

### Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens: 3

Walter Gams<sup>1</sup>

#### Summary

Gams, W.: Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens: 3. – *Taxon* 42: 112-118. 1993. – ISSN 0040-0262.

The Committee for Fungi and Lichens reports its recommendations on 15 proposals, one to amend the *Code* and 14 to conserve or reject names, recommending 10.

The previous report of the Committee was published in *Taxon* 41: 99-108. 1992. The present text reports on the activities of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens in the period Jan 1991 to Feb 1992 and deals with one proposal to amend the *Code* and 14 proposals to conserve or reject names of fungal taxa.

Most ballots were answered by all fifteen members of the Committee, a majority of at least ten positive votes being necessary for a proposal requiring a change in the listing in the appendices of the *Code* to pass. If a proposal was rejected by eight explicit No votes, the Committee discontinued discussion. The votes are recorded in the order Yes : No (incl. Abstain) : Continue Discussion. Those involved in the voting were U. Braun (Germany, from 26 Jul 1991), B. J. Coppins (U.K.), L. Holm (Sweden, Chairman), V. Demoulin (Belgium), W. Gams (Netherlands, secretary), D. L. Hawksworth (U.K.), P. M. Jørgensen (Norway), L. M. Kohn (Canada, until 9 Jun 1991), T. W. Kuyper (Netherlands), M. Larsen (U.S.A., from 1 Jun 1991 until 9 Sep 1991), E. Parmasto (Estonia), Z. Pouzar (Czechoslovakia), G. Redeuilh (France), S. A. Redhead (Canada), M. A. Rifai (Indonesia), G. J. Samuels (U.S.A., from 15 Dec 1991), and J. Walker (Australia).

The Committee voted unanimously against proposal (12), by Kostermans, to amend Art. 48 of the *Code* (*Taxon* 39: 539. 1990). Although this in no way is a “fungal/lichen” problem, the Committee regards the word ‘explicit’ as having an essential function in this Article. If it is deleted, it can never unambiguously be determined whether a new name has been created.

The Committee recommends ten of the proposals to conserve, and voted with at least eight votes against four. Other proposals which did not receive either a two-thirds majority for or eight votes against are still under discussion by the Committee, and will remain so until such a majority is achieved. Five proposals had to be modified considerably before a decision could be taken, and bibliographic references are added in the appropriate places. For other references the original proposals should be consulted.

(674) Conserve *Hyphodontia* J. Erikss. against *Kneiffiella* P. Karst. (proposed by Eriksson & al. in *Taxon* 31: 744. 1982). Published comment: Burdsall & Larsen (1983). Votes: 12 : 3 : 0 (recommended as modified).

The confusion around generic names in the *Corticaceae* is greater than anticipated in the proposal. *Hyphodontia* is sufficiently large (more than 40 species,

<sup>1</sup> Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures, P. O. Box 273, NL-3740 AG Baarn, The Netherlands.

including some important wood decayers) and widespread to justify conservation. But several additional competing generic names had to be screened by the Committee, following a series of publications listed below.

*Grandinia* Fries (1838) was reintroduced by Jülich (1982, 1983) who found that type material of *Thelephora granulosa* preserved at Leiden (L) represented a *Hyphodontia*. But a reintroduction of *Grandinia* is not found desirable. *Grandinia* was erected on seven species. Donk (1956, q.v. for further references) reviewed its lectotypification. The first species mentioned by Fries, *G. polycocca* Fr., of doubtful identity, was selected as type by Banker and Miller & Boyle under the *American Code*. Clements & Shear had selected *G. granulosa* Fr., the most common species among those listed by Fries, as the type; a specimen in Fries's herbarium has been classified in *Asterostromella* Höhn. & Litsch. (= *Vararia* P. Karst.), but this identification conflicts with the protologue (Donk, 1956), and Rogers & Jackson, based on Fries's interpretation, regarded *Thelephora (Grandinia) granulosa* as a nomen dubium. Until the 1950s, *Grandinia* was a well-known name for a genus which Bourdot & Galzin (1928) had vaguely characterized by blunt or pointed denticles and lack of cystidia and cystidioles, thus being different from *Hyphodontia*. *Grandinia granulosa* (Pers. : Fr.) Fr. sensu Bourdot & Galzin was redescribed by Pouzar (1982) who showed that it belonged to *Vararia* and had to be renamed *Vararia borealis*. It was only Jülich (1983) who examined Persoon's original material of *Thelephora granulosa* Pers. : Fr. at Leiden and found it to be identical with *Hyphodontia aspera* (Fr.) J. Erikss. Jülich's typification of *Thelephora granulosa* Pers. might be considered as arbitrary by some, especially in the light of Art. 7.20 and the existence of a specimen in UPS that conforms to the (second) sanctioning description in Fries (1828: 217).

*Lyomyces* P. Karst. was mentioned by Jülich (1983) as possibly congeneric with *Hyphodontia*. The name has often been lectotypified with *L. roseus* (Pers. : Fr.) P. Karst., which is a species of *Laeticorticium* Donk (*Corticium* Pers. s. str.) (Donk, 1957; Eriksson & Hjortstam, 1983), because this is one of the two species later retained in the genus by Karsten (see Donk, 1957). But the only species originally included in the genus, *L. serus* (Pers.) P. Karst., is the same as *Thelephora sambuci* Pers., which has been included in *Hyphodontia* as *H. sambuci* (Pers.) J. Erikss.

*Hyphodontia*, when originally published, was a superfluous name as it included *Hydnum barba-jovis*, which is the original type of the earlier *Kneiffiella* P. Karst. *Hydnum barba-jovis* Bull. : Fr. was neotypified by Jülich (1984), according to the original diagnosis, with a specimen that fits in *Hyphodontia*. Later Karsten became aware that the material he had so named had been misidentified, and he renamed it *K. bombycina* P. Karst., a tomentelloid fungus now known as *Tomentellina bombycina* (P. Karst.) Bourdot & Galzin. Therefore, before Jülich & Stalpers, *Kneiffiella* has never been used for species of *Hyphodontia* and its resurrection in this sense is undesirable.

*Chaetoporellus* Bondartsev & Singer was discussed by Donk (1967) and Jülich (1982). Its type, *C. latitans* (Bourdot & Galzin) Bondartsev & Singer, a rare species, may be regarded as a member of *Hyphodontia* (Eriksson & Hjortstam, 1983). Subsequently the name *Chaetoporellus* has not been used.

The new entry in App. IIIA should read:

- Hyphodontia** John Eriksson, *Symb. Bot. Upsal.* 16(1): 101. 1958.  
T.: *H. pallidula* (G. Bresadola) John Eriksson (*Gonatobotrys pallidula* G. Bresadola).
- (=) *Grandinia* Fries, *Epicr. Syst. Mycol.* 527. 1838.  
LT.: *Thelephora granulosa* Persoon : Fries (vide Clements & Shear, *Gen. Fung.*, ed. 2: 346. 1931).
- (=) *Lyomyces* P. Karsten, *Rev. Mycol. (Toulouse)* 3(9): 23. 1881 ("Lyomices").  
T.: *L. serus* (Persoon) P. Karsten (*Hydnum serum* Persoon).
- (=) *Kneiffiella* P. Karsten, *Bidrag Kännedom Finlands Natur Folk* 48: 371. 1889.  
T.: *K. barba-jovis* (Bulliard : Fries) P. Karsten (*Hydnum barba-jovis* Bulliard : Fries).
- (=) *Chaetoporellus* Bondartsev & Singer, *Mycologia* 36: 67. 1944.  
T.: *Chaetoporellus latitans* (Bourdot & Galzin) Bondartsev & Singer (*Poria latitans* Bourdot & Galzin).

(847) Conserve *Lepiota* (Pers.) Gray with a conserved type, *L. cristata* (proposed by Rauschert in *Taxon* 35: 738-740. 1986). Votes: general desirability of conserving the name *Lepiota* as distinct from *Macrolepiota*: 13 : 2 : 0 (recommended as modified). Ten members voted for changing the proposed type from *L. cristata* to *Agaricus colubrinus* or *A. clypeolarius*.

*Macrolepiota* is too different from *Lepiota* to be merged with it (see also Romagnesi, 1990). The type of *Lepiota* would be *L. procera* unless conserved otherwise. The original proposal with *L. cristata* as conserved type is not the best solution. There are two reasons for preferring *L. colubrina* as type for *Lepiota* instead of *L. cristata*. First, selection of *L. colubrina* will not upset sectional nomenclature; secondly, *L. cristata* is also the type of *Lepiotula* (Maire) Horák. Therefore one of the remaining original species deserves preference. *Agaricus colubrinus* Pers. is a later homonym of *A. colubrinus* Bull., a synonym of *Lepiota procera* (its epithet apparently alluding to the snake-like ornamentation of the stipe), and is homotypic with the sanctioned *A. clypeolarius* Bull. : Fr. (both being based on Plate 405 of Bulliard). *A. colubrinus* Pers. even though listed as the conserved type of *Lepiota*, remains illegitimate and is homotypic with the legitimate and correct name *L. clypeolaria* (Bull. : Fr.) Kummer, designating a well-known taxon that happens to have a central position in the genus as presently understood. The new entry in App. IIIA should read:

**Lepiota** (Persoon) S. F. Gray, *Nat. Arr. Brit. Pl.* 1: 601. 1821. (*Agaricus* sect. *Lepiota* Persoon, *Tent. Disp. Meth.* 68. 1797).  
T.: *Agaricus colubrinus* Persoon non Bulliard (*L. clypeolaria* (Bulliard : Fries) Kummer, *Agaricus clypeolarius* Bulliard : Fries) (*typ. cons.*).

(861) Conserve *Hexagona* Fr. against *Hexagonia* Pollini (proposed by Ryvarden in *Taxon* 36: 160. 1987). Votes: 10 : 5 : 0 (recommended as modified).

The Committee takes the view that Fries did not intend to create a new genus *Hexagonia* Fr., only to emend *Hexagonia* Pollini. But by analogy to Art. 14 Ex. 6 he is nevertheless considered the author of a homonym. Fries (1838: 496) unequivocally attributed *Hexagona* [sic] to Pollini and included the original type, *H. mori*. He

clearly made a mistake when forgetting the *i* in the genus name. Donk's studies (1969) refute Kauffmann Fidalgo (1968). The Committee accepts Donk's arguments for preferring *H. hirta* (Beauv. : Fr.) Fr. to *H. crinigera* Fr. as conserved type. *H. hirta* and *H. crinigera* are normally considered taxonomic synonyms. *H. hirta* possesses a holotype, which is not the case with *H. crinigera*, and it is the correct name of the taxon. Donk (e.g. 1969: 663) and Kreisel (1969: 175, pl. 6) considered *Scenidium* to be the correct name for polypores related to *H. hirta*. *Scenidium* has been used by others than Kuntze and Jülich, but it is not really "in current use". Even if *Hexagonia* is a small genus, some species are sufficiently striking and common and the name has been so generally used that a case for conservation is acceptable. The Committee disapproves the original proposal because of the choice of *H. crinigera* instead of *H. hirta* as type, and of the spelling *Hexagona* instead of *Hexagonia*. The modification involving the conservation of *Hexagonia* Fr. with a new type (*H. hirta*) is preferred. The entry in App. IIIA should read:

**Hexagonia** Fries, Epicr. Syst. Mycol. 496. 1838 ("*Hexagona*").

T.: *H. hirta* (Beauvérie : Fries) Fries (*Favolus hirtus* Beauvérie : Fries) (*typ. cons.*).

(H) *Hexagonia* Pollini, Hort. Veron. Pl. Nov. 35. 1816 [FUNGI].

T.: *H. mori* Pollini.

(894) Conserve *Gyalideopsis* Vězda against *Diploschistella* Vainio (proposed by Lumbsch & Hawksworth in Taxon 36: 764-765. 1987). Votes: 10 : 4 : 0 (recommended).

When he described *Gyalideopsis* from Europe, Vězda could not possibly have come across and checked a unispecific genus of uncertain affinity from South Africa, *Diploschistella*, thus his genus was not established as a result of bad taxonomy. The genus has proved to be large (now about 30 species) and widespread. It is frequently mentioned in recent literature and is biologically interesting. Conservation of *Gyalideopsis* is clearly in the interest of nomenclatural stability.

(907) Conserve *Aspicilia* Massal. against several names (proposed by Laundon & Hawksworth in Taxon 37: 478-479. 1988). Votes: 13 : 2 : 0 (recommended as modified).

Typification had to be settled before the proposal could be considered. The type of the species name representing the generic type is a very poor illustration which can be interpreted as representing different species. As generic names may now be typified on specimens used by the author when describing the genus, Schaerer's exsiccata (obviously the second edition) No. 125 and No. 127, cited by Massalongo, were considered for typification. Specimens of *Schaerer 125* and *127* in different herbaria have been checked. The exsiccata of either number are so far found to be uniform, and No. 127 is best developed. *Schaerer 125* and *127* are congeneric but belong to different species of *Aspicilia* s. str.: *125* to *A. caesiocinerea*, *127* to *A. cinerea*. Laundon, the original proposer, supports Jørgensen's (pers. comm.) suggestion to adopt *Schaerer 127* (VER) as the conserved type. The entry of the conserved name in App. IIIA should read:

**Aspicilia** Massalongo, Ric. Auton. Lich. Crost. 36. 1852.

T.: "*Urceolaria cinerea*  $\beta$  *alba*" Schaerer, Lich. Helv. Exs., ed. 2, Fasc. 6: No. 127 (VER) (*typ. cons.*) [= *Aspicilia cinerea* (Linnaeus) Körber, *Lichen cinereus* Linnaeus].

(=) [Rejected names as in original proposal].

(908) Conserve *Parmeliopsis* (Nyl.) Nyl. with a conserved type, *P. ambigua* (proposed by Jørgensen in Taxon 37: 479-480. 1988). Votes: 12 : 1 : 1 (recommended).

The Committee supports the view that Nylander implicitly holotypified *Parmeliopsis* with *P. placorodia*. If this were not the case, the choice of *P. ambigua* by Clements & Shear would solve all problems, and conservation would be superfluous. Both usages of the genus name are now current. This typification is preferred over that in Prop. (942).

(934) Add *Coniangium* Fr. to the names rejected against *Arthonia* Ach., nom. cons. (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 493-494. 1988). Votes: 5 : 9 : 0 (not recommended).

*Coniangium* Fr. was a nomen nudum in Fries's *Systema* and was validated only later in 1821 in a separate paper by Fries. *Coniangium*, being nomenclaturally non-existent on 1 Jan 1821, cannot be regarded as sanctioned, and does not therefore threaten *Arthonia*. The proposal is unnecessary.

(940) Conserve *Monographos* Fuckel with a conserved type, *M. fuckelii* (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 496. 1989). Votes: 5 : 9 : 0 (not recommended).

The Committee remains unconvinced that conservation of the name of a genus with two species without importance in plant pathology etc. is justified. Moreover, *Monographos* was introduced for a misidentified fungus.

(941) Conserve the spelling *Mycoblastus* Norman instead of *Mykoblastus* (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 496. 1989). Votes: 10 : 4 : 0 (recommended).

The Committee regretfully agrees that it is not possible to correct an incorrectly Latinized name in a simpler way. According to Art. 14.10, incorrect and correct transliterations may both be interpreted as "particular orthographies".

(942) Conserve *Parmeliopsis* (Nyl.) Nyl. with a conserved type, *P. placorodia* (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 497. 1989). Votes: 0 : 12 : 2 (not recommended). See Prop. (908).

(943) Conserve *Schaereria* Th. Fr. against *Schaereria* Körb. (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 497. 1989). Votes 13-1-0 (recommended as modified).

Körber's new genus, *Schaereria*, was based on a specimen misidentified as *Lecidea lugubris* Sommerfelt. As Art. 14.3 permits the conservation of generic names as typified by specimens, it is desirable to conserve *Schaereria* Körb. based on one of

the original specimens used by the author. Rather than designating *L. cinereorufa* Schaer. as type, as had been proposed, the Committee prefers to list an original specimen as the conserved type: the specimen, in Munich (M), erroneously labelled *Schaereria lugubris*, from Falkenstein, leg. Krempelhuber, which is a duplicate of one of the specimens cited by Körber. This clearly belongs to *Schaereria cinereorufa*. The entry in App. IIIA should read:

**Schaereria** Körber, Syst. Lich. Germ. 232. 1855.

T.: "*Schaereria lugubris*" Falkenstein, *Krempelhuber*, (M) (*typ. cons.*)  
[= *Schaereria cinereorufa* Schaerer].

(945) Conserve *Micarea* Fr. (Dec 1825) against *Micarea* Fr. (ante Mai 1825) (proposed by Coppins in Taxon 38: 499-501. 1989). Votes: 13 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

The original description of the genus *Micarea* Fr., on a herbarium label, is regarded as valid (with a diagnosis as required by Art. 32.2, and with definite acceptance as required by Art. 34.1, see also Art. 33, Ex. 2). Therefore conservation is necessary to correct this overlooked original misuse of the name by Fries himself.

(962) Conserve *Cryptosphaeria* Ces. & De Not. against *Cryptosphaeria* Grev. (proposed by Rappaz in Taxon 38: 664. 1989). Votes: 13 : 1 : 0 (recommended).

In addition to the arguments of the proposal, it is noted that *Cryptosphaeria* Grev. was superfluous when published, as it included *Circinostroma* Gray and *Exormatostoma* Gray. This means that the type must be listed as conserved.

(968) Conserve *Pulvinula* Boud. against *Pulparia* P. Karst. (proposed by Dissing & al. in Taxon 39: 130-131. 1990). Votes: 11 : 3 : 1 (recommended).

*Pulparia* P. Karst. has been used (incorrectly!) since 1971 for a different group of somewhat similar (at least spherical-spored) species by Korf and many other authors. Although *Pulvinula* Boud. probably only has about 25 species, failure to conserve the name would result not only in about 25 name changes but also in the use of the name *Pulparia* for a genus very different from that to which it has been applied for the last 20 years.

(973) Conserve *Sarcoscypha* (Fr.) Boud. with a conserved type, *S. coccinea* (proposed by Korf & Harrington in Taxon 39: 342-343. 1990). Votes: 6 : 8 : 0 (not recommended).

The Committee also wishes to accept *Sarcoscypha* with *S. coccinea* as type, but finds that Clements & Shear's lectotypification with this species name can be upheld under Art. 7.20. Invalidly published names, such as Martius's (1817) *Peziza* "tribus" *Sarcoscyphi*, are nomenclaturally nonexistent (Art. 12). According to Art. 46.3, the correct author citation is *Peziza* "tribus" *Sarcoscypha* Fr. Conservation is thus unnecessary.

#### Acknowledgements

I close this report with thanks to E. Parmasto and T. W. Kuyper for editorial assistance.

*Literature cited*

- Burdsall, H. H. & Larsen, M. J. 1983. On the recent proposal to conserve *Hyphodontia* J. Erikss. against *Knieffiella* [sic!] Karst. *Mycotaxon* 17: 513-516.
- Bourdot, H. & Galzin, A. 1928. *Hyménomycètes de France*. Sceaux.
- Donk, M. A. 1956. The generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes – V “*Hydnaceae*”. *Taxon* 5: 69-80.
- 1957. The generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes – VII “*Thelephoraceae*”. *Taxon* 6: 17-28, 68-85.
- 1967. Notes on European polypores – II. *Persoonia* 5: 47-130.
- 1969. On the typification of *Hexagonia* Pollini per Fr. *Taxon* 18: 663-666.
- Eriksson, J. & Hjortstam, K. 1983. *Hyphodontia* versus *Grandinia* and some other actual problems in corticology. *Windahlia* 12-13: 3-17.
- Fries, E. M. 1828. *Elenchus fungorum*, 2. Greifswald.
- 1838. *Epicrisis systematis mycologici, seu synopsis Hymenomycetum*. Uppsala & Lund.
- Jülich, W. 1982. Studies in resupinate Basidiomycetes – VII. *Int. J. Mycol. Lichenol.* 1(1): 27-37.
- 1983. (706)-(707) Proposals to emend entries under *Tomentella*, nom. cons., and to add nomina rejicienda to *Craterellus*, nom. cons. with discussions of other old generic names for Aphyllophorales (Basidiomycetes). *Taxon* 32: 480-484.
1984. Neotypification of *Hydnum barba-jovis* Bull. : Fr. *Persoonia* 12: 307-315.
- Kauffmann Fidalgo, M. E. P. 1968. Typification of the genus *Hexagona*. *Taxon* 17: 37-43.
- Kreisel, H. 1969: *Grundzüge eines natürlichen Systems der Pilze*. Lehre.
- Pouzar, Z. 1982. The problem of the correct name of *Vararia granulosa* (*Lachnocladiaceae*). *Česká Mykol.* 36: 72-76.
- Romagnesi, H. 1990. Étude sur les Lépiotes (= *Macrolepiota*) du “groupe *procera*”. *Bull. Trimestriel Soc. Mycol. France* 106(3): (68).