Nomenclatural observations on the genus “Bryopsidella” (Ulvophyceae, Bryopsidaceae)
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Feldmann (1970: 249), quoting the results of Hustede (1960), who had shown that *Bryopsis halymeniae* Berthold (1882: 497) was the gametophyte of a *Derbesia* sp., pointed out that this species could not belong to the genus *Bryopsis* differing from it in chloroplasts with no pyrenoids and gametes without a stigma. On that basis, as well as because of its peculiar life cycle, he stated that *Bryopsis halymeniae* should be considered the type of a new genus: *Bryopsidella*. Even though Feldmann (1970) did not explicitly propose the new combination *Bryopsidella halymeniae*, such a binomial was reported by Gallardo *et al.* (1993: 412, note 60) and by Boudouresque & Perret-Boudouresque (1987: 83).

The genus *Bryopsidella*, when proposed by Feldmann (1970), was invalid because no diagnosis was provided as required by Art. 38.1 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012). Moreover, it was invalid because the type species is not a validly published name as required by Art. 10.3 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012). In fact, *Bryopsis halymeniae* is invalid because it is accompanied only by habitat and locality information and not by a description or diagnosis, as required by Art. 38.1 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012) (Table 1). Moreover, Art. 38.10 cannot be applied to that species in that no figures were provided by Berthold (1882). The fact that the species was invalid was not recognized in the Index Nominum Algarum [http://ucjeps.berkeley.edu/INA.html] nor in AlgaeBase (Guiry & Guiry, 2014). Conversely, the invalid status of that species name was pointed out by Wynne (2005: 252), who however, attributed *Bryopsis halymeniae* to “Berthold ex Funk (1927: 330, fig. 17f)”. However, Funk gave no diagnosis of that species either in 1927 or in 1955 (Funk 1955: 21 and Pl. II figs 1–3) (Table 1), and figures provided by him are insufficient to validate the species because it was published after 1 January 1908 [see Arts 38.8 and 38.10 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012)]. Therefore, *B. halymeniae* cannot be considered as having been validated by Funk, but remains an invalid name.

The genus *Bryopsidella* was validated by Rietema (1975: 1, footnote) who published the Latin diagnosis of the genus and definitely included its type species, referring to the validly published species *Derbesia neglecta* Berthold (1880: 77) [see Art. 10.3 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012)]. It should be noted that *Bryopsidella* is generally attributed to Feldmann in Rietema [see Index Nominum Algarum and AlgaeBase (Guiry & Guiry 2014)], while Feldmann gave only the permission to Rietema to publish the Latin diagnosis of the genus. Therefore, the author of the genus is only Rietema (or Feldmann ex Rietema) and not Feldmann in Rietema.

Finally, the combination *Bryopsidella neglecta* (Berthold) Rietema (Rietema 1975: 1, footnote) is invalid because it lacks a full and direct reference to the basionym that includes the page on which the basionym was published [see Art. 41.5 of Melbourne Code (McNeill *et al.* 2012)]. Therefore, the following new combination is here proposed:

*Bryopsidella neglecta* (Berthold) G. Furnari et Cormaci, *comb. nov.*
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1. A more complete paper showing that *Derbesia neglecta* and *Bryopsis halymeniae* are phases of one species, was later published by Hustede (1964).
TABLE 1. “Descriptions” of *Bryopsis halymeniae* given by Berthold (1882), Funk (1927) and Funk (1955), and respective English translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Original Language</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funk (1927: 330)</td>
<td>Bildet auf <em>Halymenia floresia</em> und <em>ulvoidea</em> im Hochsommer und Herbst zarte grüne Räschen bildend. Nach Berthold bei Santa Lucia in 7–12 m Tiefe. Ich erhielt sie einmal auf den genannten Halymenien im September 1924 von der Secca di San Giovanni (15–20 m), fruktitierend.</td>
<td>It forms on <em>Halymenia floresia</em> and <em>ulvoidea</em> in high summer and autumn delicate green grass. After Berthold at Santa Lucia in depth 7–12 m. I obtained it once on the mentioned Halymenien in September 1924 from the Secca di San Giovanni (15–20 m), fertile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funk (1955: 21)</td>
<td>Entwickelt sich regelmässig im Sommer auf <em>Halymenia floresia</em>, seltener auf <em>H. ulvoidea</em>, auf denen sie mehr oder weniger dichte Rasen in Höhe von 1–1,5 cm bildet. Sie ist bei Santa Lucia in Tiefen von 10–20 m häufig. Fruktifizierend habe ich sie früher im September gefunden.</td>
<td>Developed on a regular basis in the summer on <em>Halymenia floresia</em>, rarely on <em>H. ulvoidea</em> on which it is more or less dense turf in height of 1–1.5 cm. It is common in Santa Lucia at depths of 10–20 m. I have found them fertile earlier in September</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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