

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Edited by John McNeill

Report of the General Committee: 15

Karen L. Wilson, Secretary

Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust, Mrs Macquaries Road, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia; karen.wilson@rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/655.14>

Summary Decisions are reported on proposals in Reports 65 and 66 from the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP): (1) three proposals in Report 65; (2) 33 proposals to conserve or reject names recommended for acceptance in NCVP Report 66; (3) 17 such proposals recommended for rejection in that Committee Report; (4) five conservation proposals for which the NCVP could not reach a firm recommendation; (5) one request to suppress a work under Art. 34; (6) three requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 (confusingly similar names). Proposal (1933) on the name of the cultivated apple was referred back to the NCVP. Decisions are also reported on proposals in Report 9 of the Nomenclature Committee for Fossils: (1) 17 proposals to conserve or reject names recommended for acceptance; (2) seven such proposals recommended for rejection. Action is deferred on various proposals pending further discussion.

The previous report of the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature was published in *Taxon* 65: 878–879. 2016.

General Committee (GC) membership was 25 at the time that all of these proposals were considered so the super-majority (60%) required to approve or reject a proposal was 15 votes. The voting figures are shown against any proposal where the decision was not unanimous. Committee votes are shown in the order: for the proposal – against the proposal – abstain – more discussion/refer back to the Committee.

1. Proposals from Report 65 from the Nomenclature Committee on Vascular Plants (NCVP) (in *Taxon* 62: 1315–1326. 2013)

Action was taken on three proposals that had not been finalised in time for reporting in GC Report 14.

Proposal (1801) on super-conservation of *Adoxaceae*, nom. cons., was rejected (votes 8–15–2–0). This means that the correct name for the combined family is *Viburnaceae*, nom. cons.

Consideration of Prop. (2090) on the spelling of the generic name *Mezoneuron*/*Mezonevron* was deferred until the outcome of proposals 344–345 by Greuter & Gandhi (in *Taxon* 65: 914–915. 2016) at the next International Botanical Congress is known. These proposals aim to clarify two ambiguities in Art. 60: the spelling of botanical names involving i/j and u/v. Proposal (2121) on conservation of *Brachypterum* was referred back to the NCVP for further consideration.

2. Report 66 from the Nomenclature Committee on Vascular Plants (NCVP) (in *Taxon* 63: 1358–1371. 2014)

The GC agreed unanimously to accept or reject most of the proposals that had been recommended by the NCVP.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(2005) cons. *Convallaria latifolia* Jacq. (24–1–0–0); (2011) cons. *Euphorbia acuta* Engelm.; (2091) cons. *Mascagnia*; (2118) cons. *Torricellia* with that spelling; (2119) cons. *Euphorbia retusa* Forssk.; (2125)

cons. *Dalbergia reticulata*; (2129) cons. *Asphodelaceae*; (2131) rej. *Tulipa praecox*; (2132) rej. *Cereus spinibarbis*; (2133) rej. *Capparis baducca* (typ. cons.) (amended proposal; 24–1–0–0); (2134) cons. *Phymaspermum* (typ. cons.); (2138) cons. *Balanites*, nom. cons. (feminine gender) (23–2–0–0); (2144) cons. *Kumara* (typ. cons.); (2145) rej. *Chamaerops glabra*; (2146) rej. *Sabal blackburnia*; (2148) rej. *Hesperis rupestris*; (2178) rej. *Psammanthe*; (2179) rej. *Antrospermum floribundum*; (2180) rej. *Senecio lanatus*; (2181) rej. *Senecio populi-folius*; (2182) cons. *Alyssum canescens* (typ. cons.); (2199) cons. *Agave ×leopardii*; (2200) cons. *Littaea geminiflora*; (2201) cons. *Chusquea scandens*; (2203) cons. *Monardella* (typ. cons.); (2238) cons. *Phoenix canariensis*; (2239) cons. *Myrobalanus citrina* (typ. cons.); (2240) cons. *Polygala vulgaris* (typ. cons. substit.); (2241) rej. *Aquilicia*; (2256) cons. *Salsola sedoides* Pall.; (2257) cons. *Agave hookeri* Jacobi; (2258) rej. *Cereus heteromorphus*; (2261) rej. *Lavatera micans*.

The following conservation and rejection proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are NOT conserved or rejected as indicated:

(2038) cons. *Malaceae* nom. cons. (“super-conservation” proposal; 1–24–0–0); (2136) rej. *Asperula aristata* subsp. *scabra*; (2137) rej. *Asperula longiflora*; (2147) cons. *Senecio rodriguezii* (4–21–0–0); (2150) cons. *Plantago serpentina* (1–24–0–0); it is suggested that a new proposal be made instead to reject the name *P. strictissima* L. outright [utique]; (2177) rej. *Rhytiglossa glandulosa* (1–24–0–0); (2202) cons. *Deiregyne* (1–24–0–0); (2204) cons. *Pedicularis stenocorys* (4–21–0–0); (2205) cons. *Pterygiella cylindrica* (4–21–0–0); (2206) cons. *Fontenellea brasiliensis* (4–21–0–0); (2207) cons. *Margaritopsis*; (2255) cons. *Cyathea mucilagina*; (2259) cons. *Pennisetum clandestinum* (the GC agreed with the NCVP that conservation is not necessary because taxonomic experts in the group agree that these names represent two different species); (2260) cons. *Piresia*; (2262) cons. *Microstylis koordersii* (3–22–0–0); (2263) rej. *Eriogonum* sect. *Heterosepala*; (2264) cons. *Eriogonum microthecum* Nutt.

Prop. (1933) on the name of the cultivated apple is referred back to the NCVP for further consideration.

Five proposals were reported without recommendation by the NCVP after two rounds of inconclusive voting. The GC voted to approve them all: (2018) cons. *Carex fracta* Mack. (20–3–2–0); (2045) cons. *Selaginella densa* Rydb. (18–5–2–0); (2046) cons. *Celtis glabrata* Steven ex Planch. (20–2–3–0); (2054) cons. *Drynaria* (23–1–0); (2135) cons. *Siphonandra* Klotzsch (20–4–1–0).

Proposal to suppress a work (Art. 34)

The GC approved (23–0–0–2) proposal [4] to add Steinwehr's translations in Königl. Akad. Wiss. Paris Phys. Abh. 5–9. 1754–1760 to Appendix VI of the *Code*. Conservation proposals (1839–1842) for several currently used names that are affected by this suppression are being considered by the NCVP. It should be noted that the *Code* recommends (Rec. 14A) maintaining existing usage of names until such proposals have been dealt with by the GC.

Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 on confusable names

(7) *Huberia* (*Melastomataceae*) and *Hubera* (*Annonaceae*) are ruled (20–5–0–0) as being confusingly similar, i.e., the names are regarded as likely to be confused and therefore are to be treated as homonyms.

(8) *Uvaria scheffleri* and *U. schefferi* are ruled (unanimously) as not being sufficiently alike to be confused.

(9) *Carex scirpoidea* and *C. scirpoides* are ruled (19–6–0–0) as being sufficiently alike to be confused, i.e., they are to be treated as homonyms. This decision confirms *Carex interior* as the correct name for the taxon originally named *C. scirpoides* so no vote was needed on Prop. (2130).

3. Report 9 from the Nomenclature Committee on Fossils (NCFoss) (in Taxon 64: 1306–1312. 2015)

The GC agreed unanimously to accept or reject most of the proposals that had been recommended by the NCFoss.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names

are conserved or rejected as indicated. Names for which authorship is included involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(2077) cons. *Lepidopteris*; (2078) cons. *Angaropteridium*; (2094) rej. *Filicites*; (2127) cons. *Sphenozamites*; (2151) cons. *Marattiopsis* (typ. cons.); (2174) cons. *Verrucosiporites*; (2183) cons. *Equisetites* (typ. cons.); (2184) cons. *Equisetum columnare* (typ. cons.); (2185) cons. *Lepidophloios*; (2186) cons. *Coniopteris*; (2187) cons. *Beania*; (2188) cons. *Beania gracilis*; (2189) cons. *Pityostrobus*; (2190) cons. *Juglandicarya* (typ. cons.). (2192) rej. *Solenostrobus*; (2193) rej. *Frenelites*. Also, Prop. (2083) to change authorship of *Calamites*, nom. cons., in Appendix III and delete *Calamitis*, orth. var., is approved.

The following conservation proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names are NOT conserved as indicated: (1996) cons. *Carpolithus* with that spelling; (2027) cons. *Cheirolepidae*; (2092) cons. *Cyclodendron*; (2093) cons. *Pecopteris*; (2099) cons. *Bucklandia* Brongn.; (2191) cons. *Crowella* (2–23–0–0). Proposal (2125) to conserve *Dalbergia reticulata* was not recommended by the NCFoss but that recommendation was reversed after discussion with the NCVP and the GC (see above under NCVP Report 66).

The GC rejected (4–21–0–0) prop. (1995) to conserve *Nilssonia* with that spelling as being unnecessary. The committee regards the original spelling as an orthographic error, to be corrected to *Nilssonia*, making the proposal unnecessary.

Action is deferred (i) on proposals (2095, 2096) and (2097, 2098) pending recommendations from the NCVP and the NC Algae respectively, and (ii) on proposals (2152–2173) pending the outcome of proposals (087–090) to amend the *Code* with respect to hyphenated names.