may have been prior to Arnott's demonstration of the double peristome, did not create *Haplohymenium* as a new genus; there is no generic description given, and *Haplohymenium microphyllum* as printed was an error, corrected by the author himself in the index. Doz. et Molk. were therefore in error in citing *Haplohymenium* as of Schwaegrichen. This being the case the obvious thing would be to cite *Haplohymenium* as of Doz. et Molk., M. Ined. Arch. Ind. 1845-48, omitting any reference to *Haplohymenium* of Schwaegrichen. If it should be maintained that Schwaegrichen actually though unwillingly published *Haplohymenium* in publishing *Haplohymenium microphyllum* (though no generic description was given) it would be desirable to conserve *Haplohymenium* Doz. et Molk. as against *Haplohymenium* Schwaegrichen.

#### PLATYGYRIUM BRY. EUR.

*Platygyrium* was founded by the authors of the Br. eur. on *P. repens* - *Pterigynandrum repens* Brid., 1806. It is not a *Pterigynandrum*, nor does it belong to any of the nine or ten genera under which it had been placed. The genus is quite validly published, but there is a technical objection on the ground that the species was placed under *Haplohymenium* by Schwaegrichen. As pointed out above that genus was never described or validly published, and it is doubtful if it could be held to invalidate *Platygyrium* Bry. eur. In order however to avoid any doubt it is proposed to conserve *Platygyrium* Bry. eur. as against *Haplohymenium* Schwaegr.

The voting was unanimous in favour of conserving *Papillaria* C. Müll., *Platygyrium* Bryeur., and *Haplohymenium* Doz. et Molk.

Four votes were given for retaining *Leptodon Smithii* Mohr; two for *Leptodon trichomitrius* Mohr.

#### PROPOSALS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS AT AMSTERDAM.

The following proposals will be submitted to the Congress from the Bryological Subcommittee.

I. Confirmation of the list of Nomina Generica Conservanda as agreed at Cambridge and subsequently (The list will be circulated to members from the General Secretariat).

II. To conserve the following additional Generic names :

*Atrichum* P. Beauv., Prodr., p. 42 (1803).

*Hypnum* Hedw. Sp. Musc. (1801) emend., as against *Stereodon* Brid.

*Myurium* Schimp. Syn., p. 675 (1860).

*Hookeria* Sm. in Trans. Linn. Soc. IX, p. 275 (1808).

*Neckera* Hedw. Sp. Musc., p. 200 (1801).

*Leptodon* Mohr emend. Bry. eur. (1851).

*Papillaria* C. Müll. in Oefv. af K. Sv. Vet. Akad. Foerh., n° 4,  
p. 34 (1876).

*Haplohymenium* Doz. et Molk., M. Fr. Ined. Arch. Ind. (1845-1848).

*Platygyrium* Bry. eur. (1851).

