

Report of the General Committee: 20

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/10.12705/664.15>

Summary Decisions are reported on two previously unresolved proposals and one request from Report 68 of the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants, as well as five proposals in Report 13 of the Nomenclature Committee for Bryophytes.

The previous report (19) of the General Committee for Nomenclature was published online in *Taxon* 66 on 26 June 2017, and in hard-copy in *Taxon* 66: [1 p.]. 2017.

General Committee (GC) membership was 25 at the time that the following proposals and requests were considered. One member failed to vote so the voting figures total 24 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 each proposal in the order: For the proposal – Against the proposal – Abstain – More discussion/refer back to the relevant Committee.

1. Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) Report 68 (Taxon 65: 1153–1165. 2016)

Two conservation proposals under Art. 14 and one request under Art. 53.5 in that report came without any recommendation from the NCVP and required second ballots in the GC after failing to reach a super-majority in the first ballot.

Proposal (2296) is accepted (19–5–0–0), i.e., the name *Maackia hupehensis* Takeda is conserved.

Proposal (2323) to conserve *Salsola* L. with a conserved type (*S. kali*) was a difficult case, with strong opinions for and against expressed by chenopod specialists. It was noted that this problem would be solved if the *Code* were amended in Shenzhen by accepting the proposals from the Special Committee on Mechanical Typification. However, a narrow super-majority (5–19–0–0) agreed that the GC should not delay making a decision and voted (17–6–1–0) to conserve *Salsola* with *S. kali* as the conserved type. Some members considered conservation not strictly necessary but agreed that this action would stop confusion and stabilise usage.

Request (15) was for a binding decision on whether *Hoppea* Willd. (*Gentianaceae*) and *Hoppia* Nees (*Cyperaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. A super-majority agreed (19–4–0–1) that these names are confusable and therefore should be treated as homonyms.

This result is the opposite of that for *Hopea* versus *Hopia* (Request 14 – see GC Report 17 in *Taxon* 66: 478–480. 2017) and could be considered inconsistent. However, it is in the interest of stability, in line with the second sentence of Art. 53.3 (“If established practice has been to treat two similar names as homonyms, this practice is to be continued if it is in the interest of nomenclatural stability”).

2. Nomenclature Committee on Bryophytes (NCB) Report 13 (Taxon 66: 745–746. 2017)

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are approved as recommended by the NCB, i.e., the names are conserved: (2310) *Hypnum uncinulatum* (23–1–0–0); (2442) *Tortula angustata* (24–0–0–0).

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are rejected as recommended by the NCB, i.e., the names are NOT conserved: (2331) *Globulina boliviana* (3–21–0–0); (2358) *Bartramia curvata* (3–20–1–0).

Proposal (2453) to conserve *Jungermannia ornithopodioides* with that spelling was also rejected (1–23–0–0), i.e., the original spelling of the epithet (*ornithopoides*) is to be used. The radical/stem of epithets ending in the suffix *-oides* (“resembling”) is based on the genitive case of that noun (which may be alternatively latinised Greek [*ornithopod-*] or assimilated to Latin [*ornithop-*]). Formation from either stem is acceptable in epithet formation, and neither is an orthographic error to be corrected. In the case at hand, *ornithopoides* was the original spelling.

Proposal (2460) to conserve *Selenia* Nutt. was dealt with in GC Report 18 (Wilson in *Taxon* 66: 743. 2017).

Proposal (1900) to conserve *Gertrudia validinervis* is still being considered, while action on Prop. (2468) and Request (53) is deferred until recommendations are received from the NCA and NCVP respectively.