XXVI. Report of the Committee for Bryophyta
Author(s): R. Van Der Wijk
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 8, No. 1 (Jan., 1959), pp. 17-18
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1217290
Accessed: 15/03/2014 09:49

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

This content downloaded from 212.238.114.212 on Sat, 15 Mar 2014 09:49:44 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

Note 1. Names in the list are treated as illegitimate, but any which are earlier homonyms retain their status as such.

Note 2. If the specific epithet has been transferred to another genus it may be legitimate in its new position as from the date of transfer (see Art. 72, Note).

Note 3. A *nomen specificum rejiciendum*, when cited as a synonym, should be followed by the explanatory words ("*nomen rejiciendum*" or "*nom. rejic.*"

Note 4. The list of *nomina specifica rejicienda* will remain permanently open for additions. Any proposal of an additional name must be accompanied by a detailed statement of the cases both for and against its rejection. Such proposals must be submitted to the General Committee (see Division III), which will refer them for examination to the committees for the various taxonomic groups.

Supplementary proposals (in case the above is accepted):

303. *Article 15.* Renumber as Article 16 and reword as follows: When a proposal for conservation or rejection of a name has been provisionally approved by the General Committee, botanists are authorized to accept it pending the decision of a later International Botanical Congress.

304. *Article 63.* Add paragraph "If it is included in the List of *Nomina Specifica Rejicienda* (Appendix —)".

Mr. N. Y. Sandwith wishes it to be recorded that he considers that no special action for the stabilization of specific names is desirable.

XXVI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR BRYOPHYTA

1. *Starting-point date.*

Several bryologists, mostly from N. America, have expressed disagreement with the presen starting-point date of 31 Dec. 1801 (Hedwig, Species Muscorum) and desire a change.

To the notice in Taxon 6: 55. 1957, I got 9 answers, almost all from American bryologists all in favour of a change of date. They were not in agreement, however, about the date which should be accepted; 5 were in favour of 1 January 1801, 3 in favour of 19 April 1801, the actual date of publication, and one preferred that Linnaeus, Species Plantarum, 1753, should again be the start of moss nomenclature.

The members of the Special Committee for Bryophyta were asked by letter to vote on this point in the autumn of 1957. The results of the ballot were:

a. A large majority (8 for, 2 against) wanted to change the present starting-point date (31 Dec. 1801).

b. The result about what the date ought to be was:

for 1 Jan. 1801	5 votes
for 19 April 1801	5 votes

In these circumstances the Committee cannot submit a definite proposal to the next International Botanical Congress in Montréal. In view of the result of the first vote, and the opinions received from bryologists not members of the committee, it can be regarded as certain that there is a majority in favour of altering the date. The following alternative amendments to Article 13 are therefore submitted to the next Congress: Article 13 b to read as follows:

305. "b. Musci (the Sphagnaceae excepted), 1 Jan. 1801.
(Hedwig, Species Muscorum)."

or

306. "b. Musci (the Sphagnaceae excepted), 19 April 1801.
(Hedwig, Species Muscorum)."

Since the Stockholm Congress accepted a general proposal that starting-point dates should be either 1 Jan. or 31 Dec. of the year in which the work was issued, it would be more in accordance with that decision to accept 1 Jan. 1801.

2. *List of family names.*

The members who expressed an opinion on this point were unanimously in favour of such a list However, it seems preferable to await the compilation of a definitive list, and meanwhile to use the list of Evans (Bot. Rev. 5: 49-96. 1939) for the Hepaticae and that of Fleischer for the Musci.

3. *Priority above the rank of family* was voted against by all members of the Committee.

This content downloaded from 212.238.114.212 on Sat, 15 Mar 2014 09:49:44 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

4. *The type specimen.*

The type specimen in the Bryophytes must always be a permanently preserved specimen, and living material cannot be indicated as type. Only one member considers that a printed diagnosis with many figures of characteristic parts could replace preserved material as a type.

5. *Conservation of names.*

Androcryphia and Herberta are wrongly included in the list of nomina generica conservanda published in the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, 1953. They should be deleted.

The results of the ballot on the additional names proposed for conservation were as follows:

	in favour	against
a. *Amblyodon* B.S.G.	9	—
b. *Holomitrium* Endl.	9	—
c. *Orthothecium* B.S.G.	8	1
d. *Pleuropus* Griff.	4	4
e. *Grimaldia* Raddi	2	6
f. *Saccogyna* Dum.	9	—

The Committee thus rejects the conservation of *Grimaldia* Raddi, and is undecided about *Pleuropus* Griff. The other proposals for conservation are accepted and are referred to the general Committee for submission to the next Congress for ratification.

R. VAN DER WIJK

XXVII. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ALGAE

I. Is your committee of the opinion that a list of commonly accepted family names, together with their type genera, could be established?

Five members thought it was possible and feasible to prepare such a list; one member thought it was possible but difficult; five members thought it was impossible or inadvisable.

II. Is your committee of the opinion that, for your group of plants, the rules of priority and of typification should not be applied to names of taxa above the rank of family?

Six members thought that such rules should not apply at this rank; two members thought that in principle they should apply, but that it was not practicable at present; three members thought that they should apply.

III. Is your committee of the opinion that it should be made a rule that the type of a name of a taxon of the rank of species or below must in the future be a permanently preserved specimen? If this proves technically impossible for some kinds of organisms, what measures should be taken to safeguard a consistent application of the type method?

One member thought that a permanently preserved specimen (or type preparation for microscopic organisms) should be required without alternatives; six members thought that a permanently preserved specimen should be designated as type if possible, but if impossible, illustrations and/or descriptions [five members] or only illustrations [one member] should be permitted to serve as types; two members thought that a permanently preserved specimen should serve jointy with illustrations, but if a specimen were impossible to preserve, an illustration (but never a description) should be permitted to serve alone as type; two members thought that permanently preserved specimens were impossible for many organisms, and one of these members suggested the acceptance of photomicrographs serving jointly with figures and descriptions as types in such instances.

P. C. SILVA

XXVIII. VARIOUS PROPOSALS

307. In *Article 7, Note 5* is said: "The typification of organ genera, form genera, genera based on plant microfossils (pollen, spores etc.), genera of imperfect fungi, and any other analogous genera or lower taxa does not differ from that indicated above". (See also App. IV, 7). It is not evident from this that genera based on Sporae dispersae (pollen grains and spores etc.) are organ genera and form genera. They are made to appear to be a speciality. This has produced confusion. We must emphasize that genera of sporae dispersae are organ genera and form genera, because sporae dispersae are "detached organs" (see Art. PB 1 etc.).

Proposed by: R. POTONIÉ (Krefeld).

This content downloaded from 212.238.114.212 on Sat, 15 Mar 2014 09:49:44 AM
All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions