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LATER "STARTING POINTS" AND THE GENERA
MNIUM L., MNIUM HEDWIG, AND CALYPOGEJA RADDI

J. Proskauer (Berkeley, Calif.) *

There exists an interpretation of Art. 13, 1961 Code, which, in determining the applicable "starting point" date for a given name, takes into consideration to what group the original author assigned it. While I do not see any basis for such interpretation in the wording of the article, it apparently requires clarification.

27. Proposed new Note to Art. 13. Add: "The affinity of a name is determined by the actual affinity of its type."

Add example: "The names of the genus Porella L., and its single species P. pinnata L., Sp. pl. 1106, 1753, the type being a liverwort, were validly published although Linné listed them among the "Muscii."

It is most unfortunate that we ever accepted the principle of later "starting points". In several of the groups it is doubtful if any practical advantage has derived from it. The authors of these later "starting point" works were quite unaware of the honor to be bestowed on them by ex post facto legislation. On the contrary, they strove to apply to the best of their exceptional abilities a system of nomenclature basically identical with our own. Much of the time, to decide what they did under our ex post facto Code, we have to cover just the same the ground between the natural "starting point" accepted by them, the Species plantarum, and our artificial date. Further, any special treatment for one group has repercussions in other places. One such repercussion derives from the publication of taxa in which plants of different "starting point" dates were included fifteen "good" mosses, but also three species now recognized to comprise leafy liverworts. But we have decreed, in Article 13, that for purposes of valid nomenclature these mosses did not ipso facto exist in 1753. Therefore the genus Mniium L. comprised as of 1753 three species of liverworts only. By our legislation it is totally irrelevant what Linné had in mind. To say that Linné intended Mniium as a genus of mosses, that therefore it was not validly published under our Code, and that therefore the three included liverwort species were not validly published under Art. 43, is an argument which is sheer hypocrisy in terms of our current legislation (as well as an unwarranted curtailment of the rights of liverworts).

Of the three species of liverworts included originally in Mniium L., one (M. jungermanniæ L.1) is apparently based on a mixture of different liverworts, but the other two names (M. trichomanis L. and M. fissum L.) are used as basionsyms for species included in the genus Calypogeja (usually misspelled Calypogeia) Raddi, Mem. Soc. Ital. Sci., Modena 18: Fisica: 42, 1818. (I say "used as basionsyms" advisedly: It seems to have entered nobody's head to apply Art. 43 with the argument that if Mniium L. is a non-existent genus of mosses the species M. fissum and M. trichomanis L. are illusions!) I hereby select Mniium fissum L., Sp. plant. 1114, 1753, as the lectotype of the genus Mniium L.,

* Written during the tenure of NSF Grant G-18759.

1 Whatever plant the author may have had in hand, the name Jungermannia cochleariformis Weiss, Pl. crypt. fl. Gottingensis, p. 123, 1770, is clearly a substitute name for Mniium jungermanniæ L. and must share its (lecto-) type (Art. 7: Note 4), whatever that is going to be. Weiss cited Mniium jungermanniæ L. in synonymy, but the strange and persistent botanical tautonymphobia did not allow him to write Jungermannia jungermannia.
Sp. plant. 1109, 1753. The previous lectotypification of *Mnium* L. with the moss "*Mnium hornum* L." by Andrews (in Grout, Moss flora N. Am. 2: 243, 1940) cannot stand. Andrews proceeded on the basis of a 1753, not 1801, "starting point". However, Prof. van der Wijk (see below) suggests that this lectotypification be accepted for *Mnium* Hedwig.

As matters stand, the well known moss genus *Mnium* Hedwig is a later homonym, and the liverwort genus *Calypogeja* [LT.: *C. fiss* (L.) Raddii, (*Mnium fissum* L.), cf. Evans, Bryologist 10: 24-30, 1907] has to be called *Mnium* L., requiring a wonderful lot of new combinations. It is tempting to let matters be, as a permanent monument to the folly of special dispensations. However, things can be put back on the accustomed keel by a simple conservation procedure.


A further clarifying statement should be incorporated in the Code.

23. Proposed new Note to Art. 13. Add: "A taxon in which were included plants belonging to groups for which different "starting point" dates are decreed in this Article, shall be deemed to have comprised only those components which were priorable at the time of publication according to this Article."

Add example: "The genus *Mnium* L., Sp. plant. 1109, 1753, included at its inception a mixture of species of mosses and of liverworts. As only the latter were priorable at the time, one of them must be selected as the type of the genus."

**SUMMARY**

Two amendments are proposed to Article 13, to clarify problems arising out of the decree of different nomenclatural "starting point" dates for different groups of plants. The name of the moss genus *Mnium* Hedwig is proposed for conservation over *Mnium* L., which is technically the name of a genus of liverworts.

---

**THE PROPOSAL (93) TO CONSERVE PANDANUS L.f.**

Harold St. John (Honolulu)

It was proposed by H. K. Airy Shaw (1962) that *Pandanus* L. f. (1781) be adopted as a nomen conservandum, and that *Keura* Forssk. (1775), and *Athrodactylis* J. R. & G. Forst. (1776) be made nomina generica rejicienda.

The writer is fully in favor of the use of the generic name *Pandanus* for the enormous genus containing the screw pines, and he uses it in his current "Revision of the Genus *Pandanus* Stickman." The first thirteen parts of this monographic study have appeared in Pacific Science, and subsequent parts will be printed quarterly. During the course of this revision the writer has examined the early botanical literature on this genus. He is de-