

## NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Edited by John McNeill

### Report of the General Committee: 18

Karen L. Wilson, Secretary

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

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/663.15>

**Summary** Decisions are reported on proposals and requests in Reports 15 and 17 of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae, Report 69 from the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants, Reports 20 and 21 from the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi, plus an old proposal (1193) from the then Committee for Spermatophyta. The first six lists of fungal names authorized under Art. 14.13 from fungal working groups are approved, as are two additions to the list of institutional votes for the Nomenclature Section of the XIX IBC.

The previous report (17) of the General Committee for Nomenclature was published in *Taxon* 66: 478–480. 2017.

General Committee (GC) membership was 25 at the time that the following proposals and requests were considered. Two members failed to vote so all voting figures total 23 votes, but the super-majority required to approve or reject remains at 15 votes (60% of the full membership). Committee voting figures are shown against proposals in the order: For the proposal – Against the proposal – Abstain – More discussion/refer back to the relevant Committee. Voting results were (22–0–1–0) unless a different set of figures is shown.

Where proposals involved names for organisms from more than one of the major groups, all relevant Nomenclature Committees (NCs) have considered them. The GC agreed with nearly all recommendations of the NCs; 9 proposals and 6 requests came without a recommendation. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

#### 1. Nomenclature Committee for Algae (NCA) Report 15 (Taxon 66: 191–192. 2017)

##### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCA, i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated:

(2194) cons. *Gloeobacter violaceus*; (2195) cons. *Gloeotheca* (typ. cons.); (2303) cons. *Chara hispida* (typ. cons.); (2340) rej. *Jania verrucosa*; (2382) cons. *Scrippsiella*; (2383) rej. *Goniodomataceae*.

The GC agrees with the NCA that *Scrippsiella* should be conserved. However, the NCA would appear to have erred in its comments on validity and authorship. For a taxon originally described under another *Code* but now regarded as belonging to the algae or fungi, Art. 45.1 states that internal evidence is used when determining under which *Code* a name was originally published, “irrespective of any claim by the author as to the group of organisms to which the taxon is assigned”. In Prop. (2382) (Gottschling & Elbrächter in *Taxon* 64: 1051–1052. 2015), the name *Scrippsiella* Balech is regarded as validly published under the *ICZN* as a dinoflagellate. Balech (in *Biol. Bull. Mar. Biol. Lab. Woods Hole* 116: 195–205. 1959) used that term throughout the paper, despite also referring to the taxon as belonging to the (algal) family *Peridiniaceae*. Although Balech did not specify the *Code* that he was following, such internal evidence suggests that the correct author citation should be just “Balech”.

The following proposal under Art. 56 is declined, as recommended by the NCA, i.e., the name is NOT rejected: (2302) rej. *Gonyaulax catenella* (1–21–1–0).

Proposals (2273) to conserve *Gelidium bipectinatum* and (2365) to conserve *Cyanospira* are still being discussed.

#### Request for a binding decision under Art. 53.5 on potentially confusable names

The GC voted (3–19–1–0) that (25) *Geisleria* Nitschke (*Ascomycota: Strigulaceae*) and *Geissleria* Lange-Bert. & Metzeltin (*Bacillariophyceae: Naviculaceae*) are not sufficiently alike to be confused, as recommended by the NCA (the NCFung did not reach a majority recommendation).

#### 2. Nomenclature Committee for Algae Report 17 (Taxon 66: 481–482. 2017)

##### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCA (as well as the NCFoss for (2097) and the NCFung for (2393)), i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated:

(2097) cons. *Vertebraria* Royle ex McCoy; (2393) cons. *Catenaria* Sorokin (with changed type citation); (2464) cons. *Trichomonas* with that spelling.

Proposal (2440) to conserve *Lagerheimia* (De Toni) Chodat and the related request for a binding decision (43) on whether *Lagerheima* Sacc. (*Fungi, Ascomycota, Helotiaceae*) and *Lagerheimia* (De Toni) Chodat (*Algae, Chlorophyta, Oocystaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused are still being considered.

#### 3. Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) Report 69 (Taxon 66: 500–513. 2017)

##### 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:

(1722) cons. *Carex rostrata* (typ. cons.); (1933) cons. *Malus domestica* against *M. pumila*, *M. communis*, *M. frutescens*, and *Pyrus dioica* plus *P. praecox*, *M. dasyphylla*, and *M. paradisiaca* (17–6–0–0); (1979) cons. *Odontarrhena obovata*; (2121) cons. *Brachypterum* (21–1–1–0); (2360) rej. *Chenopodium caudatum*; (2373) cons. *Casearia*; (2421) cons. *Forsteronia* (typ. cons.); (2422) cons. *Pinochia*; (2426) cons. *Drynaria fortunei* (typ. cons.); (2427) cons. *Stellaria* (typ. cons.); (2429) cons. *Acalypha communis*; (2430) cons. *Acalypha brasiliensis*; (2431) cons. *Astragalus membranaceus* Fisch. ex Bunge; (2432) cons. *Hymenaea stigonocarpa* (typ. cons.); (2433)

cons. *Chalcas paniculata* (typ. cons.); (2434) cons. *Ioichroma*, nom. cons., against additional names *Acnistus* and *Pederlea*; (2435) cons. *Selinum microphyllum* (typ. cons.); (2443) change author, place and date of publication of *Actinidiaceae*, nom. cons. (18–4–1–0); (2444) change place and date of publication of *Eucommiaceae*, nom. cons. (18–4–1–0); (2445) change author, amended place and amended date of publication of *Lardizabalaceae*, nom. cons. (18–4–1–0); (2446) change author, place and date of publication of *Melanthiaceae*, nom. cons. (18–4–1–0); (2447) change author, place and date of publication of *Primulaceae*, nom. cons. (18–4–1–0); (2455) cons. *Andropogon caricoides* (typ. cons.); (2456) rej. *Crocus purpureus*; (2458) rej. *Corylus virginiana*; (2460) cons. *Selenia* Nutt. (recommended by both NCVP and NCB); (2462) cons. *Miconia*, nom. cons., against additional names *Maieta* and *Tococa*; (2470) rej. *Aloe obscura*; (2471) rej. *Aloe picta*; (2472) rej. *Aloe perfoliata* var. *saponaria*; (2473) cons. *Sobralia infundibuligera*; (2474) rej. *Aristolochia cordata*; (2476) rej. *Cereus subrepandus*; (2477) rej. *Cereus cubensis*.

Prop. (2095) to conserve *Scytophyllum* Bornem. was accepted, as recommended by both the NCVP and NCFoss. The associated Prop. (2096) to conserve *Scytophyllum bergeri* (typ. cons.) was also accepted, as recommended by the NCFoss (Taxon 64: 1306–1312. 2015).

Prop. (2460) to conserve *Selenia* Nutt. was accepted, as recommended by both the NCVP and NCB (Klazenga in Taxon 66: 746. 2017).

The following conservation and rejection proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are NOT conserved or rejected as indicated: (1969) [mis-numbered 1947 in Taxon] cons. *Trisetum* (1–20–1–1); (2371) cons. *Dalbergia polyphylla* Benth. (0–22–1–0); (2428) cons. *Drosera ×beleziana* (typ. cons.) (5–18–0–0); (2459) cons. *Macrocladum trilobum* with that spelling (0–22–1–0); (2469) rej. *Aloe perfoliata* (2–20–1–0).

The following proposals came without recommendation from the NCVP after two ballots but are accepted by the GC: (1841) cons. *Rhaponticum* (typ. cons.) (18–4–1–0); (1842) cons. *Rhaponticoides* Vaill. (17–5–1–0); (2399) cons. *Aloe parvibracteata* (18–5–0–0).

Prop. (2370) to conserve *Salvia cruikshanksii* with that spelling of the epithet was rejected as not necessary (0–22–1–0); the GC regards this as an orthographic error to be corrected to “*cruickshanksii*” since the person’s surname was Cruickshanks. The GC voted (19–3–1–0) to suggest this to the Editorial Committee as a suitable example (non-voted) to add after Art. 60.1.

Proposals (2385) and (2386) are different ways to deal with the application of the name *Pteris semipinnata*. The GC is still considering these proposals along with proposals (2387) *Dyschoriste humilis* and (2461) ×*Laburnocytisus*, and has deferred action on (2404) *Alyssum hyperboreum*, (2457) ×*Brassolaeliocattleya* and (2478) *Myriophyllum spicatum* until after the XIX IBC.

#### Proposals to suppress works (Art. 34)

The following three proposals to add publications to the list in the Code Appendix VI of “Suppressed Works” are approved: (19) Dochnahl, F.J. 1855–1860. Der sichere Führer in der Obstkunde vol. 1–4 [Genera and species]; (22) Miller, P. 1754. The gardeners dictionary, abridged edition 4. London (TL-2 No. 6056) [Species and infra-specific taxa] (20–1–2–0); (25) Glaziou, A.F.M. 1905–1913. Plantae Brasiliae centralis a Glaziou lectae. Mém. Soc. Bot. France 1(3): 1–661. (TL-2 No. 2030) [All ranks].

#### Requests for binding decisions under Art. 38.4 on adequacy of descriptive statements

The following names are ruled as having adequate descriptive statements (they came without any recommendation from the NCVP), i.e., the names are validly published: (34) *Erica longipedunculata* G. Lodd. (19–3–1–0); (36) *Goodyera tessellata* G. Lodd. (15–7–1–0).

The following names are ruled as lacking adequate descriptive statements, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are NOT validly published: (35) *Euonymus bullatus* Wall. ex G. Lodd. (4–18–1–0); (45) *Thea piquetiana* Laness (1–21–1–0).

The GC are still considering (40) *Pittosporum angustifolium* and (41) *Tillandsia amoena*.

#### Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 on potentially confusable names

The following names are ruled as being sufficiently similar to be confused, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., they are to be treated as homonyms: (10) *Andinia* and *Andina* (19–3–1–0).

The following names are ruled as not being sufficiently similar to be confused, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., they are NOT to be treated as homonyms: (11) *Senecio petasiodoides* and *Senecio petasitoides* (2–20–1–0); (42) *Pittosporum napaulense* and *P. napaliense* (2–20–1–0); (47) *Huperzia rubricaulis* and *H. rubricaulis* (0–22–1–0).

#### 4. Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (NCFung) Report 20 (Taxon 66: 483–495. 2017)

##### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCFung, i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated. Prop. (2128) was also recommended by the NCVP (Report 66. Taxon 63: 1358–1371. 2014).

(2032) cons. *Pseudocyphellaria* (typ. cons.); (2033) cons. *Armillariella ostoyae* (21–0–2–0); (2044) cons. *Agaricus tabescens* (21–0–2–0); (2050) rej. *Saccharomyces sphaericus* (21–0–2–0); (2051) cons. *Talaromyces*; (2052) cons. *Lichen vulgatus* (typ. cons.); (2069) cons. *Chrysotrichaceae* (with that orthographically correct spelling); (2071) cons. *Lichen leucomelos* with that original spelling (21–0–1–1); (2087) cons. *Lecidea oederi* (typ. cons.); (2100) cons. *Chrysothrix*, nom. cons., against additional name *Alyssphaeria*; (2101) cons. *Ganoderma camphoratum* (typ. cons.) (21–1–1–0); (2128) cons. *Flammula* (Fr.) P. Kumm. (changed typ. cons. *Agaricus alnicola* Fr.: Fr.) (21–0–2–0); (2142) cons. *Peziza ammophila* Durieu & Lév.; (2143) cons. *Fuscopannaria*; (2176) cons. (modified proposal) *Torula stilbospora* (typ. cons.); (2196) cons. *Alectoria fuscescens*; (2197) cons. *Hebeloma* (typ. cons.); (2198) cons. *Agaricus laterinus* against sanctioned *Agaricus fastibilis*; (2210) cons. *Blumeria*; (2211) cons. *Erysiphe arcuata*; (2212) cons. *Microsphaera azaleae*; (2213) cons. *Erysiphe buhrii*; (2214) cons. *Erysiphe catalpae*; (2215) cons. *Erysiphe celosiae*; (2216) cons. *Microsphaera oehrensii*; (2217) cons. *Erysiphe quercicola*; (2218) cons. *Erysiphe biocellata*; (2219) cons. *Erysiphe magnicellulata*; (2220) cons. *Golovinomyces sonchicola*; (2221) cons. *Erysiphe verbasci*; (2222) cons. *Leveillula rutae*; (2223) cons. *Phyllactinia alni*; (2224) cons. *Phyllactinia ampelopsidis*; (2225) cons. *Phyllactinia chubutiana*; (2226) cons. *Phyllactinia dalbergiae*; (2227) cons. *Phyllactinia gmelinae*; (2228) cons. *Phyllactinia populi*; (2229) cons. *Sphaerotheca leucotricha*; (2230) cons. *Sphaerotheca euphorbiae-hirtae*; (2231) cons. *Sphaerotheca filipendulae*; (2232) cons. *Podosphaera solanacearum*; [Props. (2211)–(2232) were considered and voted on as a block]; (2234) cons. *Helminthosporium maydis* Y. Nisik. & C. Miyake;

(2274) cons. spelling of *Polycaryum*; (2275) cons. spelling of *Polycaryum branchipodianum*; (2276) cons. *Erysiphaceae*; (2288) rej. *Botrytis farinosa*; (2289) cons. *Morchella semilibera* (21–0–2–0); (2291) cons. *Gastrum* (typ. cons.); (2341) cons. *Lichen fuscatus* Schrad. (typ. cons.); (2349) cons. *Hebeloma fragilipes*; (2393) cons. *Catenaria* Sorokin (with changed type citation); (2396) cons. *Lichen muralis* (typ. cons.); (2397) cons. *Stereocaulon pileatum* (typ. cons.).

As Prop. (2033) established *Agaricus occultans* (1783) as a homotypic synonym of *A. obscurans* (1774), it may be unnecessary to include the former as a rejected name but this is an editorial matter to be checked later.

The following conservation proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCFung, i.e., the names are NOT conserved or rejected as indicated: (2070) cons. *Dothioraceae* (2–19–2–0); (2085) cons. *Cylindrocladium buxicola* (3–18–2–0); (2086) cons. *Catillaria* (typ. cons.) (0–21–2–0); (2237) rej. *Lichen quisquiliaris* (3–19–1–0); (2290) cons. *Verrucaria subcerasi* (0–21–2–0); (2348) rej. *Aspidelia* (1–20–2–0).

#### 5. Old proposal (1193) on *Kyllinga triceps* Rottb.

This conservation proposal was not recommended by the then Committee for Spermatophyta back in 1998 but the GC deferred action on it (GC Report 8. Taxon 48: 373–378. 1999) and it was

subsequently overlooked. Its status is now resolved. The proposal is declined (0–20–2–1), i.e., the name *Kyllinga triceps* is not conserved. The first available name for the taxon involved appears to be *Kyllinga tenuifolia* Steud. or *Cyperus tenuifolius* (Steud.) Dandy.

#### 6. Nomenclature Committee for Fungi Report 21 (Taxon 66: 496–499. 2017)

The GC approved for conservation, as recommended by the NCFung, the first six lists of fungal names prepared by working groups set up under Art. 14.13 to deal *en bloc* with names considered to require conservation: (1) *Cordyceps*; (2) *Diaporthales*; (3) *Dothideomycetes*; (4) *Hypocreales*; (5) *Leotiomyces*; (6) *Trichoderma* and *Hypocrea*.

#### 7. Additions to list of institutional votes for XIX IBC

Institutional votes for the following two institutions were approved, as recommended by the Special Committee on Institutional Votes and the Bureau of Nomenclature: Korea National Arboretum (KH – 2 votes); Botanical Survey of India, Northern Regional Centre, Dehra Dun (BSD – 1 vote).