

of algal taxa acceptable under the *Zoological Code* are considered validly published by the *ICBN*, Paul Silva pointed out that coordinate zoological names automatically established under the zoological “Principle of Coordination” would become valid when applied to algal taxa. However, any attempt to integrate names of automatically established coordinate taxa into botanical nomenclature would lead to needless confusion and uncertainty. Therefore Paul Silva proposed to add to Art. 45.4 the following sentence: “However, names generated in zoological nomenclature in accordance with the Principle of Coordination are not considered validly published under the present botanical code unless such a name appears in print and is applied to an accepted taxon.” with an example: “The publication of *Prorocentraceae* (*Prorocentridae*) F. Stein 1883 automatically established the subfamilial name *Prorocentrinae* F. Stein in accordance with the zoological principle of coordination. Because the subfamilial name did not appear in print, however, it is not accepted as validly published in botanical nomenclature”. This proposal was accepted by a large majority of the committee; therefore, it may be presented in the name of the Committee for Algae.

Proposal of modification to art. 18.1 (see *Taxon* 53:

Report of the Committee for Fungi: 11

Walter Gams

Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures, P. O. Box 85167, NL-3508 AD Utrecht, The Netherlands.
gams@cbs.knaw.nl

The previous report of the Committee was published in *Taxon* 51: 791–792. 2002. Since then, the Committee for Fungi has had undergone some changes and now consists of J. L. Crane (Urbana-Champaign, USA), V. Demoulin (Liège, Belgium, chm.), W. Gams (Utrecht, Netherlands, secr.), J. Hafellner (Graz, Austria), P. M. Kirk (Egham, Surrey, U.K.), T. Iturriaga (Caracas, Venezuela), P. M. Jørgensen (Bergen, Norway), P. LizoÁ (Bratislava, Slovakia), L. Norvell (Portland, OR., USA), E. Parmasto (Tartu, Estonia), G. Redeuilh (Maule, France), S. Redhead (Ottawa, Ont., Canada), S. Ryman (Uppsala, Sweden), G. J. Samuels (Beltsville, Md., USA), and H. J. Sipman (Berlin, Germany).

The present report relates the outcome of a ballot concerning 25 proposals which was completed by 13 members. Thirteen of these proposals could be settled and nine are recommended. The votes are reported as Yes : No : More discussion : Abstain. Votes for More discussion are disregarded unless the voter presented any further arguments. Among the favourably voted proposals, Prop. 1516 cannot yet be closed because typification was found to be ambiguous. The remaining open proposals have not yet received an unequivocal vote or have not yet been voted upon. One of the open proposals is the most controversial question about

851. 2004.). Votes: 12; 1; 1 (Proposal to be presented in the name of the committee).

When corrected according to Art. 18.1 of *ICBN*, *Trigoniaceae* Gleser 1981 (based on *Trigonium* Cleve, *Bacillariophyta*) becomes a later homonym of *Trigoniaceae* Endl., based on *Trigonia* Aublet (Spermatophyta). It does not seem possible to consider *Trigonium* and *Trigonia* as likely to be confused under Art. 53.3 of *ICBN*, because of Ex. 10, *Peponia* vs. *Peponium* (voted example). *Trigonium* is thus a legitimate generic name, on which it should be possible to base a family name. A possible solution was suggested to the committee, by comparison with family names based on generic names of non-classical origin. It would be to add to Art. 18.1, after the sentence concerning generic names of non-classical origin, a sentence stating: “Likewise when formation from the genitive singular of a generic name results in a homonym, -aceae is added to the nominative singular”. An example with *Trigoniumaceae* based on *Trigonium* could be added as Ex. 3. This proposal was accepted by a large majority of the committee, which means that it may be presented to the next congress in the name of the Committee for Algae.

which should be the type of *Coprinus*. In addition, proposal (1432), reported as recommended in Report 10, requires a modification.

(1384) To change the listed type of the name *Buellia* (proposed by R. Moberg, A. Nordin & C. Scheidegger in *Taxon* 48: 143. 1999). Votes: (a) as the proposal stands 0 : 9 : 1 : 1; (b) formal postponing 7 : 3 : 1 : 2. If the Yes votes to (b) and the No votes to (a) are summed up, this sums up to 12 No votes; i.e., the proposal is not recommended at the present moment.

After long debates and repeated votes, it has become quite obvious that it is impossible to decide now about a meaningful typification of this heterogeneous complex because of insufficient taxonomic knowledge. Groups of the large genus *Buellia* have been segregated and given generic status. Some of these groups seem to be well delimited and fairly well circumscribed, others are more doubtful, and many species are left “ungrouped”. The genus *Hafellia* is relatively well-defined. Unfortunately, the present lecto-type species of *Buellia*, *B. disciformis* (Fr.) Mudd (sanctioned by conservation) groups together with the *Hafellia* spp., rendering the genera synonymous. Even this undesired consequence is not considered dramatic at the moment. As

an unorthodox procedure, we considered to explicitly postpone conservation rather than rejecting the proposal. This possibility did not find sufficient support, but it is quite clear that the CF is not now prepared to support conservation of the name *Buellia* with any of the proposed types.

(1432) Support for conservation reported by Gams (2002, l.c.). A possible correction: Jack R. Laundon on 11 March 2003 kindly added: ‘Unfortunately the authorship of the name in the proposal is erroneous and requires correction. The proposal should read “Conserve *Lecidea pulveracea* Flörke ex Th. Fr. against *Leptra cyanescens* Rabenh.” This is because Fries, Lichenogr. Scand. p. 549 (1874), did not base the name on Schaerer’s publication.’

(1434) Conserve *Usnea madeirensis* Motyka (proposed by P. Clerc in Taxon 48: 826. 1999). Votes: 2 : 11 : 0 : 0 (not recommended).

While proposal (1433) to conserve *U. hesperina* is still being debated, it has become clear that proposal (1434) is supposed to conserve a name which is not well-known, but has been used more often lately, as a consequence of the work by Clerc, where he anticipates its conservation—a procedure that should not be encouraged. It will not be problematic at this stage to switch to the oldest valid name. Accordingly, the proposal as presented is unnecessary, as *U. subgracilis* is the correct name today as pointed out in a letter by I. Tavares.

(1462) Reject *Chlorocyphella* Sp. (proposed by R. Lücking, K. Kalb, E. Sérusiaux & A. Vězda in Taxon 49: 558–560. 2000). Votes: 1 : 12 : 0 : 0 (not recommended).

For the associated proposal (1461) no conclusion has yet been reached. It may be desirable to protect holomorph names against associated anamorph names, but the alternative of conserving threatened names should be considered in this case rather than invoking the rejection mechanism. The rejection of all three generic names as proposed would be based on the assumption that one cannot classify their type species in either *Calopadia* or *Tapellaria*. If one cannot assign the species of *Chlorocyphella* and *Cyrta* to either of these genera, then rejection of the genera alone still leaves the possibility of using the species names open. If someone is able to determine what the species are, it should certainly be possible to determine what the genera are. Therefore, on principle, if these names were to be rejected, the names should completely be rejected, also including the species names.

(1463) Reject *Cyrta* Batista & H. Maia (proposed by Lücking et al., Taxon 49: 558–560. 2000). Votes: 1 : 12 : 0 : 0 (not recommended).

Same argumentation as for (1462).

(1475) Conserve *Agaricus lycoperdoides* Bull. (proposed by S. A. Redhead & K. A. Seifert in Taxon 50: 279–280. 2001). Votes: 12 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

The authors present convincing evidence that *Asterophora lycoperdoides* (Bull.) Ditmar refers to the

teleomorph. Its replacement by *A. physaroides* is out of the question because this epithet refers to the anamorph. The original epithet *lycoperdonoides* Bull. is not correctable to *lycoperdoides*, and conservation of the orthography, as presently universally used, is thus absolutely necessary. Conservation is best from the source where the name was first published (with a revised orthography), rather than from Fries’ later reformulation.

(1485) Conserve *Kluyveromyces* van der Walt with a conserved type (proposed by C.P. Kurtzman, M.-A. Lachance, H.-V. Nguyen & H. Prillinger in Taxon 50: 907–908. 2001). Votes: (a) as the proposal stands, 8 : 4 : 1 : 0; (b) with *K. lactis* as type: 6 : 2 : 1 : 0. Adding up yes voters of both alternatives (some members voting for both), 12 yes votes favour conservation, with a simple majority for (a).

While the original type species, *K. polysporus* van der Walt, is rather obscure and unrelated to the majority of species presently included in the genus, it is desirable to stabilise the generic name for the best known, most economically or ecologically important species. These are *K. marxianus* and *K. lactis*. During the discussions, the alternative of choosing *K. lactis* as conserved type came up because this species is more frequently cited than *K. marxianus*. Principally, this alternative will not have any effect on the taxonomy, because both species belong to the same taxonomic group.

(1497) Conserve *Hymenochaete* Lév. against *Cyclomyces* Fr. (nom. cons.) (proposed by M. Fischer & T. Wagner in Taxon 50: 1185–1186. 2001). Votes: 13 : 0 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

The disruption that would be caused by transferring >100 *Hymenochaete* species to the pantropical *Cyclomyces* (with 5 species) is very undesirable. Conservation of the former genus thus becomes necessary, whether the phylogenetically necessary merging of the genera is followed or not.

(1540) Conserve *Gyalidea* Lettau ex Vězda against additional *Soloriniella* Anzi (proposed by A. Aptroot & R. Lücking in Taxon 51: 565. 2002). Votes: 12 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

The authors present a straightforward and agreeable rationale for conserving *Gyalidea* (nom. cons.) also over the older *Soloriniella*.

(1541) Reject *Collema proboscoidale* Mont. (proposed by P. M. Jørgensen in Taxon 51: 567–568. 2002). Votes: 13 : 0 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

This proposal concerns a text-book example of an undesirable name that was used only once and then forgotten.

(1542) Conserve *Collema phyllocarpum* Pers. with conserved type (proposed by P. M. Jørgensen in Taxon 51: 567–568. 2002). Votes: 12 : 1 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

Leptogium phyllocarpum is a commonly used name,

which merits protection in its present circumscription.

(1555) Conserve *Physciaceae* Zahlbr. against additional *Caliciaceae* Cheval. (proposed by M. Wedin & M. Grube in Taxon 51: 802. 2002). Votes: 13 : 0 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

A most necessary action since the *Caliciaceae* traditionally has been strongly linked to a morphologically specialized and characteristic group, different from the rest of the family as now understood. The family *Physciaceae* is widespread and well-known, comprizing a great variety of lichen types.

(1556) Conserve *Peronospora lunariae* Gäum. against *P. senecionis* Fuckel (proposed by O. Constantinescu in

Taxon 51: 803. 2002). Votes: 10 : 1 : 0 : 2 (recommended).

Constantinescu presents cogent taxonomic arguments for superseding the nomenclaturally correct name by the more informative one, *P. lunariae*. This is an instance where strict adherence to the *Code* would be counterproductive.

(1558) Conserve *Xanthoparmelia* (Vainio) Hale against *Chondropsis* Nyl. ex Crombie (proposed by D.L. Hawksworth & A. Crespo in Taxon 51: 807. 2002). Votes: 12 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

The genus *Xanthoparmelia*, even though it has come into use only a few decades ago, is one of the largest lichen genera. Therefore its conservation against *Chondropsis*, although conserved, is to be defended.

(1644) Proposal to reject the name *Scirpus miliaceus* (*Cyperaceae*)

Mark T. Strong

Department of Botany, MRC-166, Smithsonian Institution, P.O. Box 37012, Washington, D.C. 20013, U.S.A.
strong.mark@nsmnh.si.edu

(1644) *Scirpus miliaceus* L., Syst. Nat., ed. 10: 868. 7 Jun 1759. [*Monocot.*: *Cyper.*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*
Lectotypus (vide Blake in J. Arnold Arbor. 35: 216–219. 1954): Herb. Linnaeus No. 71.40 (LINN).

The original material of *Scirpus miliaceus* may have consisted of two sheets in the Linnaean herbarium, one (No. 71.40) is inscribed “*miliaceus*” in Linnaeus’s hand, while the other (No. 71.41) is not. Clarke (in J. Linn. Soc., Bot. 30: 312–313. 1895) pointed out that No. 71.40 applied to *Fimbristylis quinquangularis* (Vahl) Kunth, a different taxon than *Fimbristylis miliacea* sensu Vahl, but did not discuss No. 71.41, which is representative material of the latter taxon as circumscribed by Vahl.

Since Linnaeus did not cite either sheet in the original protologue, Blake (in J. Arnold Arbor. 35: 216–219. 1954) chose No. 71.40 as the type by an act of lectotypification. However, Blake’s designation applied *Scirpus miliaceus* in a sense that had not previously been used and the consequence of his action, under the previous Article 69 (Lanjouw & al. in Regnum Veg. 23. 1961; now Article 57 of Greuter & al. in Regnum Veg. 138. 2000), was to render the name *Scirpus miliaceus* ambiguous and unavailable for use in any sense. Kern (in Taxon 3: 246. 1954), later in the same year, disagreed with Blake and designated No. 71.41 as lectotype. Since then the name *Fimbristylis miliacea* has thus become totally ambiguous, being used about equally in the two different senses, both for the species represented by No. 71.40 and No. 71.41. Since Blake’s lectotypification, examples of major floras accepting *Fimbristylis miliacea* in the sense of Vahl include Standley & Steyermark, Fl. Guatemala, Fieldiana, Bot. 24(1): 157. 1958; Ohwi, Fl. Japan, Engl. ed.: 207. 1965; Adams, Flow. Pl. Jamaica: 154.

1972; Koyama in Li & al., Fl. Taiwan 5: 234. 1978, in Smith, Fl. Vit. Nov. 1: 242. 1979, in Howard, Fl. Lesser Antilles 3: 236. 1979, in Dassanayake, Rev. Handb. Fl. Ceylon 5: 296. 1985; Cranfill in Hickman, Jepson Man.: 1143. 1993; Wunderlin, Guide Vasc. Pl. Florida: 165. 1998; Kral in Steyermark & al., Fl. Venez. Guayana 4: 573. 1998, in Stevens & al., Fl. Nicaragua 1: 767. 2001; Kukkonen in Ali & Qaiser, Fl. Pakistan 206: 683. 2001; and Kral in Ball & al., Fl. N. Amer. 23: 131. 2003. Examples of major floras that have followed Blake’s lectotypification and treat *Fimbristylis miliacea* sensu Vahl as *F. littoralis* include Koyama in Wiggins & Porter, Fl. Galápagos Isl.: 815. 1971; Napper in Hepper, Fl. W. Trop. Africa 3(2): 323. 1972; Kern in Steenis, Fl. Males. 7: 551. 1974; Koyama in Walker, Fl. Okinawa S. Ryukyu Isl.: 251. 1976; Hooper in Townsend & Guest, Fl. Iraq 8: 365. 1985; Adams in Davidse & al., Fl. Mesoamer. 6: 456. 1994; Kukkonen in Rechinger, Fl. Iran. 173: 73. 1998; and Yatskievych, Steyermark. Fl. Missouri 397. 1999. Usage of the name in two senses is further detailed by Strong & Kral (in Taxon 48: 388. 1999).

Strong & Kral (in Taxon 48: 387–389. 1999) proposed conservation of *Scirpus miliaceus* in the sense of its traditional usage (circumscribed by Vahl as *Fimbristylis miliacea* (L.) Vahl) with a conserved type. Although cyperologists gave strong support to this proposal, it was rejected by the Committee for Spermatophyta (Taxon 49: 807–808. 2000) but a new proposal was invited to reject the name outright. Napper (in Kew Bull. 25: 439. 1971) was the first to propose rejecting this name. However, Napper’s proposal was published in the Kew Bulletin, not Taxon, and no floras or other treatments have been found that acted upon this. A formal proposal to reject *Scirpus miliaceus* is now necessary to best serve stability of nomenclature, ending the usage of this name in two senses. If approved, the two taxa