

Report of the Committee for Algae: 9

Pierre Compère

Jardin Botanique National de Belgique, Domein van Bouchout, B-1860 Meise, Belgium. p.compere@br.fgov.be

The Committee for Algae (previous report in Taxon 53: 1065–1067, 2004) reports on five conservation proposals concerning two generic names and three specific names. All these proposals are recommended. The Committee also expresses opinion on two proposals to amend the *Code*; these proposals are not supported by the Committee.

The Committee still includes fourteen members: J. Bolton (Capetown), G. Furnari (Catania), L. Hoffmann (Luxembourg), H. Lange-Bertalot (Frankfurt-am-Main), J. Larsen (Copenhagen), M. Masuda (Sapporo), D. J. Patterson (Sidney), A. K. S. Prasad (Tallahassee), F. F. Pedroche (Mexico), W. F. Prud'homme van Reine (Leiden), P. C. Silva (Berkeley, Chairman), K. L. Vinogradova (Saint Petersburg), W. J. Woelkerling (Melbourne) and P. Compère (Meise, Secretary). Eleven of them expressed their votes on all the proposals. The votes of the members who did not send back their ballot form on time are recorded as abstentions. Under the 60% rule, nine votes are necessary for a proposal to be recommended or rejected. The vote is recorded in the order: yes : no : abstention.

(1569) Conserve the name *Coleochaete soluta* (Bréb.) Pringsh. (*Chlorophyceae*) against *C. prostrata* Kütz. (proposed by M. T. Cimino & al. in Taxon 52: 133–134, 2003). Votes: 10 : 1 : 3 (recommended).

Coleochaete prostrata was proposed by Kützing (1854) as a new name at the species level for *C. scutata* var. *soluta* Bréb. (1844), which antedates the combination *C. soluta* (Bréb.) Pringsh. (1860); both names are thus homotypic synonyms. Since 1860 *C. prostrata* has never been used in the literature, whereas the name *C. soluta* is currently used to designate this species. In a first ballot, the case was left undecided but several members of the committee pointed out that the genus *Coleochaete* was important in discussions on the origin of land plants and that all uncertainties about names in this genus have to be avoided. Conservation of *C. soluta* would stabilize the use of the name and should be recommended. A large majority of the Committee agrees with this point of view and consequently recommends conservation.

(1570) Conserve the name *Coleochaete obicularis* Pringsh. (*Chlorophyceae*) against *Phyllactidium pulchellum* Kütz. (proposed by M. T. Cimino & al. in Taxon 52: 134, 2003). Votes: 9 : 2 : 3 (recommended)

Coleochaete Bréb. (1844) is conserved against *Phyllactidium* Kützing (1843). The authors of the present proposal consider that the type of *Phyllactidium*, *P. pulchellum* Kütz. (1843), is conspecific with and antedates the well known and currently used name *Coleochaete orbicularis*

Pringsh. (1860). Considering that *Coleochaete pulchella* (Kütz.) Rabenh. has been consistently ignored whereas *C. orbicularis* was widely used, they propose conservation of the latter, designating an epitype to fix the application of the name. It was pointed out in the committee that both *C. orbicularis* and *C. soluta* were currently used in recent important works, including Dutch and British Floras of freshwater algae. Conservation of the name together with the epitype proposed by the authors would remove any uncertainties on the application of the name *C. orbicularis*. Therefore, conservation is recommended.

(1620) Conserve the name *Caloglossa* against *Apiarium* (*Chlorophyceae*) (proposed by Paul C. Silva in Taxon 53: 555–556, 2004). Votes: 11 : 0 : 3 (recommended).

Apiarium Durant has never been in use but it antedates the well known and currently used *Caloglossa* (Harv.) G. Martens. Acceptation of the proposal would allow the continuous use of the name *Caloglossa*. All the members of the committee who expressed an opinion recommend conservation.

(1633) Conserve the name *Pinnularia gastrum* with a conserved type (*Bacillariophyta*) (proposed by E. J. Cox & R. Ross in Taxon 53: 830–831, 2004). Votes: 9 : 2 : 3 (recommended).

Contrary to the statement of the authors of the proposal, specimens from the original material survive in Ehrenberg's collections in BHU, and one of these specimens was designated as lectotype independently of the proposal. Unfortunately this specimen is conspecific with the diatom currently known as *Placoneis amphibola*, which would mean that this diatom should now be known as *P. gastrum* whereas the rather common species hitherto known as *P. gastrum* should receive a new name. To avoid these disadvantageous nomenclatural changes, Cox & Ross propose to conserve the name *P. gastrum* with a new type corresponding to the current use of the name. A sufficient majority of the committee recommends acceptance of the proposal, which allows the continuous use of both *Placoneis amphibola* and *P. gastrum* in their current sense.

(1653) Conserve the name *Fragilariopsis* against *Pseudo-eunotia* (*Bacillariophyceae*) (proposed by P. C. Silva & G. R. Hasle in Taxon 54: 177–178, 2005). Votes: 11 : 0 : 3 (recommended).

Medlin & Sims have recently concluded that *Pseudo-eunotia* Grunow 1881, lectotypified by *P. doliolus*, is congeneric with *Fragilariopsis* Hustedt 1913. The older *Pseudo-eunotia* has been used for a monotypic genus

whereas the younger *Fragilariopsis* is currently used for several species well known by oceanographers, marine biologists and diatom taxonomists. Because *Fragilariopsis* is the best known and the most widely used of both names, in spite of the priority of *Pseudo-eunotia*, the combination *Fragilariopsis doliolus* (G. C. Wall.) Medlin & Sims has been proposed and has already been used in several books on diatoms. Conservation of *Fragilariopsis* as proposed by Silva & Hasle would allow the continuous use of the name not only by diatom taxonomists but also by numerous researchers in diverse fields of marine biology. Conservation is recommended by all the members of the committee who took part in the vote.

Proposals to amend the code

(221) Delete the second sentence of Art. 46.5 and Art. 46 Ex. 22 (proposed by P. C. Silva in Taxon 53: 852, 2004). Votes: 2 : 9 : 3 (not supported)

The current version of this article only proposes a style of author's citation that is certainly not mandatory and a majority of the committee considers that authors should be free to use this style of citation when they feel this precision useful. The use of "ex" after the parentheses clearly indicates that it is not a reference to a basionym. The committee does not support the proposal.

(222) In art. 13.1(e), delete "Nostocaceae homocysteeae" and "Nostocaceae heterocysteeae" (proposed by P. C. Silva in Taxon 53: 852–853, 2004). Votes: 1 : 10 : 3 (not supported).

The later starting points for some groups of algae have been challenged for a long time, but it is not sure that cancelling would be more advantageous than maintaining these later starting points. The present proposal deals only with two groups of *Cyanophyta* at a moment when the International Association for Cyanophyte Research is trying, with the help of members working in both the botanical and the bacteriological fields, to harmonize cyanophyte nomenclature under the Botanical and the Bacteriological Codes. Rather than trying to amend the Botanical Code on this question, it could be wiser to work in collaboration with specialists of bacterial nomenclature to arrive at a common system for the *Cyanophyta* / *Cyanobacteria*. The committee does not support this proposal.

Proposal to the next International Botanical Congress to appoint a special committee to deal with the harmonization of cyanophyte nomenclature under the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* and the *International Code of Nomenclature of Bacteria* [the future *International Code of Nomenclature of Prokaryotes*]. (Proposal from the Committee for Algae, to be submitted to the next International Botanical Congress). Votes : 9 : 0 : 5 (supported by the committee)

Rather than amending articles dealing with *Cyanophyta* in the Botanical Code only from the botanical point of view, the Committee for Algae proposes that the next International Botanical Congress set up a special committee to work with specialists of bacterial nomenclature and dele-

gates of the International Association for Cyanophyte Research towards the harmonization of the nomenclature of *Cyanophyta* / *Cyanobacteria* under both the Botanical and the Bacteriological Codes.