

Report of the Committee for Fungi: 13

Walter Gams

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

Shortly after the previous report of the Committee was published in *Taxon* 54: 520–522. 2005, the Committee (with the same composition) found that it could resolve a significant number of proposals most of which were so straightforward that they could be handled quickly with little discussion prior to the XVII *International Botanical Congress* in Vienna in July 2005. In addition, the Committee expressed its opinion on a number of proposals to change the *Code*. All fifteen members cast their vote and the outcome is reported as Yes : No : More discussion : Abstain.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(1578) Reject the name *Lecidea atro-alba* var. *concreta* (proposed by A. M. Fryday & B. J. Coppins in *Taxon* 52: 351. 2003). Votes: 13 : 0 : 0 : 2 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1621) Reject the name *Homodium pernigratum* (proposed by P. M. Jørgensen & G. Paz-Bermúdez in *Taxon* 53: 557. 2004). Votes: 14 : 1 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1634) Reject the name *Lichen daedalius* Sm. (proposed by J. R. Laundon in *Taxon* 53: 832. 2004). Votes: 15 : 0 : 0 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate. The lichenologists on the Committee strongly support the proposal.

(1654) Conserve the name *Verticillium* Nees with conserved type (proposed by W. Gams, R. Zare & R. C. Summerbell in *Taxon* 54: 179. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate. Loss of the generic name *Verticillium* would be disastrous to plant pathologists. There is no problem in applying *Acrostalagmus* to the pretty, red verticillium like fungus known previously as *V. cinnabarinum* and now *A. luteo-albus*.

(1655) Conserve the name *Ustilago scitaminea* Syd. against *U. amadelpha* (proposed by K. Vánky & G. R. Shivas in *Taxon* 54: 180. 2005). Votes: 11 : 2 : 2 : 0 (recommended).

In spite of an objection that host specificity might lead to a segregation of *Ustilago scitaminea* into several species retaining also *U. amadelpha* as a distinct species, a sufficient majority has recognized the desirability of retaining the name *U. scitaminea* according to a morphological species concept.

(1656) Reject the name *Lecidea flavocoerulescens* Hornem. (proposed by A. M. Fryday, *Taxon* 54: 181–182. 2005). Votes: 9 : 4 : 1 : 1 (recommended, but still controversial).

This case is somewhat controversial and more thorough taxonomic studies would be desirable. An alternative would be to conserve the names *L. flavicunda*, *L. flavocoerulescens* and *L. melinodes* with conserved types rather than reject a name that could still be useful in the future. It is apparently not absolutely certain that *L. flavocoerulescens* has priority over *L. flavicunda*. Both names were published in 1810.

(1657) Conserve the name *Baeomyces bacillaris* Ach. with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 183–184. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1658) Conserve the name *Cenomyce coniocraea* Flörke with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 184. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1659) Conserve the name *Cenomyce polydactyla* Flörke against three other names (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 184. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1660) Conserve the name *Cenomyce stellaris* Opiz with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 185. 2005). Votes: 13 : 1 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Returning to the epithet *alpestris* that was best known some decades ago is no longer considered appropriate. Otherwise approved without further debate.

(1661) Conserve the name *Cladonia macilentata* Hoffm. with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 186. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1662) Conserve the name *Cladonia ochrochlora* Flörke with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 186. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1663) Conserve the name *Cladonia rangiformis* Hoffm. with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 187. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

An external lichenologist found that the proposed type was an unfortunate choice. *Cladonia rangiformis* is a species of predominantly calcareous areas, such as coastal dunes and limestone outcrops. It is especially common in the Mediterranean and Atlantic coast, and it is therefore not surprising that the material available for its original description originates from the Netherlands, where it was collected by a travelling German lichenologist. The habitat and locality given for the proposed conserved type “in turfosis prope Zwischenahn” is a very unlikely locality for this species. During a visit of the locality in 2004, which harbours about 20 *Cladonia* species, no *C. rangiformis* was found. A specimen of the proposed, widely distributed exsiccatum was studied in Leyden, and it contained *C. rangiformis* as well as the species most likely to be confused with it, *C. furcata*. As an answer to this criticism, the proposers chose another type of *Cladonia rangiformis* from Germany (Hoffmann reported the species from Germany) which also is represented in a widespread exsiccata series (so that there are many isotypes): Typus: [Germany, Niedersachsen], “Auf begrastem Heideboden bei Wenden, Hannover, 1921 Okt., leg. Sandstede”, Sandstede, *Cladoniae exsiccatae* No. 803 (H; isotype: UPS).

(1664) Conserve the name *Cladonia transcendentis* (Vain.) Vain. with conserved type (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 187. 2005). Votes: 13 : 1 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1665) Reject the name *Lichen monocarpus* Ach. (proposed by T. Ahti & P. DePriest in *Taxon* 54: 188. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1684) Conserve the name *Isaria* Pers. : Fr. with a conserved type (proposed by W. Gams & al. in *Taxon* 54: 537. 2005). Votes: 11 : 1 : 2 : 1 (recommended).

Art. 7.8, stating that typification of sanctioned names “may be effected by anything associated with the name” in the sanctioning work, was devised to satisfy those who, like Singer, used to typify according to Fries (it is mostly concerned with agarics) and the problem was mainly recognized at the specific level. The present case may be the first such problem at the generic level, for Fries was not a splitter of genera. The formulation “be effected in the light of” is not stated to override other articles (e.g. Art. 10.2). It means in the present case that if in the original publication several species names were cited, only the types of those fitting the Friesian concept would be eligible but not those of additional species names included by Fries. Therefore Art. 7.8 cannot be used to typify *Isaria* by *I. farinosa*, not included by Persoon, and conservation is necessary to maintain current usage.

(1685) Conserve the name *Fusicladium*, nom. cons. also against *Cycloconium* (proposed by U. Braun in *Taxon* 54: 538. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1686) Conserve name *Cryphonectria* with a conserved type (proposed by M. Gryzenhout, G. F. Glen, B. D. Wingfield & M. J. Wingfield in *Taxon* 54: 539–540. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1687) Conserve the name *Calvatia* nom. cons. also against *Omalycus* (proposed by J. C. Coetzee & A. E. van Wyk in *Taxon* 54: 541–542. 2005). Votes: 11 : 1 : 2 : 1 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1688) Conserve the name *Amaurochaete* against *Lachnobolus* (proposed by C. Lado, U. Eliasson, S. L. Stephenson, A. Estrada-Torres & M. Schnittler in *Taxon* 54: 543. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1689) Conserve the name *Ceratiomyxa* against *Famintzinia* (proposed by C. Lado, U. Eliasson, S. L. Stephenson, A. Estrada-Torres & M. Schnittler in *Taxon* 54: 544. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

(1690) Conserve the name *Cribraria* Pers. against *Cribraria* Schrad. ex J.F. Gmel. (proposed by C. Lado, U. Eliasson, S. L. Stephenson, A. Estrada-Torres & M. Schnittler in *Taxon* 54: 544–545. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

One member rightly commented: “By use of “(=)”, the proposal treats *Cribraria* Schrad. ex J. F. Gmel. as a synonym of *Cribraria* Pers. The proposal states *Cribraria* Schrad. ex J. F. Gmel. “may be a legitimately published earlier synonym” [note the qualification “may”], but also states that “From the description of Gmelin (l.c.), neither the genus nor species can be identified with certainty” — which goes against establishing that it is a synonym. It is certainly necessary to propose conservation. If this is accepted, then in the entry in Appendix IIIA it would seem better to treat *Cribraria* Schrad. ex J. F. Gmel. simply as an earlier homonym, because the status as a synonym has not been established with certainty.” — For the rest the proposal was approved without further debate.

(1691) Conserve the name *Hemitrichia* against *Hyporhamma* (proposed by C. Lado, U. Eliasson, S. L. Stephenson, A. Estrada-Torres & M. Schnittler in *Taxon* 54: 545. 2005). Votes: 14 : 0 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

Approved without further debate.

Proposals to amend the Code

In addition to Props 183–187 which are specifically mycological and which are discussed below, the Committee considered a selection of other proposals, the opinions on

which were communicated at the Nomenclature Section meetings in Vienna.

Prop. 183, to prohibit the introduction of new formal dual nomenclature (proposed by D. L. Hawksworth in *Taxon* 53: 597. 2004). Votes: 3 : 8 : 2 : 2 (majority no).

The dual nomenclature has been introduced because it is useful for communication. Users prefer a name as short as possible for what they see that is *Penicillium xy* not the *Penicillium* stage of whatever else. The desirability of abolishing dual nomenclature for sexual and asexual forms of a fungus have been strongly debated and the best synopsis of the debates is found in *Mycotaxon* 88: 493–508. 2003, in which a majority of mycologists present at IMC in Oslo express preference for the *status quo*. A simple abolition of the present system will throw mycological nomenclature into chaos unless precautions are taken that such a system will affect only names to be given in the future. Hennebert, in a text on the CBS website (www.cbs.knaw.nl) has analysed technical possibilities of such a change and found quite complicated solutions, which were not sufficiently taken into account, neither by Hawksworth nor by Rossman & Samuels. A system as proposed by Rossman & Samuels in *Inoculum* 56(3): 3–6, 2005 will also not work. These authors support their proposals by examples taken from some quite thoroughly studied genera, where a 1 : 1 relationship between anamorphs and teleomorphs has been achieved. Such cases are still exceptions; forcing supposedly congeneric taxa under one preferred generic name (either anamorph- or teleomorph-typified) does not make sense as long as so many fungal groups have not been based on a phylogenetic analysis establishing genera as monophyletic. Even in many of the carefully scrutinized groups, anamorph and teleomorph genera cannot be made to coincide. Declaring the binomial name introduced for an alternative morph illegitimate is quite a crude method and will cause more misinformation than lead to simplicity. It is indicative that two of the Yes voters are an agaricologist and a lichenologist who, in their work are not exposed to the complexity of the matter for pleomorphic ascomycetes.

Prop. 184, to avoid introduction of unnecessary teleomorph names (epitypes!) (proposed by D. L. Hawksworth in *Taxon* 53: 597. 2004). Votes: 3 : 8 : 2 : 2 (majority no).

Same comments.

Prop. 185, Provisions for the use of informal designations for anamorphs (proposed by D. L. Hawksworth in *Taxon* 53: 598. 2004). Votes: 3 : 8 : 2 : 2 (majority no).

Same comments.

Prop. 186, Recommendations on the use of informal designations for anamorphs (proposed by D. L. Hawksworth in *Taxon* 53: 598. 2004). Votes: 3 : 8 : 2 : 2 (majority no).

Same comments.

Prop. 187, to authorize the Ed. Comm. to amend cross-referencing (proposed by D. L. Hawksworth in *Taxon* 53:

598. 2004). Votes: 5 : 7 : 2 : 1 (majority no).

Same comments. Some editorial anticipation of a change might do no harm.

Prop. 057, to standardize *-opsidis* as the genitive of *-opsis* (Art. 18.1) (proposed by J. C. David, *Taxon* 52: 636. 2003). Votes: 12 : 2 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Supported without further debate.

Prop. 058, to add *-botrys* to the list of endings regarded as masculine (Art. 62.2), part of a (proposed by J. C. David in *Taxon* 52: 636. 2003). Votes: 11 : 3 : 0 : 1 (recommended).

Although some members would regret losing the familiar feminine gender of *Arthrobotrys* (at least 46 epithets), *Stachybotrys* (ca. 70 epithets), and other generic names, a majority accepts the proposal.