REVIEWS


The Spanish Bryological Society (SEB) has published the first two of 14 projected fascicles of the bryophyte flora of the Iberian Peninsula. Fourteen bryologists form the editorial board of the Flora chaired by J. Guerra and R. M. Cros. Each of these two fascicles has the usual format of conventional modern floras, where the generic diagnosis, a key to the species, and species descriptions are presented with bibliographic references, synonymy, basionyms, ecological preferences, and short discussions on the peculiarities of each taxon. In agreement with the instructions to authors, the flora only cites the peninsular range followed by a short list of selected specimens studied. Line drawings by S. Gallego, depicting the salient features of specific and subspecific taxa, supplement the descriptions.

The Iberian flora is an important effort to present an up-to-date treatment of the peninsular bryophytes. To my knowledge, the last inclusive floristic works were those of Cásares-Gil in 1919 (liverworts) and 1932 (mosses). Since then, numerous publications on the peninsular bryophytes have appeared, but none on the entire peninsular states and territories (i.e., Andorra, Balearic Islands, Gibraltar, Portugal, and Spain). The Canary Islands are not included in the present study. The treatments show the combined effort of long-established bryologists and younger professionals; taxonomic concepts in the two published fascicles of the flora are nearly always those in recent monographs by foreign as well as by local bryologists. The treatments in Fascicle 1 were prepared by J. Guerra and edited by M. J. Cano and R. M. Ros, while those in fascicle 3 were written by M. T. Gallego and edited by Cano, Ros, and Guerra.

The descriptions are well written in concise (Spanish) language. The terminology follows that of standard glossaries, but the use of “filidio,” “nervio,” and “caudículo,” although acceptable, is somewhat awkward for those used to reading about the leaf, costa, and stem of bryophytes. The use of the equivalent terms for “upper,” “basal,” “ventral,” and others, is inadequate and may be changed to “distal,” “proximal,” “adaxial,” etc. Also, the citation of type specimen data is limited to the geographical information and herbarium. It is not established why Trichostomum triumphans De Not. and Syntrichia montana Nees are retained in lieu of Weissia triumphans (De Not.) M. O. Hill and Tortula intermedia (Br.) De Not., respectively, that have been accepted by various specialists.

Beyond these details, each issue of Flora Briofítica Iberica should be numbered and identified; a statement on the taxa to be treated, the system of classification, and the production schedule is desirable. The reader should be aware of the web site of the Spanish Bryological Society (http://www.uam.es/informacion/asiaciones/SEB/) where the sequence of production is provided for the genera of Pottiaceae, Sphagnales, Andreaeales, and Encalyptaceae. The two published fascicles are printed on good quality paper with elegant orange and white covers, but the price may be rather high if one waits for the fascicles to pile up.—CLAUDIO DELGADILLO M., Instituto de Biología, UNAM, Apartado Postal 70-233, Ciudad Universitaria, Delegación Coyoacán, 04510 México, D. F. México.