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THE RELATION OF ARTS. 41 & 42 (1966) TO THE PALAEOBOTANICAL ARTS.
P 3 & 6 (1952)

Article PB 3 (1952), says: "From 1 Jan. 1953 the name of a genus or of a taxon of
higher rank is not validly published unless it is accompanied by a description of the
taxon or by a reference to a previously and effectively published description of it
(see Art. 48)." Because this Article is still in effect today, genera of fossil plants
published before 1 Jan. 1953 may be considered as validly published even if the name
of the genus is not accompanied by a generic description or diagnosis or by a reference
to a previously published description or diagnosis. The conditions of Art. PB 3 are
fulfilled if genera published before 1 Jan. 1953 contain one or more well described
species, whether these species are new or already known.

Articles 41 and 42 of the ICBN 1966 can apply, therefore, only to those genera of
fossil plants published later than 1 Jan. 1953. Art. 41 does not mention this in a note,
as Art. 42 does, but the meaning is clear enough.

Art. PB 3 was adopted by the Seventh Botanical Congress in Stockholm in July 1950,
with my cooperation. At that time there existed many form genera having no descrip-
tion. We were forced to accept the validity of these taxa because of the state of palaeo-
botany at that time. Therefore 1 Jan. 1953 was adopted as the starting point of Art.
PB 3. At the end of this article, published in 1954, there is the notation "see Art. 48."
This shows that the date cited in Art. PB 3 (for fossil plants) is the only difference
between it and Art. 48 (for recent plants). PB 3 would not have been necessary except
for that date. Once more we see that Art. 48 (that is, the later Art. 41 (1966)) was not
effective for fossil plants before 1 Jan. 1953.

Indeed, before 1953 the palaeobotanical literature contains examples of genera without
a description or with an insufficient one, this fault being only later corrected. PB 3
at this time said clearly enough that a description of these genera was necessary only
from 1 Jan. 1953 on.

In a paper concerning the treatment of the sporae dispersae (Potonié, April 1956, p. 75)
I mentioned article PB 3 (1952) and stated: "Consequently in Palaeobotany these
regulations are valid only since Jan. 1, 1953. Hence it was an error to use them for
genera published before this date, as Pflug (in Thomson & Pflug 1953) has done.
Such genera remain valid to a great extent." "Pflug has rejected older genera because
they had no description. This was inadmissible on account of PB 3." The same applies
to the paper of Pocock, Dec. 1968, S. 639, on Zonalapollenites. We must remember
that not all the articles included in the International Code of 1966 are retroactive.
This is the case also with regard to Article 42 (1981 & 1966). Here it has not been
forgotten to transfer the date cited in PB 6 (1952). That means that the name of a
monotypic genus of fossil plants must be accompanied by a description or diagnosis
of the genus only if it was published on or after 1 Jan. 1953.

A descriptio generico-specifica is no longer valid for fossil plants after 1 Jan. 1953.
From that time until December 1966 Article 42 further specified that the name of a
monotypic genus of fossil plants must be accompanied by a description of the genus
indicating its difference from other genera. This last passus was withdrawn in December
1966; therefore monotypic genera without indication of difference unfortunately are
invalid if they were published between 1 Jan. 1953 and Dec. 1966.
The validity of many genera has been ascertained since the publication of PB 3 according to this article.

The priorities resulting from PB 3 are now in force. Starting points once established by dates, and accepted for some time, can not later be crossed off. If in our case this has been done erroneously, I am an accomplice, because I am a member of the Committee for Fossil Plants.

Proposal. Note to be added to Art. 41. This article applies to fossil plants only for names published after 1 January 1953.

R. Potonié,
Geologisches Landesamt, Krefeld, Germany.

**PTERYGOPHYLLUM BRID. IS A GOOD NAME**

*Pterygophyllum* Bridel 1819 is listed in Index Muscorum as an illegitimate name, apparently under Article 63 of the Code as nomenclaturally superfluous for *Hookeria* Smith 1808.

In as much as Bridel's original description begins:


this would seem at first glance to have been Bridel's intent even though only four of Bridel's 15 species are common with Smith's seven species. Neither generic concept, as exemplified by the species comprising it, could have been considered homogeneous by today's standards. But, Bridel's assemblage includes only Hookeriales as against Smith's list which included species now placed in *Camptochaete* and *Homalioidendron* in the Isotryales Neckerineae, and *Hypnum* in the Hypnobrales. In essence, Bridel eliminated these discordant elements from his "Pterigophyllum" and the discordant elements could be considered to have been left in Smith's *Hookeria*. Were it not for the conservation of *Hookeria* with *H. lucens* as the type, thus avoiding the matter of "residues," the genus now called *Homalioidendron* could have been *Hookeria*. In any event, it is clear that the entry in the Index Muscorum, "*PTERYGOPHYLLUM* Brid., *Mant. Musc.* 149. 1819 ["Pterigophyllum"] nom. illeg. incl. gen. prior. [Hookeria Sm., 1808] = *HOOKERIA* Sm. nom. cons.", does not completely cover the situation.

My first reaction to such an entry was to create a new name for *Pterygophyllum* Brotherus 1907 and to manufacture a series of new combinations — all of which could be accomplished very neatly from the Index Muscorum by flipping a few pages. However, I was reluctant to shelf an appropriate name of long standing and looked further. *Pterygophyllum*, the spelling corrected by Bridel himself in the *Bryologia Universa*, is a valid name and probably would have been recognized as such in the Index Muscorum except for the erroneous citation of the type species.

It is clear from the composition of *Pterygophyllum* at the time of its description that it applied to *Hookeria* Smith only in part. Thus, "incl. gen. prior." is not totally true and the case for applying Article 63 is lost. That later action resulted in selection of a *Pterygophyllum sensu* Bridel as the type for *Hookeria* by conservation does not in itself negate the validity of *Pterygophyllum*.

The key to the problem is found in the only species not transferred out of the genus, i.e., *Pterygophyllum quadrifarium*, which is fortunately the type of the genus. A citation given in several earlier sources and picked up in the Index Muscorum as (P) "*quadrifarium* Sm. Brid., *Bryol. Univ.* 2: 1827 (*Hookeria*, 1808)," is erroneous. Bridel clearly included this species among those originally listed in 1819 as "12. *P. quadrifarium*. (Smith.) *foliis quadrifariis obovatis, subintegerrimus ruptinervibus intermediis utrimque brevioribus appressis.* *Smith in Act. Soc. Linn.* *Lond.* 9. p. 277 sub *Hookeria Leskea quadrifaria.* Schwagr. *Suppl.* I.P. II. p. 160.*"

Somehow species 667 on page 151 of the *Muscologiae Recentiorum* Supplementum Pars 4... (= *Mant. Musc.*) of 1819 just quoted has been overlooked. The oversight...