

NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE FOR FUNGI

22 February, 2007

Commenting procedures

All proposals for our action are numbered by IAPT as published in TAXON, and we assume that all members have TAXON available in its entirety. As Secretary, I will send whatever references are necessary (either articles in TAXON or elsewhere) to those who lack **and** request them. **Commentaries** contain the accumulated responses sent to the Secretary by CF members who wish to comment on TAXON proposals or a previous commentary. Before emailing input to the Secretary, members should edit for clarity & brevity and separate comments according to proposal number. Members are also *encouraged* to forward any **published** comments regarding proposals to the Secretary, who will forward them to all CF members. Commentaries are emailed to Committee members as PDF attachments at least four times a year and will be posted on the CBS Nomenclature website <http://www.cbs.knaw.nl/nomenclature/index.htm>. Discussions are cumulative, so that members can safely refer to the most recent commentary, which will contain all discussion on a topic up to that date. Text pertaining to proposals that have been recommended or rejected by the Committee after a ballot will be removed.

Commentaries follow a format that is slightly different from previous mailings. Discussions are still grouped in three sections: GENERAL REMARKS (if present), PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES, and PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE. Proposal sections are still organized numerically by proposal, with each proposal topic headed by proposal number, informal title, and reference citation. Where votes have been held, ballot tallies still appear in the second paragraph (see Ballots, below). When necessary, I will assign temporary CF numbers to topics or unassigned proposals; these discussions will stand at the end of the appropriate section.

Member comments are assigned alphanumeric codes that begin with the first four letters of the member's name and end with a date-based number in YMMDD format. This new method codes the dates each comment are submitted, particularly helpful in long-running discussions. For the same reason, each proposal's comments will now stand in chronological order according to submission date rather than alphabetically by member name. Smaller (10-point) font indicates text that printed previously; new text appearing for the first time is in 12-point font and, as before, with the member code flagged by an arrow (→). Please note that this PDF is formatted for LETTER style paper; you may wish to convert to A4 before printing hard copy.

Ballots will be held two or more times as year as needed. Commentaries include a running tally of all Committee votes, which are reported as YES : NO : MORE DISCUSSION NEEDED : ABSTENTION. A 60% majority (now **10!**) of the whole Committee must vote YES or NO to remove a proposal from discussion. Members are urged to return every ballot and vote on every ballot issue. Members "who, for three times in sequence over a period of nine months or more, fail to respond to requests for voting or subsequent reminders, are considered to have resigned" and will be replaced. Any qualified request for more discussion may outweigh a majority decision of the Committee and the respective proposal will remain open for further discussion.

GENERAL REMARKS:

Ascomycota Cavalier-Smith

Committee members are encouraged to comment on the name *Ascomycota* Cavalier-Smith (refer to Letter4_Ascomycota.pdf for detailed background information). Responses will be not be incorporated into these Commentaries unless a majority of members request otherwise.

Article 59

The Special Committee on Names for Pleomorphic Fungi (Chair Rossmann, Secretary Redhead, and members Bischoff, Gams, Grgurinovic, Hawksworth, Hosoya, Kirk, Sampaio, Seifert, Spiegel & Wingfield) has been formed. Members are instructed to evaluate the impact of modifications (or elimination of) **Art. 59**, and forward recommendations to the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi and General Committee for further input before presentation to the Nomenclature Section at the 18th Botanical Congress in Melbourne. Please contact Scott Redhead for additional information.

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

Prop. 1078, to conserve *Laurera* Rchb. with a conserved type against *Laureria* Schltdl. Proposed by Per M. Jørgensen & R. Santesson. Taxon 42: 884.

BACKGROUND—GAMS 50823: One question has remained open among the proposals handled during my function as Secretary of the CF:

Prop. 1078 on *Laurera* vs. *Laureria* was reported in Taxon 45: 310. 1996, with a 10 votes majority for the names not being confusable, and an 8 votes majority for superfluity of the proposal. The latter vote was not recognized as sufficient by the General Committee (Taxon 48: 374. 1999), because a minimum of 9 votes would have been necessary to represent 60% of the membership, although the outcome was the direct consequence of the first vote about confusability. Therefore I send out my last ballot in order not to burden my successor with this futility. To close the books you would have to vote Yes to the question:

Do you consider conservation of the name *Laurera* with a conserved type unnecessary?

Voted: 11-0-0-7

[SECRETARY'S COMMENT: *Unfinished business now concluded. This item will be removed from future Commentaries.*]

Prop. 1486, to conserve the name *Coprinus* Pers. (*Basidiomycota*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Per M. Jørgensen, Svengunnar Ryman, W. Gams & J.A. Stalpers. Taxon 50(3): 909-910. 2001.

Voted: [September, 2003] 7-5-1-0, clearly divided opinions, remaining open for discussion
[23 Dec. 2004 and later] 6-7-1-1. Although no 60% majority defeated the proposal, Secretary Gams removed this from our discussion due to the passage of Proposition 1474b to conserve *Coprinopsis*.

[24 Nov. 2006]: 2-11-0-0 (4 members did not reply.)

[SECRETARY'S COMMENT: *As a 64.7% majority of the Committee rejected this proposal, it is now permanently retired from our lists.*]

Prop. 1708, to conserve the name *Perenniporia* against *Physisporus* with a conserved type (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Cony Decock & Joost Stalpers. Taxon 55(1): 227.

[See also Decock & Stalpers, 2006, Taxon 55(3): 759-778 for a detailed discussion of the taxonomy.]

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 60530:** The authors provide excellent support for conserving *Perenniporia* Murrill against *Physisporus* with *Perenniporia medulla-panis* as the conserved type. I support this proposal.

→**REDH 61130:** This made a lot of sense and certainly clarified a very messy uncertain situation in order to stabilize the usage of the name. It would do no good to go back to using the very confusing *Poria*. I support the proposal.

→**REDH 61206:** I just noticed an error in Prop. 1708 that I should have picked up on earlier (when editing it). In their proposal they propose to conserve *Perenniporia* with *Perenniporia* [sic] *medulla-panis* (Jacq. : Fr.) Murrill as conserved type. However, Murrill did not make that combination. It should instead have been written, *Perenniporia* [sic] *medulla-panis* (Jacq. : Fr.) Donk (*Persoonia* 5: 76. 1967). The authors correctly treated the authority (p. 768) in their longer nomenclatural paper in Taxon 55(3): 759-778. 2006.

Should the proposal pass we will need to put down the correct authority. This is a case of conservation under Art. 57, although that is not spelled out. Please include these comments in the circular.

→**NORV 61215:** Redhead (REDH 61206) correctly notes that the proper name for the proposed type should be *Perenniporia medulla-panis* (Jacq.: Fr.) Donk.

Prop. 1709, to conserve the name *Chroogomphus* against *Brauniellula* (*Gomphidiaceae*, *Agaricales*, *Basidiomycota*). Proposed by M. Catherine Aime & Orson K. Miller, Jr.†. *Taxon* 55 (1): 228.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 60915:** I foresee a number of like proposals for the future as morphologically based generic concepts give way to ‘sequence-based’ generic concepts. The decision to confer conservation upon the more widely known name would be well advised in this instance, presuming that the taxa are congeneric. I support this proposal.

→**REDH 61130:** This makes sense as *Chroogomphus* is far better known. The only question arising here is whether the two are synonymous. Manfred Binder may have additional information on these genera and had questioned it. We should ask for his input into the taxonomy. Nonetheless I would support the proposal.

Prop. 1719, to conserve the name *Spilomium graphideorum* with a conserved type to safeguard the current usage of the generic names *Lecanographa* and *Milospium* (*Fungi*). Proposed by David L. Hawksworth. *Taxon* 55(2): 528–529.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 60915:** The proposal well clarifies the byzantine nomenclatural history behind *Milospium graphideorum* (Nyl.) D. Hawksw. and provides good support for designating a type based on the lichenicolous hyphomycete. I support this proposal.

→**REDH 61130:** I know little about these fungi, but the proposal made sense to me and effectively will stabilize the situation.

Prop. 1730, to conserve the name *Strigula schizospora* against *S. gibberosa* (*Ascomycota: Prynulales: Strigulaceae*). Proposed by Robert Lücking. *Taxon* 55: 801.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**REDH 61130:** This proposal made sense to me. I support it.

→**NORV 61215:** Lücking provides excellent support for conserving a “widely accepted and commonly used name for a widespread and abundant species” over an earlier named synonym. I support the proposal.

Prop. 1731, to conserve the name *Lichenochora* against *Paralaestadia*. Proposed by Nikolaus Hoffmann, Josef Hafellner & David L. Hawksworth. *Taxon* 55(3): 802.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**REDH 61130:** I support this proposal.

→**NORV 61215:** The authors explain to my satisfaction why the name for a genus already containing 25 species but proposed only 17 years ago should be conserved over a ‘name apparently never used since 1921 for these fungi.’ I support this proposal.

Prop. 1732, to conserve the name *Pseudocercospora* against *Stigmina* and *Phaeoisariopsis* (*Hyphomycetes*). Proposed by Uwe Braun & Pedro Crous. Taxon 55(3): 803.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**REDH 61130:** This is one of the more controversial proposal and I am withholding judgement until I hear more from committee members more familiar with these fungi and genera.

→**NORV 61215:** Although the proposers’ statement that “it is inevitable that *Stigmina*, *Phaeoisariopsis* and *Pseudocercospora* be merged” might be challenged by those holding different taxonomic opinions, their proposal to conserve a unified genus under the name *Pseudocercospora* is a pragmatic and welcome solution. Nonetheless, I need opinions from members who better understand the ramifications of such a proposal before making a final decision.

Props. 1733–1735, to conserve the names *Chrysomyxa empetri*, *C. piperiana*, and *C. ledicola* (*Uredinales*) with teleomorph types against their anamorph homonyms. Proposed by Patricia E. Crane. Taxon 55(3): 804–805.

[SECRETARY’S COMMENT: Discussion pertaining to the three proposals as a unit will be placed after the above header. Comments directed to only one proposal will be placed after the appropriate header below.]

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**REDH 61130:** Each of these makes sense and were long over due but note that an alternative solution might be possible. The author had indicated a willingness to go the route of epitypification prior to publication, but because the proposals had been delayed for so long it was decided to go ahead with them as published. Epitypification of the anamorphic names by teleomorphs is possible (Vienna Code: Art. 59. 7) when “no existing legitimate name for the holomorph” is available. Committee members should be aware of the fact that a special committee on Art. 59 has been established which may lead to recommended changes ranging from further modification towards single names or towards changing it backwards to pre-Vienna Code wording. It is not known how the Special Committee will lean. For now the safest route to go would be to support 1733 and 1734, which maintain current usage. 1735 is slightly different because a place of publication and a type need conservation, but is also supportable.

→**NORV 61215:** I support these proposals.

(1733) *Chrysomyxa empetri* vs. *Chrysomyxa empetri* (p. 804)

(1734) *Chrysomyxa piperiana* vs. *Chrysomyxa piperiana* (p. 804-5)

(1735) *Chrysomyxa ledicola* +type vs. *Chrysomyxa ledicola* (p. 805)

Committee comments:

Prop. 1738, to conserve the name *Poria cocos* against *Daedalea extensa* (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Scott A. Redhead & James Ginns. Taxon 55(4): 1027–1028.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70128:** The proposers clarify an unusually tangled nomenclature where “there are dual nomenclatures running in parallel — the correct one using ‘*extensa*’ and the popular one, using ‘*cocos*’.” They provide the history behind a continuing 23-year long resistance by the majority of the “scientific, medical, and other user communities” to use the nomenclaturally correct species epithet (‘*extensa*’) despite the Ginns & Lowe (1983) paper that publicized the proper use of ‘*extensa*’. Rather than continue to beat a dead horse, I agree with the Redhead & Ginns conclusion that “it is in the best interest of science to make correct the continued usage of ‘*cocos*’ via conservation of *Poria cocos*.”

Prop. 1739, to conserve the name *Boletus applanatus* against *B. lipsiensis* (Basidiomycota).
Proposed by Scott A. Redhead, James Ginns & Jean-Marc Moncalvo. Taxon 55(4): 1029–1030.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70128:** There is no doubt that the shifting the starting dates for fungal nomenclature in the 1910 and 1983 CODES has considerably complicated the tortuous nomenclatural path of the well-known ganoderma first published by Batsch (1796) as *Boletus lipsiensis* but more commonly accepted using the ‘*applanatus*’ introduced by Persoon (1800) four years later. Redhead & al. observe that current use of ‘*applanatus*’ is far more frequent than for the earlier named ‘*lipsiensis*’, but perhaps more persuasive is their discussion of the type designations for each name. I tend to support this proposal.

Prop. 1740, to conserve the name *Agaricus lepideus* against *A. suffrutescens* (Basidiomycota).
Proposed by Scott A. Redhead, James Ginns & Tom. W, May. Taxon 55(4): 1030–1032.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70205:** The widespread and well-known train-wrecker, *Neolentinus lepideus*, is definitely a destructive fungus of significant economic importance. It is indeed unfortunate that when Fries proposed *A. lepideus* in 1815, he sanctioned it against older synonyms but not against *A. suffrutescens*, another earlier named taxon (1805) that he regarded as a distinct species. Eventually, the lesser-known ‘*suffrutescens*’ came to be regarded as a synonym of ‘*lepideus*’ by most mycologists. This situation continues to the present day even though May & Wood (1995) treated ‘*lepideus*’ as a synonym of their new combination, *Neolentinus suffrutescens*, correctly in accordance with the Sydney Code (1983). This confusing nomenclatural situation is exacerbated by the fact that some authorities list the two names as synonyms while others continue to treat them as independent species.

This situation is definitely complex. As Redhead & al. note, “Adoption of *N. suffrutescens* is also historically unusual in that its basionym is not the oldest validly published name, but enjoys a special status because of a series of unanticipated repercussions of changes to the Code otherwise designed to stabilize nomenclature.” Here the proposers equate ‘valid publication’ with the fact that as both names were sanctioned by Fries in 1815, they both have the same ‘valid’ publication date. The fact that ‘*suffrutescens*’ as applied to the taxon in question is definitely 10 years older than ‘*lepideus*’ definitely confuses, however. The fact that the fungus in question is economically well known under the ‘*lepideus*’ epithet and that May (of May &

Wood, 1995) is a co-author – along with a desire to cut short potentially pointless semantic discussions — all lead me to support this proposal.

Prop. 1741, to conserve the name *Pleurotus japonicus* against *Agaricus guepiniformis* and *Pleurotus harmandii* (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Scott A. Redhead & Hitoshi Neda. *Taxon* 55(4): 1032–1033.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70205:** A well-researched and well-written proposal, which I support.

Prop. 1742, to conserve the name *Lyophyllum* with a conserved type (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Scott A. Redhead, Valerie Hofstetter, Heinz Clémenton, Jean-March Moncalvo & Rytas Vilgalys. *Taxon* 55(4): 1034–1036.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**Matheny via NORV 70131:** Brandon Matheny, senior author of the “Major clades of *Agaricales*: a multilocus phylogenetic overview” for the 2006 AFTOL issue of *Mycologia* (98: 984–997), regards this proposal as sensible.

→**NORV 70205:** There is no question that applying *Lyophyllum* to brightly pigmented species and *Calocybe* to grey-brown species would confuse most agaricologists, and that including several currently accepted segregate genera into one mega-*Lyophyllum* genus would severely reduce the information carried with the generic name. I commend the authors for using both molecular and morphological characters to select an appropriate new type species of *Lyophyllum*. As the four stated advantages for selecting *L. leucophaeatum* as type far outweigh the three stated disadvantages, I support the proposal.

Prop. 1743, to conserve the name *Hygrophorus hudsonianus* against *Endocarpon viride* and *Normandina davidis* (lichenized *Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Scott A. Redhead & Per M. Jørgensen. *Taxon* 55(4): 1036–1037.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70210:** An overdue proposal that I firmly support.

Prop. 1744, to conserve the name *Lichen hagenii* (*Lecanora hagenii*) with a conserved type (lichenized *Ascomycota*). Proposed by Lucyna Sliwa & David L. Hawksworth. *Taxon* 55(4): 1038–1039.

Voted: No vote yet taken; to be included on the March (2007) ballot.

Committee comments:

→**NORV 70210:** As the evidence for the need for a conserved type is convincingly presented and the proposers preferentially selected a type with samples already distributed in an exsiccatum, I support this proposal.