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SALPINGOECa AMmULLOIDEs, NOM. NOv. (CHRYSOPHYCEAE)

Denise de C. Bicudo and Carlos E. de M. Bicudo


Since it has come to our knowledge that the name Salpingoeca ampullacea published by us is a later homonym of Salpingoeca ampullacea Stein (“Der Organismus der Flagellaten nach eigenen Forschungen in systematischer Reihenfolge bearbeitet,” vol. 3, part 1, p. 154, pl. 11, figs. 6-7. 1878), it is illegitimate and must be rejected (International Code of Botanical Nomenclature, Art. 64.1).

Thus, we hereby propose the name Salpingoeca ampulloides D. Bic. & C. Bic., nom. nov. to replace Salpingoeca ampullacea D. Bic. & C. Bic. The diagnosis remains unchanged.

THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE TYPE OF HYPOGLOSSUM KÜTZING (DELESSERIACEAE, RHODOPHYTA)

Michael J. Wynne

The recent use of the binomial Hypoglossum hypoglossoides (Harv.) Womersley et Shepley (1982) caused me to notice an earlier use of this combination by Collins and Hervey (1917). In checking the current status of the earlier name it became apparent that the correct name for the type of Hypoglossum (Delesseriaceae, Ceramiales) is H. hypoglossoides (Stackh.) Coll. et Herv., including the currently accepted H. woodwardii Kütz.

Hypoglossum was established by Kützing (1843: 444, pl. 65, I) and was based on Fucus hypoglossum Woodward (1794). Kützing substituted the epithet woodwardii to avoid a tautonym, and this combination has been used over the ensuing years as the name of the type (Kylin, 1923, 1924, 1956; Womersley and Shepley, 1982). Stackhouse (1801) described an alga, Fucus hypoglossoides, which was placed close to Woodward’s species but differed allegedly on its lacking the “double fructification” of the earlier species. Woodward (1794) had observed dimorphic reproductive plants and described the species as dioecious; it is readily evident that he confused the cystocarpic plants as male plants and the tetrasporic plants as female plants. Stackhouse also noted that the blades of his species had a reticulate, hexagonal appearance, a feature not referred to in Woodward’s description of Fucus hypoglossum. Turner (1802, 1808) pointed out that the reticulate appearance was not restricted to Stackhouse’s “Cornish variety” but also characteristic of F. hypoglossum, and he placed the Stackhouse species in synonymy with the Woodward species, a practice also followed by others, e.g., Agardh (1822), Greville (1830), Harvey (1871), De Toni (1900), and Praeda (1909).

Lamouroux (1813) included the Woodward species in his new genus Delesseria. Harvey (1853) recorded both D. hypoglossa and his new species D. tenuifolia from North America. Collins and Hervey (1917) recognized that the Stackhouse name antedated the Kützing epithet and thus applied the name Hypoglossum hypoglossoides to a species occurring in Bermuda which they assumed was...
the same as that in European waters. Later workers (Børgesen, 1919; Taylor, 1960) regarded the Caribbean alga as distinct from the European type.

Dixon (1962) has called attention to the fact that he discovered a large number of Stackhouse specimens housed in the Lamouroux Herbarium in the Institut Botanique, Caen. Dixon also emphasized that typification of Stackhouse taxa must be undertaken with extreme caution. At my request Professor Paulette Gayral, Université de Caen, has looked for the presence of any Stackhouse material corresponding to his Fucus hypoglossoides. She located and sent a photograph of a specimen labelled "F. hyppoglos in fruit. Pridmouth July." Although not signed by Stackhouse, the handwriting has been verified by Dr. F. A. Turk, Extra-Mural Research Fellow of the University of Exeter, to be that of Stackhouse. I hereby designate it as the lectotype of Fucus hypoglossoides (Stackh.) Coll. et Herv.

Fucus hypoglossurn Woodward and its replacement name, Hypoglossurn woodwardii, representing the type specimen of Hypoglossurn under Art. 10.2 (Sydney Code), now fall into taxonomic synonymy. The taxonomically correct name is Hypoglossurn heterocystideurn (Stackh.) Coll. et Herv.

In their study of southern Australian species of Hypoglossurn, Womersley and Shepley (1982) determined that the type specimen of Delesseria spathulata Sonder (1845), which had been thought to represent a Hypoglossurn (Agardh, 1898), was in reality an Apoglossurn and an earlier name for the alga being called Apoglossurn tasmanicum (F. von Muell. in Harv.). J. Ag. Womersley and Shepley proceeded to select the oldest available name for what had been called H. spathulatum, which was Delesseria hypoglossoides Harvey (1855). They also listed several species in its synonymy: H. heterocystideurn (J. Ag.) J. Ag.; H. undulatum (J. Ag.) J. Ag.; H. marginatum J. Ag. Since H. hypoglossoides (Harv.) Womers. et Shepl. is a later homonym of H. hypoglossoides (Stackh.) Coll. et Herv., it is necessary to use Hypoglossurn heterocystideurn, the oldest available name, for this southern Australian species.

I am grateful to Prof. P. Gayral and Dr. F. A. Turk for their assistance.
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ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF GOTTSCHEA NEES EX MONT.
1843 (SCHISTOCHILACEAE, JUNGERMANNIALES)

Rielef Grolle1 and Gea Zijlstra2

Summary

Gottschea Nees ex Mont. 1843 has been published without generic description. It is valid there by indirect reference to Jungermannia sect. Nemorosae [subsect.] Aligerae Reinw. et al. 1824 only. The type of both is J. aligera Nees et Blume (Art. 22.4). Schistochilaster H. Miller 1970 is a nomenclatural synonym and Paraschistochila Schust. 1963 and Tegulfolium Hässel 1973 are taxonomic ones. 18 new combinations are proposed under Gottschea.

Schistochila Dum. 1835 s. amplo has recently been split into several genera (Schuster, 1963; Miller, 1970; Hässel de Menendez, 1973; Schuster and Engel, 1982). This raised the question, whether the synonyms of Schistochila s. amplo have to be kept as those of Schistochila s. str. as well.

Following Miller’s 1970 nomenclatural treatment of Gottschea Nees ex Mont. 1843, Schuster (1971, p. 625 [footnote]) concluded that “there is no Schistochila-Gottschea problem concerning nomenclature.”

A recent checking of the protologue of Gottschea in Montagne (1843) revealed however that Miller’s 1970 typification of Gottschea Nees ex Mont. 1843 is untenable. The reasons are the following:

Montagne (1843) described three new species of Gottschea, and mentioned three further species. The study of the fructification of G. neesii made him conclude that the hepatics of the “section Aligerae” should be considered as a genus of its own. He wrote this to Nees, who answered him that he had come to the same conclusions, and was publishing this now as the n.g. Gottschea in the first fascicle of the ‘Synopsis Hepaticarum’ (which appeared in 1844). Montagne did not provide a generic diagnosis, but Gottschea is validly published by him, by his indirect reference to the “section Aligerae.” Hence J. aligera, the type of the Aligerae, is the type of Gottschea (Art. 22.4).

With Jungermannia aligera Nees et Blume as the type of Gottschea Nees ex Mont. 1843, this generic name has to replace Paraschistochila Schust. 1963 following the taxonomic concept advocated by Schuster (1971) and Schuster and Engel (1977). Unfortunately, 18 new combinations are required. The name commemorates, however, C. M. Gottsche (1808–1892), an eminent expert of hepatics in the past century and physician to the poor in Hamburg.
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