

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

Edited by John McNeill, Scott A. Redhead & John H. Wiersema

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 11

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Netherlands Centre for Biodiversity Naturalis (Section NHN), Leiden University, P.O. Box 9514, 2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands; Prudhomme@nhn.leidenuniv.nl

Summary It is recommended that the listed type of the genus *Chlamydomonas* be changed from *C. pulvinus* to *C. reinhardtii* and that the name *Cylindrotheca* be conserved against *Ceratoneis*. It is also recommended that the name *Sargassum vulgare* not be conserved with a conserved type. The Committee's view on the size of the current ICBN and its method of publication is discussed.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae (previous report in Taxon 60: 585–587. 2011) reports here on two conservation proposals concerning generic names and one conservation proposal concerning a specific name. The Committee also discussed the size and publication of ICBN.

The Committee included fifteen members of whom D.J. Patterson (Sydney and Massachusetts) has recently resigned. The chairman and the secretary of the Committee asked Dr. S. Adl, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada to take his place. Dr. Adl accepted and did already vote in the most recent ballot. He is also a representative of the International Society of Protistologists, a Society that has asked to become involved in the process of governance of the ICBN.

Fourteen of the members expressed their votes on the proposals. The votes of the single member who did not send back his completed ballot form on time are recorded as abstentions. Under the 60% rule, nine “yes” votes are necessary for a proposal to be recommended and also nine for rejection. The vote is recorded in the order: yes : no : abstention.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(1768) Proposal to change the listed type of the genus *Chlamydomonas* Ehrenb. nom. cons. (*Chlorophyta*) (proposed by Pröschold & Silva in Taxon 56: 595–596. 2007). Vote: 14 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

The proposal suggests changing the listed type of *Chlamydomonas*, viz. *C. pulvisculus* (O.F. Müll.) Ehrenb. to *C. reinhardtii* P.A. Dang. The Committee thought this a very desirable proposal and in accordance with general use, although the identity of the alga described as *C. reinhardtii* by P.A. Dangeard is still uncertain. The proposed epitypification is thought to be a good solution.

(1783) Proposal to conserve the name *Cylindrotheca* against *Ceratoneis* (*Bacillariophyta*) (proposed by Medlin & Mann in Taxon 56: 953–955. 2007 with an erratum on p. 1307). Vote: 13 : 0 : 2 (recommended).

The proposal describes the complex history of the naming of species within the diatom genus *Ceratoneis*, while also the circumscription of that genus was changed by Grunow. The authors of the proposal state that *Cylindrotheca*, however, is a genus of which the identity has never been controversial. While one of its species is a model organism for the study of diatom physiology and biochemistry, another one of its species is a major feed organism for marine aquaculture. Thus there is a vast amount of literature on these organisms, viz. the genus name *Cylindrotheca* is a name in current use. The

Committee supported this conservation proposal due to the volume of literature involved in the physiological and feeding studies of some species in this genus.

(1784) Proposal to conserve the name *Sargassum vulgare* (*Phaeophyceae: Sargassaceae*) with a conserved type (proposed by Ramon & Gil-ad in Taxon 56: 955–957. 2007). The proposal aims to conserve the name of a common marine brown alga that has been recorded from warm-temperate and tropical coasts of the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific Oceans. Vote 4 : 10 : 1 (not recommended).

In 1820 C. Agardh (Sp. Alg. 1: 3) described *S. vulgare* on the basis of material from the Atlantic Ocean (both East and West coasts) communicated by Cabrera and Haenseler. This material is not present in the Agardh herbarium in Lund (LD). Carl Agardh listed five synonyms, viz. the pre-Linnaean *Lenticula marina, serratis foliis* Lobel. (Kruidt. 2: 292. 1581) without mentioning “No. 261” as claimed in the proposal), unnamed varieties in *Fucus sargasso* S.G. Gmelin and *Fucus acinarius* Esper, *Fucus natans* Turner non L. (thus an illegitimate name) and *Fucus salicifolius* J.V. Lamour. (1813, a later homonym of *F. salicifolius* S.G. Gmelin, 1768, thus also an illegitimate name). However, *F. salicifolius* S.G. Gmelin is cited by C. Agardh as the basionym of his *S. vulgare* var. *salicifolium* (‘ζ’) and so *S. vulgare* is superfluous and thus illegitimate. Although C. Agardh did not designate or definitely indicate a type for the illegitimate name *Sargassum vulgare*, it is not automatically that of *Fucus salicifolius* S.G. Gmelin, because of that name's inclusion under *S. vulgare* var. *salicifolium* (S.G. Gmelin) C. Agardh (compare second sentence of Art. 7.5).

By designating nine varieties and citing five synonyms C. Agardh made clear that he considered *Sargassum vulgare* as an important species, occurring in many places in the Atlantic Ocean, while the varieties partly occurred in other seas outside the Atlantic Ocean. If *Sargassum vulgare* had not been an illegitimate name, then choice of the woodcut of *Lenticula marina, serratis foliis* as lectotype would apparently have ensured the application of the name to the same taxon as that proposed. Since all names cited as synonyms for his “species”, as opposed to the variety mentioned above, could not be used as an available name for that taxon, C. Agardh used a new name: *Sargassum vulgare*. However C. Agardh's new name is illegitimate and now a new name in *Sargassum* based on *Fucus salicifolius* S.G. Gmelin 1768 cannot be proposed because of the existence of *S. salicifolium* Gaillon 1828. The only way to make the name *Sargassum vulgare* C. Agardh available again is by conservation. But what should be the type in that case? For *Lenticula marina, serratis foliis* in the

Kruytboeck the localities are Tuscany (Hetrurien in old Dutch) and Venice (Venegien), while C. Agardh cites for his var. *salicifolium*, apart from the Sea of Marmora in Turkey, the cities of Livorno and Montpellier. The collections in BM and OXF, however, have not been searched by the proposers for historical material of *Fucus salicifolius* S.G. Gmelin (according to TL-2, I/958 the herbarium material of S.G. Gmelin is mainly in BM, with additional material in OXF and LE). Is the proposed conserved type suitable, while it is originating from the coast of Israel? The majority of the Committee thinks it is not, especially because the specimen chosen as “typus conservandus prop.” has no historical link with the name *Sargassum vulgare*. In the discussions in the Committee some members stated that, “due to the extreme morphological variability of the species in the genus *Sargassum*, it is not possible to decide if the proposal is on solid grounds. So far, it is not shown unequivocally that this species is encompassed by C. Agardh’s concept of *S. vulgare*.” A better understanding of

the species is desirable before a good proposal can be prepared for conservation of *Sargassum vulgare*. A majority of the members of the Committee have accepted this reservation and have voted against recommending the proposal.

ICBN matters: Discussion about the size of the current ICBN and its way of publication

The Committee has discussed this topic already several times. The only decisive conclusion, however, was that the ICBN has to be published in a printed version and *simultaneously* on the internet (vote 12 : 1 : 2, thus recommended). The Committee is still considering whether the ICBN should be published as a single printed book or as two separate books (Rules and “Exceptions”, i.e., App. II–VI) or if the “Exceptions” should be published on the internet only.

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 12

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Netherlands Centre for Biodiversity Naturalis (Section NHN), Leiden University, P.O. Box 9514, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.
Prudhomme@nhn.leidenuniv.nl

Summary The following three names are recommended for conservation: *Achnanthes brevipes* against *A. adnata*, *A. baccillarioides*, and *A. dubia*, and with a conserved type; *Sphacelaria* with a conserved type; and *Dasya*, nom. cons. against *Rhodonema*. As result of reference under Art. 53.5, it is recommended that the genus names *Sykidion* and *Sycidium* and all the higher taxa based on these names are not to be considered confusingly similar and thus cannot be treated as (para-)homonyms.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae (previous Report 11 in this issue, *Taxon* 60: 898–899. 2011) reports here on three conservation proposals. As result of reference under Art. 53.5, it is recommended that two genus names and all the higher taxa based on these names are not to be considered confusingly similar and thus cannot be treated as (para-)homonyms (ICBN Art. 53.3).

The Committee included fifteen members, of whom two did not vote on two of the recommendations in this report (indicated as abstentions). They were S. Adl (Halifax, Canada), R.A. Andersen (Laurium, U.S.A.), J. Bolton (Capetown, South Africa), P. Compère (Meise, Belgium), G. Furnari (Catania, Italy), L. Hoffmann, (Luxembourg), H. Lange-Bertalot (Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany), M. Masuda (Sapporo, Japan), A.K.S.K. Prasad (Tallahassee, U.S.A.), F.F. Pedroche (Mexico), B. Santelices (Santiago de Chile), P.C. Silva (Berkeley, U.S.A., Chairman), K.L. Vinogradova (Saint Petersburg, Russia), W.J. Woelkerling (Melbourne, Australia) and W.F. Prud'homme van Reine (Leiden, The Netherlands, Secretary). Under the 60% rule, nine “yes” votes are necessary for a proposal to be recommended and also nine for rejection. The vote is recorded in the order: yes : no : abstention.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(1718) Proposal to conserve *Achnanthes brevipes* (*Bacillariophyceae*) against *A. adnata*, *A. baccillarioides*, and *A. dubia*, and with a conserved type (proposed by Toyoda & al. in *Taxon* 55: 527–528. 2008). Votes: 9 : 5 : 1 (recommended).

Although the authors of the proposal state that pervasive use of the illegitimate *Achnanthes brevipes* warrants, if not demands, that this name be conserved rather than using the legitimate name *Achnanthes adnata* even though an epitype has been chosen for this name, the Committee was only lukewarm in their support of this proposal. The name *Achnanthes brevipes* has been consistently used for this species in recent diatom literature and to replace this name by one of the three names proposed for rejection is stated to unnecessarily disturb the nomenclature used in almost all the recent books on diatoms. The proposal was published unofficially but with illustrations by the same authors in *Diatom Res.* 20: 375–386. 2005. *Achnanthes brevipes* is a superfluous name because the protologue includes the citation of the name *Achnanthes adnata* Bory (1822) without any expression of doubt. Although Boyer in his *Synopsis of North American Diatomaceae* (1927: 232) designated *A. adnata* as generitype, he treated this name as a probable synonym of *Achnanthes brevipes*, the name that has been applied to this species almost exclusively. Authentic material of *A. adnata* apparently is not extant so that Bory’s illustration remains as lectotype, for which the authors of the proposal designated an epitype. One of the arguments put forth for conservation is the existence of 26 infraspecific names within *A. brevipes*, but the biological and genetic meaning of these taxa can be challenged.

An insufficient majority of voting members in an earlier ballot of the Committee considered that conservation of this species name is necessary (Votes 6 : 5 : 3, undecided, so that further discussions within the Committee had to be initiated).