

| |
|--|
| PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT |
|--|

Edited by Dan H. Nicolson

Report of the Committee for Fungi: 8

Walter Gams¹

The previous report of the Committee was published in Taxon 47: 445-447. 1998. The Committee for Fungi still consists of the same 15 members: U. Braun (Halle, Germany), B. J. Coppins (Edinburgh, U.K.), V. Demoulin (Liège, Belgium), W. Gams (Baarn, Netherlands), P. M. Kirk (Egham, Surrey, U.K.), L. Holm (Uppsala, Sweden), P. M. Jørgensen (Bergen, Norway), T. W. Kuyper (now Wageningen, Netherlands), E. Parmasto, Chairman (Tartu, Estonia), G. Redeuilh (Maule, France), S. Redhead (Ottawa, Canada), G. J. Samuels (Beltsville, Maryland, USA), H. J. Sipman (Berlin, Germany), J. Walker (Baulkham Hills, N.S.W., Australia), and Zhuang Wen-Ying (Beijing, China).

The present report relates the outcome of a ballot which was completed by 13 members. The Committee recommends three of the proposals to conserve and five to reject names; two of the proposals had to be amended. One proposal to conserve and two to reject names are found unjustified. The remaining open proposals have not yet received an unequivocal vote or have not yet been voted upon.

A short-notice ballot on five proposals to amend the *Code* that are relevant to mycology was answered by 11 members.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(933) Conserve *Arthopyrenia* A. Massal. with a conserved type (proposed by Hawksworth & David in Taxon 38: 493. 1989). Votes: 13 : 0, supporting conservation in general; 10 : 3, to designate *A. cerasi* as conserved type (recommended; the remaining three votes were for *A. rhyponia*, as originally proposed).

Conservation was first regarded as being unnecessary (see Taxon 41: 107. 1992), but the discussion was reopened at the request of P. M. Jørgensen, because typification of *Arthopyrenia* by *A. rhyponia* (Ach.) A. Massal. could not be taken for granted. The main question was, which type would serve nomenclatural stability best. Candidates included *A. rhyponia* (a rather atypical species in the genus), *A. analepta* (a name of uncertain application, based on *Verrucaria olivacea* Pers., of which no type is preserved), *A. punctiformis* (a commonly used but widely misunderstood name), and *A. cerasi* (Schrad.) A. Massal., the identification of which is unequivocal. The latter type was suggested in a late stage by P. M. Jørgensen, following advice by R. C. Harris (More Florida Lich.: 76. 1995) who subdivided the heterogeneous genus *Arthopyrenia* among three different families. *A. cerasi* is representative of a large group of species.

¹ Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures, P. O. Box 273, NL-3740 AG Baarn, Netherlands.

(1096) Reject *Nephroma laevigatum* Ach. (proposed by Jørgensen in Taxon 43: 462-463. 1994). Votes: 4 : 9 (not recommended).

The proposal had already been withdrawn (see Taxon 44: 414. 1995), but the case was reopened at the request of Demoulin. The well-known name *Nephroma laevigatum* was misapplied in the past but is now in current use in the sense including its type, and that use is to continue.

(1145) Conserve *Octavianina* Kuntze against *Octaviana* Vittad. (proposed by David & Pegler in Taxon 44: 99-100. 1995). Votes: 3 : 10 (not recommended).

The dilemma between the two names was not of current use but of taxonomic conflict and possible homonymy. Typification and interpretation of *Octaviana* were strongly debated: typification by *O. asterosperma* was vaguely suggested by Corda (Anleit. Stud. Mykol.: 107. 1842) then definitely effected by Clements & Shear (Gen. Fungi: 355. 1931), and must be followed. Hence the two generic names have the same type, and *Octavianina* is a later orthographic variant, not to be used.

(1254) Conserve *Helotiaceae* Rehm against several earlier family names (proposed by Korf *et al.* in Taxon 45: 683-684. 1996). Votes: 13 : 0 (recommended).

Since the generic name *Helotium* Pers. [non Tode : Fr.] in discomycetes is a later homonym, the family name *Helotiaceae* based on it was illegitimate, and *Leotiaceae* Corda was commonly used for fungi formerly classified in *Helotiaceae*. However, the *Leotiaceae* in a strict sense are now regarded as unrelated to the bulk of the *Helotiales* (currently known as *Leotiales*) and may even belong to a different order. At any rate, a separate name is required for the large family that remains once *Leotia* Pers. : Fr. is excluded. Reintroduction of *Helotiaceae* by conservation is the simplest solution, as other family names in this order, particularly *Bulgariaceae* Fr., are less known and may be distinct at family level, as Döring & Triebel (in Cryptog. Lichénol. 19: 123-136. 1998) have demonstrated based on 18S ribosomal DNA sequences. *Cudoniella* Sacc. (the currently correct name for *Helotium* Pers.) has never been included in the *Bulgariaceae* and is probably not closely related to them.

(1255) Conserve *Hyphodontia* J. Erikss., *nom. cons.*, also against *Xylodon* (Pers.) Gray and *Schizopora* Velen. (proposed by Langer & al. in Taxon 45: 685-686. 1996). This was treated as two separate proposals: (a) add *Xylodon* as a rejected name: 13 : 0; (b) add also *Schizopora*: 12 : 1 (both recommended).

The desirability of rejecting *Xylodon* was evident, whereas *Schizopora* is sometimes recognised as a separate genus and sometimes treated as a synonym of *Hyphodontia*. However, even if rejected as a heterotypic synonym, *Schizopora* remains available for use in a restricted sense. Both names can therefore safely be listed as *nomina rejicienda* under *Hyphodontia*.

(1275) Conserve *Fusarium sambucinum* Fuckel against several earlier names (Proposed by Gams & al. in Taxon 46: 111-113. 1997). Votes: 13 : 0 (recommended).

The main concern of the proposers was to get rid of the confused name *Fusarium roseum* Link. Among other potential earlier synonyms, *F. sulphureum* Schldl. is also in use, but had not properly been typified; its type, recently discovered in Halle, probably represents a different fungus, making synonymy uncertain. The alternative

favoured by Subramanian in 1981, to adopt *F. maydis* Kalchbr., has never been followed, nor is the typification of that name settled. Hence conservation of the best known name, *F. sambucinum*, is supported.

(1276) Conserve *Luttrellia* Shearer against *Luttrellia* Khokhr. & Gornostaj (proposed by Crane & Shearer in Taxon 46: 114. 1997). Votes 12 : 1 (recommended).

Even though *Luttrellia* Shearer is less than 20 years old, its conservation is preferable to the creation of a new generic name for this fungus. *Luttrellia* Khokhr. & Gornostaj is not needed, being a synonym of *Exserohilum* K. J. Leonard & Suggs.

(1285-1286) Reject *Dactylium* Nees and *Dactylium candidum* Nees (proposed by Gams & Rubner in Taxon 46: 335. 1997). Votes: 13 : 0 (recommended).

The application of these names has always been uncertain, and for the nematophagous fungi in question *Monacrosporium* Oudem. has become firmly established in recent years. One of its species is often cited as *M. candidum* ("Nees : Fr., sensu Drechsler") X. Z. Liu & K. Q. Zhang, but that name has never been formally neotypified; for this species the name *M. haptotylum* (Drechsler) X. Z. Liu & K. Q. Zhang has also become established. Rejection of *D. candidum* will settle a long-lasting debate.

(1302) Reject *Lecidea tavaresiana* H. Magn. (proposed by C. Printzen in Taxon 46: 543. 1997). Votes: 3 : 10 (not recommended).

The species will have to be anyhow transferred to a new genus and will thus undergo a name change. Therefore, rejection is not supported. The required new combination will have to be based correctly on *Lecidea tavaresiana* rather than on the better known *L. carrollii* Coppins & P. James.

(1303) Reject *Lecanora anomala* var. *tenebricosa* Ach. (proposed by C. Printzen in Taxon 46: 543-544. 1997). Votes: 10 : 3 (recommended).

Rejection of a varietal name is a rare case, but the taxon became subsequently known as a species, *Lecanora tenebricosa* (Ach.) Röhl. In view of the heterogeneous nature of the type material and of the fact that, upon lectotypification, *L. tenebricosa* would inevitably displace a now generally used but junior species name, rejection is supported.

Proposals to amend the Code

(211 & 212) = Art. 8 Prop. C + Art. 37 Prop. A + Art. 9 Prop. C – Gams & al. in Taxon 47: 954. 1998. – Votes: 9 : 2 (recommended).

After controversial discussions on the reliability of permanently preserved living fungal cultures, the proposed solution was found acceptable by a majority, when explicitly restricted to the fungal groups specified.

(213) Rec. 50E Prop. B – Kuyper & al. in Taxon 47: 955. 1998. – Votes: 10 : 0 : 1 for more discussion (recommended).

The proposed modification explains and describes the way of citing authorship of sanctioned names that has become general practice since 1981. An addition to the

proposed text was suggested: “The same convention should be used for all combinations based on the sanctioned name”.

(214) = Art. 59 Prop. B – Jørgensen & Gams in Taxon 47: 956. 1998. – Votes: 8 : 2 : 1 for more discussion (almost recommended).

Art. 59 opens too widely the door for a double nomenclature for anamorphs and teleomorphs. This proposal tries to shift the balance by discouraging the use of anamorph names when they are not strictly needed.

(215) = Art. 59 Prop. A – Jørgensen & Gams in Taxon 47: 956. 1998. – Votes: 10 : 1 (recommended).

This proposal offers an editorial amendment in line with current practice.