

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Edited by John McNeill

Report of the General Committee: 14

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/10.12705/654.15>

Summary Decisions are reported on: (1) 35 proposals to conserve and reject names recommended for acceptance in the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) Report 65 and one proposal from Report 64; (2) 11 such proposals recommended for rejection in those Committee Reports; (3) one proposal was referred back to the NCVP for further consideration; (4) two conservation proposals for which the NCVP could not reach a firm recommendation; and (5) three recommendations from the NCVP on requests for binding decisions, one under Art. 38.4 (adequate description) and two under Art. 53.5 (confusingly similar names).

The previous report of the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature was published in May 2016 (Taxon 65: 380–381).

We note with great sadness the death in early June of Dr. Dan Nicolson, who was a leading figure in nomenclatural matters for over four decades. He was a valued member of this Committee from 1981, Secretary 1987–2001, and Chair 2005–2010. He shared his extensive nomenclatural expertise freely with everyone, but he will be remembered just as much for his friendly disposition.

General Committee membership stood at 22 until the recent co-optation of Valéry Malécot (France), John Wiersema (U.S.A.) and David Williams (U.K.) until the end of the present committee's term at the IBC in Shenzhen in July 2017.

1. Prop. (1978) from Report 64 from the Nomenclature Committee on Vascular Plants (NCVP) (Taxon 61: 1108–1117. 2012)

Proposal (1978) to reject *Corispermum orientale* was inadvertently left out of the previous General Committee ballot. Membership was 22 at the time this proposal was considered, so the supermajority (60%) required to approve or reject the proposal was 14. It was approved unanimously, i.e., the name is rejected.

2. Report 65 and Prop. (1802) in Report 66 from the Nomenclature Committee on Vascular Plants (NCVP) (in Taxon 62: 1315–1326. 2013 and Taxon 63: 1358–1371. 2014)

General Committee membership was 22 at the time Report 65 and Prop. 1802 were considered, so the super-majority (60%) required to approve or reject proposals was 14. The General Committee agreed unanimously to accept or reject most of the proposals that had been recommended by the NCVP. The voting figures are shown against any proposal where they differed from these general voting figures. Committee votes are shown in the order: Votes for the proposal – Against the proposal – Abstain – More discussion/refer back to 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 included involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(1800) cons. *Viburnaceae* (18–3–0–1); (1905) cons. *Ageratum conyzoides* (typ. cons.); (1964) cons. *Cacalia* sect. *Cissampelopsis* (typ. cons.); (2023) rej. *Erndlia subpersonata* [the name, being unwanted and of uncertain application, is rejected utique]; (2047) cons. *Geranium pyrenaicum* (typ. cons.); (2048) rej. *Oisodix fulva*; (2055) rej. *Potamogeton dimorphus*; (2056) cons. *Myosotis sicula*; (2057) cons. *Maytenus ilicifolia* Mart. ex Reissek; (2058) rej. *Alyssum fischerianum*; (2059) cons. *Glycyrrhiza inflata*; (2060) cons. *Macrolobium grandiflorum*; (2061) cons. *Meconopsis* (typ. cons.); (2062) cons. *Polygala longicaulis*; (2063) rej. *Spermacoce strigosa*; (2064) rej. *Spermacoce hyssopifolia* Sm.; (2065) cons. *Spermacoce hyssopifolia* Willd. ex Roem. & Schult.; (2074) cons. *Hoya mitrata*; (2075) rej. *Cactus coquimbicus*; (2076) cons. *Ipomoea semisagitta* (typ. cons.); (2080) cons. *Ornithogalum narbonense* (typ. cons.); (2081) cons. *Glycine floribunda* (typ. cons.); (2082) rej. *Eriogonum cordatum*; (2088) rej. *Potamogeton petiolaris*; (2089) cons. *Hedysarum incanum* Sw.; (2102) rej. *Pinus californiana*; (2103) rej. *Pinus adunca*; (2104) cons. *Carex norvegica* (typ. cons.); (2105) cons. *Bambusa bac-cifera* (typ. cons.); (2106) cons. *Calamus latifolius* (typ. cons.); (2107) rej. *Gomphrena polygonoides*; (2112) rej. *Sisymbrium lineare*; (2113) cons. *Eucalyptus populnea* (typ. cons.); (2120) rej. *Laurus nitida*; (2122) cons. *Dunbaria* (typ. cons.); (2126) cons. *Ficus insipida* (typ. cons.) (21–1–0–0).

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

(1887) cons. *Prunus virginiana* (typ. cons.) (not considered necessary); (2079) cons. *Carex foliosa* D. Don; (2109) rej. *Blainvillea rhomboidea*; (2110) rej. *Verbesina dichotoma*; (2111) cons. *Inula* (typ. cons.); (2114) rej. *Hexasepalum*; (2115) rej. *Hexasepalum angustifolium*; (2116) cons. *Xiphion vulgare*; (2117) cons. *Pabstiella*; (2123) cons. *Cytisus podolicus*; (2124) cons. *Cytisus blockianus* (21–1–0–0).

The General Committee did not accept (votes 0–0–8–14) the recommendation of the NCVP on proposal (2030) to conserve *Solanum torvum*. It is referred back for further consideration by the NCVP. The Report of the NCVP stated: “Swartz gave most species in his *Prodromus* numbers that matched their numbers in the 14th edition of Linnaeus's *Systema Vegetabilium* or indicated where they would be placed in that series. *Solanum torvum* was numbered 26–27, indicating that it was to be inserted between the species numbered 26 and 27, whereas *S. indicum*'s number was 32.” In light of the statement in the proposal that there is no internal evidence in Swartz's *Prodromus*

(1788) that this is what 26–27 meant, the proposal is referred back to the NCVP to provide evidence on Swartz’s meaning.

Two proposals – (1801) to “superconserve” *Adoxaceae* against *Viburnaceae* and (1802) to conserve *Sambucaceae* – were reported without recommendation by the NCVP after two rounds of inconclusive voting. The General Committee’s vote (9–11–1–1) on (1801) failed to reach a super-majority, so this proposal is still being discussed. The General Committee voted (1–19–1–1) not to conserve *Sambucaceae* (1802).

**Request for binding decision under Art. 38.4
on adequacy of a description**

(2) The descriptive statement accompanying the name *Laurus porrecta* was considered by the NCVP to be inadequate to regard

the name as validly published. The General Committee agreed (2–20–0–0) that this was not a validly published name.

**Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5
on confusable names**

(1) *Ferdinanda* Lag. (*Compositae*) and *Ferdinanda* Pohl (*Rubiaceae*) are ruled (21–0–1–0) as confusingly similar, i.e., the names are regarded as likely to be confused and therefore are to be treated as homonyms.

(6) *Lerouxia* Mérat (*Primulaceae*) and *Lerouxia* Caball. (*Plumbaginaceae*) are also ruled (21–1–0–0) as confusingly similar and to be treated as homonyms.