

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

Edited by John McNeill, Scott A. Redhead & John H. Wiersema

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae: 10

Willem F. Prud'homme van Reine

Netherlands Centre for Biodiversity Naturalis (Section NHN), Leiden University, P.O. Box 9514, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands; Prudhomme@nhn.leidenuniv.nl

Summary It is recommended that the name *Dasya baillouviana* not be conserved with a conserved type; the committee is undecided on the proposal to conserve *Achnanthes brevipes* against *A. adnata*, *A. bacillarioides*, and *A. dubia*, and is seeking more comments by diatom specialists. *Sycidium* and *Sykidion* were considered not sufficiently alike to be confused, but the committee is undecided on the confusability of *Sycidiaceae* with *Sykidiaceae* and *Sycidiales* with *Sykidiales*. Recommendations are made on the membership of the Special Committee on Harmonization of the Nomenclature of *Cyanophyta/Cyanobacteria* established in 2005 but yet to be set up. The Committee's views on some modifications to the ICBN are presented including some proposals that might be made from the floor at the forthcoming Congress in Melbourne.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae (previous report in Taxon 54: 523–524) reports here on two conservation proposals concerning specific names. The Committee also expresses opinions on several other topics. The Committee included fifteen members: R.A. Andersen (Laurium), J. Bolton (Capetown), P. Compère (Meise), G. Furnari (Catania), L. Hoffmann (Luxembourg), H. Lange-Bertalot (Frankfurt-am-Main), M. Masuda (Sapporo), D.J. Patterson (Sydney), A.K.S.K. Prasad (Tallahassee), F.F. Pedroche (Mexico), B. Santelices (Santiago de Chile), P.C. Silva (Berkeley, Chairman), K.L. Vinogradova (Saint Petersburg), W.J. Woelkerling (Melbourne) and W.F. Prud'homme van Reine (Leiden, Secretary). D.J. Patterson, however, resigned recently and did not vote. Eleven of the members expressed their votes on the proposals. The votes of the three members who did not send back their completed ballot form on time are recorded as abstentions. Under the 60%-rule, nine “yes” votes are necessary for a proposal to be recommended and also nine for rejection. The vote is recorded in the order: yes : no : abstention.

Proposals to conserve or reject names

(1718) Conserve the name *Achnanthes brevipes* (*Bacillariophyceae*) against *A. adnata*, *A. bacillarioides*, and *A. dubia*, and with a conserved type (proposed by K. Toyoda, E.J. Cox, P.A. Sims & D.M. Williams in Taxon 55: 527–528. 2006). Vote: 6 : 5 : 3 (undecided, further discussions within the committee have been initiated).

The authors of the proposal state that pervasive use of the illegitimate *Achnanthes brevipes* warrants, if not demands, that this name be conserved rather than using the legitimate name *Achnanthes adnata* even though an epitype has been chosen for this name. An insufficient majority of voting members of our Committee, however, considered that conservation of this species name is necessary. Some members asked for more comments by diatom specialists, but we did not receive additional comments by those members who are diatom experts. According to the proposers and some Committee members, the name *Achnanthes brevipes* is consistently used for this species in recent diatom literature, and to replace this name by one of the three names proposed for rejection would change unnecessarily the nomenclature used in almost all recent books on diatoms. The legitimate name *Achnanthes adnata* is the type of its generic name, but

its precise identity is unknown. A lectotype as well as an epitype have been designated in the text of proposal 1718 and an unofficial earlier version of this proposal was published (with illustrations) in *Diatom Research* (20: 375–386. 2005). The opponents of this proposal state that diatomists failed to address this perceived problem 180 years ago by rejecting *A. brevipes* and adopting one of the three other names, all proposed by Bory de Saint Vincent in 1822. The existing 26 infraspecific names within *A. brevipes* are not accepted as good arguments, because it can be expected that some of these infraspecific taxa will ultimately be accorded specific rank or subsumed in other species. These members do not think the 26 infraspecific names within *A. brevipes* require immediate re-combination under *A. adnata* as there is taxonomic uncertainty about the status of such taxa. One member explained: “With many questions still unanswered, I am reluctant to apply article 14.2 on conservation as an exception to the rule of priority in this case.”

(1755). Conserve the name *Fucus baillouviana* (*Dasya baillouviana*) with a conserved type (*Dasyaceae*, *Rhodophyta*) (proposed by C. Pena-Martin, A. Gómez-Garreta & M.B. Crespo in Taxon 56: 253–255. 2007). Votes: 1 : 10 : 3 (not recommended).

The name *Dasya baillouviana* (S.G. Gmel.) Mont. is currently applied to a red alga widespread on the marine coasts of many different countries, with *Dasya pedicellata* C. Agardh regarded as a synonym. The pre-Linnaean designation “*Baillouviana*”, published in 1750 by Griselini, was used by S.G. Gmelin as the basis of his description of the species and the much debated Griselini figure of “*Baillouviana*” became the lectotype of the *Dasya baillouviana*. The authors of the proposal suggest that Griselini's figure may be considered as an illustration resembling a species of the brown algal genus *Sporochneus* or of the red algal species *Eupogodon planus* (C. Agardh) Kütz. Earlier, C. Agardh (1824) had already regarded *Fucus baillouviana* as a synonym of *Sporochneus pedunculatus* (Huds.) C. Agardh. The proposers want to prevent application of *Fucus baillouviana* either to a species of *Sporochneus* or of *Eupogodon*, and that is their main motive to formally propose conservation of *Fucus baillouviana* with a new conserved type that will maintain usage. They proposed as conserved type a specimen from New York (in LD) that was part of the original material of *Sphaerococcus pedicellatus* C. Agardh, a

synonym of *F. baillouviana*. However, there was widespread opposition to the proposal by members of our Committee. Some members suggested considering the New York type not as a lectotype for *Dasya baillouviana*, but as an epitype that can be used for future molecular research. Others pointed out that Mediterranean material of *Dasya baillouviana* (the region from which the original material came) might belong to different cryptic species within *Dasya* than that of the New York sample. For these reasons it does not seem to be the right moment to accept proposal 1755.

Conservation of *Lithophyllum laeve* (Rhodophyceae)

Our Committee earlier rejected (Taxon 53: 1065–1067. 2004) proposal 1577 to conserve *Lithophyllum laeve* Strömfelt 1886 with a new, conserved type, and this recommendation of rejection was approved by the General Committee on Botanical Nomenclature and ratified by the International Botanical Congress in Vienna in 2005 (Taxon 55: 795–800. 2006). In spite of the assertions by Athanasiadis & Adey (in Phycologia 45: 1–115. 2006 & in Nordic J. Bot. 24: 469–499. 2007) the General Committee has not asked us to review our previous decision regarding *Lithophyllum laeve*. The Nomenclature Committee for Algae considers the new assertions as baseless incorrect interpretations of the ICBN, which are not acceptable. We do not understand why Athanasiadis and Adey continue to invoke the *Code* incorrectly to justify unfounded nomenclatural assertions that our Committee has rejected (all voting members agreed), especially as the views of our Committee have been approved by the General Committee on Botanical Nomenclature and then ratified by the International Botanical Congress in Vienna in 2005.

Recommendation on a case of near homonymy (under Art. 53.5)

Likelihood of confusion of *Sycidium* Sandberger and *Sykidion* E.P. Wright. Votes: 1 : 10 : 3 (the two names are *not* likely to be confused).

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae has been asked, under Art. 53.5, whether *Sycidium* Sandberger 1849 (fossil *Characeae*) and *Sykidion* E.P. Wright 1881 (extant green algae) are to be considered sufficiently alike to be confused. The members of our Committee considered these two names as *not* likely to be confused, because they are spelled differently, and because of the distance between the areas of research, no problems can be expected.

Sycidium can be classified in the family *Sycidiaceae* Peck 1934 and the order *Sycidiales* Maedler 1952, and for *Sykidion* classification in the family *Sykidiaceae* and the order *Sykidiales* has been proposed in manuscript. Thus at the ranks of family and order, the differences between the names would only be one letter. The vote on likelihood of confusion between the two different family and order names was indecisive (Votes: 4 : 5 : 5). It has been suggested that separating the matter of the confusability of *Sycidium* and *Sykidion* is inappropriate—an element in the extent to which the generic names might be confused is if the higher rank names derived from them are confusable. Further discussion in our Committee might result in a single recommendation and thus achieve a clearer result.

Our chairman added: Although the areas of research are far apart, indexing brings them together. Among the entries in the Index Nominum Algarum (INA) there is *Sykidion polonicum* Eichler

& Gutwinski 1894, with the generic name a hybrid. The name alone does not indicate whether it applies to a fossil charophyte or to an extant green alga. [It applies to an extant green alga so that the INA entry when edited will read *Sykidion_* ('*Sykidion*') *polonicum*. If the Polish species were a fossil charophyte, the INA entry when edited would read *Sycidium_* ('*Sykidion*') *polonicum*.]

Establishment of a Special Committee on Harmonization of the Nomenclature of *Cyanophyta/Cyanobacteria*

The Nomenclature Section of the Vienna Congress in 2005 resolved that such a Special Committee be established, but this has yet to be implemented. Our Committee suggests asking members P. Compère, L. Hoffmann, P. Silva, and W.F. Prud'homme van Reine to consider this matter. We agree with suggestions to ask A. Oren, B. Tindall, V. Demoulin, J. Komarek, S. Golubić and J. Johansen. Added suggestions are J.A. Nienow and B.A. Whitton, while our member A.K.S.K. Prasad is also interested to help. It is the responsibility of the Secretary of the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature to organize this Special Committee. One of our members stated: “There were similar efforts to bring about rapprochement between bacteriologists and botanists in the 1980s (Sydney Congress) by Imre Friedmann and others and nothing has changed since then. We continue to have three different nomenclatural systems for the blue-green algae or *Cyanobacteria* (Drouetian, Geitlerian and that by R. Stanier and others). I have been following the efforts since my time as a graduate student of blue-green algae in early 1970s.”

ICBN matters

The proposal made by our Committee to the International Botanical Congress in Vienna in 2005 to modify Art. 18.1 to avoid homonymy in family names (Art. 18 Prop. A, see McNeill & Turland in Taxon 54: 222. 2005) was accepted by the Section, but the Editorial Committee did *not* accept the addition of a new example of the application of the new provision. This seems to be an omission to be rectified in the next *Code*.

The Nomenclature Committee for Algae has discussed how the ICBN can deal with binding decisions on quasi-homonyms (parahomonyms) (Art. 53.5) and what would be the best way to publish the ICBN which has (in the *Vienna Code*) 126 pages of rules and recommendations and 357 pages of exceptions to the rules. In the meantime our Chairman has already proposed in his own name that an appendix listing all binding decisions resulting from Art. 53.3 be included in the *Code* (Silva in Taxon 59: 1294. 2010). Incidentally, but of primary importance, he asks for a definition of a binding decision. This is, according to D.H. Nicolson in the Report of the General Committee: 8 (Taxon 48: 373–378. 1999) a recommendation by the General Committee that has been ratified by an International Botanical Congress. It was also suggested in the Committee that the binding decisions resulting from Art. 32.4 (whether or not a description or diagnosis satisfies the requirement of Art. 32.1 (d)) should be added. It is hoped that this inclusion will be proposed from the floor during the meeting of the Nomenclature Section of the Melbourne Congress.

The term “parahomonym” is not defined in the ICBN, but a definition exists in *Terms Used in Bionomenclature*, compiled by David

Hawksworth (2010, see also <http://www.gbif.org/communications/resources/print-and-online-resources/bionomenclature/>). The definition is tagged “unofficial”: “one of two or more names based on different types and spelled similarly but which are likely to be confused because they apply to related taxa or any other reason and are therefore treated as homonyms”. Our Chairman hopes that someone at Melbourne will propose from the floor that the term be introduced in Art. 53.3 and in the Glossary.

All voting members of our Committee would like a list of binding decisions about parahomonyms in ICBN, four members would like to see that list incorporated in a printed version of ICBN, four others both in a printed version as well as on the internet and two prefer that publication of that list will only be on the internet. Four members abstained from voting, of whom three who did not vote at all. Discussions in our Committee about the size of the printed ICBN have not yet been completed.

(1997) Proposal to conserve the name *Buellia subcanescens* (*Diploicia subcanescens*) against *B. leptina* (lichenized *Ascomycota*, *Caliciaceae*)

Ayhan Şenkardeşler,¹ Laszlo Lökös² & Orçun Fuat Calba¹

¹ Department of Biology, Faculty of Science, Ege University, Bornova, 35100 Izmir, Turkey

² Department of Botany, Hungarian Natural History Museum, 1476 Budapest, Pf. 222, Hungary

Author for correspondence: Ayhan Şenkardeşler, Ayhan.Senkardesler@ege.edu.tr

(1997) *Buellia subcanescens* Werner in Bull. Soc. Hist. Nat. Afr. N. 67: 90. 1956, nom. cons. prop.

Typus: “Anti-Atlas, Crizim, falaises maritimes quartziliques, 26.4.1934 Emberger & Gattifossé” (BC).

(=) *Buellia leptina* J. Steiner in Oesterr. Bot. Z. 51: 223. 1911, nom. rej. prop.

Holotypus: Canary Islands “Ins. Canariensis, Gomera, Baranco de Bilbao, May” (W 1911-3765).

Buellia leptina was described from the Canary Islands and is a forgotten name that applies to a species of the genus *Diploicia* A. Massal. under current generic concepts because of its characters such as rosette-forming and pruinose thallus with distinctly elongated marginal lobes, chlorococcoid photobionts, apothecia without a thal-line exciple, *Lecanora*-type 8-spored asci, plurilocular, brown and ellipsoid ascospores.

Initial reference of the deposition of the type specimen of *B. leptina* is missing in the original publication (Steiner, l.c.). However, Julius Steiner’s home institutions were Vienna University (WU) and Natural History Museum in Vienna (W). The first author has checked for type materials of names of taxa described by J. Steiner housed at W and WU. After diligent searches over a period of five months (supported by TUBITAK and SYNTHESYS, respectively) only one specimen belonging to *B. leptina* was seen. This is deposited together with *Caloplaca gomerana* J. Steiner and the hard lava rock is covered by a mosaic of *Buellia* and *Caloplaca* thalli. *Buellia leptina* was probably overlooked and not included in earlier revisions because this specimen was sorted alphabetically under the name *C. gomerana*, and not separately as *B. leptina*. This single specimen is considered as the holotype and the name was reduced to synonymy by Şenkardeşler (in Lichenologist 42: 439–448. 2010), since its morphological and anatomical characters agree well with *Diploicia*

subcanescens (Werner) Hafellner & Poelt (in Herzogia 5: 59. 1979) based on *Buellia subcanescens* Werner (l.c.). This basionym was published in 1956 with the specimen cited above as holotype, while *B. leptina* was published more than five decades earlier, and thus has priority over the widely adopted name *Diploicia subcanescens*, according to Art. 11.4 of the ICBN.

However, the name *Buellia leptina* seems never to have been accepted since its original publication. It has also not been included under any name in the regional checklist or in local flora list of the Canary Islands (Hafellner in Fritschiana 5: 1–132. 1995).

On the other hand, *Diploicia subcanescens* is an uncontested species name in current use, known from France, Italy, Morocco, Portugal, Spain and Yemen, and it is included in modern checklists, e.g., Nimis & Poelt (Lichens and Lichenicolous Fungi Sardinia: 96. 1987), Nimis (Lichens Italy: 277. 1993), Hafellner (l.c.: 31), and in numerous regional Floras, e.g., Llimona & al. (in Rev. Bryol. Lichenol. 42: 617. 1976), Roux (in Bull. Mus. Hist. Nat. (Marseilles) 37: 91. 1977), Crespo & al. (in Lazaroa 1: 139. 1979), Torrente & Egea (in Anales Biol., Fac. Biol., Univ. Murcia 13: 17. 1987), Alonso & Egea (in Anales Biol., Fac. Biol., Univ. Murcia 21: 63. 1996), Sánchez-Biezma Serrano & al. (in Bot. Complutensis 25: 264. 2001), Calatayud & al. (in Mycol. Res. 106: 1231. 2002), Sipman (in Willdenowia 32: 131. 2002), Ariño & Gómez-Bolea (in Bol. Soc. Hist. Nat. Baleares 46: 24. 2003), Hernández Padrón & al. (in Vieraea 31: 368. 2003), Llop & Hladun (in Butl. Inst. Catalana Hist. Nat. 71: 43. 2003), and Herrera & al. (in Bot. Complutensis 31: 7. 2007).

As the name *Diploicia subcanescens* is well-established in numerous Floras all over the distribution range of the species, the strict application of the ICBN would undoubtedly be undesirable. However, accepting this proposal to conserve it against *Buellia leptina* would allow *Diploicia subcanescens* to be retained.