

## NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Edited by John McNeill

## Report of the General Committee: 17

Karen L. Wilson, Secretary

Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust, Mrs Macquaries Road, Sydney NSW 2000, Australia; karen.wilson@rbgsyd.nsw.gov.au

DOI <https://doi.org/10.12705/662.13>

**Summary** Decisions are reported on proposals and requests in Reports 61, 67, and 68 from the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants, in Reports 10 and 11 from the Nomenclature Committee on Fossils, in Report 14 from the Nomenclature Committee for Algae and in Report 12 from the Nomenclature Committee for Bryophytes.

The previous report (16) of the General Committee for Botanical Nomenclature was published in *Taxon* 66: 189–190. 2017.

General Committee (GC) membership was 25 at the time that the following proposals and requests were considered: Wendy Applequist (ex officio, U.S.A.), Fred Barrie (U.S.A.), Vincent Demoulin (Belgium), Laurence Dorr (U.S.A.), Vicki Funk (ex officio, U.S.A.), Hugh Glen (South Africa), Werner Greuter (Italy), David Hawksworth (U.K.), Patrick Herendeen (ex officio, U.S.A.), Niels Klazenga (ex officio, Australia), Hans Walter Lack (Germany), Li De-Zhu (China), David Mabblerley (Chair, Australia/U.K.), John McNeill (Canada/U.K.), Valéry Malécot (France), Karol Marhold (ex officio, Slovakia), Hidetoshi Nagamasu (Japan), Tom May (ex officio, Australia), Willem Prud'homme van Reine (ex officio, The Netherlands), Nicholas Turland (ex officio, Germany), John Wiersema (U.S.A.), David Williams (U.K.), Karen Wilson (Secretary, Australia), George Yatskievych (U.S.A.), Fernando Zuloaga (Argentina). The GC agreed with all recommendations of the Nomenclature Committees (NCs); seven proposals and one request came without a recommendation. Where a proposal involved names for organisms from more than one of the major groups, all relevant NCs have given the GC a recommendation. The super-majority (60%) required to approve or reject was 15 votes. Committee voting figures are shown against any proposal where the decision was not unanimous, in the order: For the proposal – Against the proposal – Abstain – More discussion/refer back to the relevant Committee.

### 1. Two proposals from Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) Report 61 (*Taxon* 59: 1271–1276. 2010)

The GC considered two old proposals. Both involved first deciding whether the names had adequate descriptive material to be validly published. After this was agreed by the GC (see Report 16), the committee voted on whether to conserve or reject (respectively) the names. The proposals were not referred back to the NCVP since the wording of NCVP Report 61 made it clear that the NCVP would have accepted both proposals if the NCVP had agreed that the names were validly published. The GC accepted both proposals: prop. (1564) to conserve *Platonia insignis* (21–1–2–1), i.e., that name is conserved, and prop. (1601) to reject *Agave noah* (22–1–1–1), i.e., that name is rejected.

### 2. Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants Report 67 (*Taxon* 65: 169–182. 2016)

#### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names

are conserved or rejected as indicated. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(1357) cons. *Bidens* with feminine gender (22–2–1–0); (2277) cons. *Orchis italica* (typ. cons.; 23–2–0–0); (2278) cons. *Serapias helleborine* (typ. cons.); (2279) rej. *Areca glandiformis*; (2280) cons. *Omphalodes verna*; (2281) rej. *Arnica coronopifolia*; (2282) cons. *Griselinia* G. Forst.; (2283) rej. *Dolichos altissimus*; (2284) cons. *Cliffortia filicaulis* (typ. cons.; first vote 11–14–0–0, second vote 21–2–2–0 (i.e., proposal is accepted); (2294) rej. *Cereus panoploea-tus*; (2295) cons. *Senecio doria* (typ. cons.); (2298) cons. *Persicaria maculosa*; (2299) rej. *Polygonum* subg. *Diocetus*; (2300) cons. *Viola blanda* Willd.; (2313) cons. *Momordica lanata* (typ. cons.); (2315) rej. *Hylococcus*; (2316) rej. *Hylococcus sericeus*; (2317) cons. *Ligustrum sempervirens* (Franch.) Lingelsh.; (2318) cons. *Stilpnophyllum* Hook. f.; (2321) cons. *Lycopsis pulla* (typ. cons.); (2324) cons. *Pentaptera arjuna*; (2328) rej. *Bauhinia ruficarpa*; (2329) cons. *Sorbus* (typ. cons.); (2332) cons. *Sporobolus*; (2334) cons. *Bignonia magnifica* (typ. cons.); (2335) cons. *Senecio macrophyllus*; (2336) rej. *Lassonia*; (2337) rej. *Plantago recurvata*; (2338) cons. *Gynochthodes*; (2339) cons. *Ulmus laciniata* Mayr ex Schwapp.; (2344) cons. *Bambusa vulgaris* (typ. cons.); (2350) rej. *Panicum polygamum*; (2351) rej. *Rhytidea bicolor*; (2352) cons. *Dendrobium officinale* (24–0–1–0); (2353) cons. *Halostachys* (typ. cons.); (2354) cons. *Adelostigma* (typ. cons.); (2355) cons. *Filago arvensis* (typ. cons.); (2356) cons. *Erythrina falcata*.

The following conservation and rejection proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are NOT conserved or rejected as indicated: (2293) amended cons. *Anodendron paniculatum* A. DC. (5–19–1–0); (2314) rej. *Euphorbia illirica* (4–21–0–0); (2319) cons. *Onychium contiguum* (typ. cons.; 2–23–0–0); (2320) cons. *Carex laticeps* (3–22–0–0); (2325) cons. *Terminalia coriacea* (Roxb.) Wight & Arn. (4–21–0–0); (2326) cons. *Micromeria varia* (typ. cons.; 4–21–0–0); (2327) cons. *Micromeria hyssopifolia* (3–22–0–0); (2347) cons. *Crataegus laciniata* (typ. cons.) (4–21–0–0).

Prop. (2297) to conserve *Aconogonon* (Meisn.) Rchb. with that spelling was rejected after two ballots as being unnecessary (first vote 12–13–0–0; second vote 2–21–2–0), i.e., the generic name is regarded as based on *Polygonum* sect. *Aconogonon* Meisn., NOT as a nomen novum published by Reichenbach.

Prop. (2322) to conserve *Viburnum betulifolium* Batalin was recommended by the NC on Fossils (see Report 10) but not recommended by the NCVP. The GC voted by a narrow super-majority (votes 15–9–1–0) to conserve the name. Members supporting conservation felt that this name applies to a horticulturally important plant and therefore conservation is appropriate, and whether the taxon is treated in a broad or narrow sense is a separate taxonomic matter.

**Proposals to suppress works (Art. 34), i.e., to add them to App. VI**

The following proposals to add publications to the list in Code Appendix VI of “Suppressed Works” were approved: (9–12) two publications of *List of Indian Woods collected by N. Wallich*, and two publications of selections from this *List* (“principal trees” and “Catalogue of woods peculiar to Goalpara”); (13) any quarto version of J.R. Forster & G. Forster’s *Characteres Generum Plantarum* dated 1775 (23–1–1–0); (14) any folio version of J.R. Forster & G. Forster’s *Characteres Generum Plantarum* dated 1775 (23–1–1–0); (15) any folio version of J.R. Forster & G. Forster’s *Characteres Generum Plantarum* dated 1776 (24–1–0–0).

**Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 on confusable names**

All of the following names are ruled as not being sufficiently similar to be confused: (13) *Codia* (*Cunoniaceae*) and *Coddia* (*Rubiaceae*) (3–22–0–0); (14) *Hopea* (*Dipterocarpaceae*) and *Hopia* (*Poaceae*) (4–21–0–0); (16) *Hoppea* (*Gentianaceae*) and *Hopea* (*Dipterocarpaceae*) (3–22–0–0); (17) *Otidea* (*Fungi: Ascomycota: Pyronemataceae*) and *Otidia* (*Geraniaceae*); (18) *Ficus chapaensis* and *F. chaparensis* (2–23–0–0); (19) *Ficus jacobii* and *Ficus jacobsii* (1–24–0–0); (20) *Bertia* (*Ascomycota: Bertiaceae*) and *Bertya* (*Euphorbiaceae*) (2–23–0–0); (21) *Sacoglottis* (*Humiriaceae*) and *Sarcoglottis* (*Orchidaceae*) (3–22–0–0); (23) *Rubus chingii* and *R. chingianus*; (24) *Rubus tsangiorum* and *R. tsangii*.

The GC is concerned at the increasing number of requests about possibly confusable names, most of which end up being ruled as not confusable. This increase may be partly due to the now widespread use of databases, in which similar names in very disparate groups may cause confusion, particularly if any spellings are incorrect. Where epithets have been based on the same surname, this does not make them confusable *per se*, as illustrated by Requests (23) and (24) in this report, which are clear examples of non-confusable names. As stated in NCVP Report 67: “It is not desirable to create two epithets that use genitive (substantive) and adjectival forms of the same surname, but it is legal, and they are easily distinguished by sound and spelling.”

Guidelines to help people recognise confusable names have been widely discussed by this and the other nomenclatural committees, but it is impossible to give strict rules because each case has unique features. Generalised guidelines are published regularly in *Taxon* (e.g., McNeill in *Taxon* 64: 177–178. 2015). As stated there, factors that may be relevant in deciding whether similar names should be considered homonyms or not include: taxonomic assignment (whether they apply to closely or distantly related taxa), nomenclatural status (e.g., legitimacy), orthographical variation (how different are the spellings of the names), derivation, history and frequency of use, geographical distribution of the taxa concerned, and significance of the taxa (e.g., whether the taxa are economically or ecologically important in some way). In addition, the last sentence of Art. 53.3 should be taken into account, i.e., to continue established practice if it maintains nomenclatural stability.

**3. Nomenclature Committee on Fossils (NCFoss) Report 10 (Taxon 65: 382–387. 2016)****Proposals to conserve or reject names**

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated. Names for which authorship is included involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(2243) cons. *Psaronius*; (2246) cons. *Todites*; (2247) cons. *Pecopteris williamsonis*; (2252) cons. *Vojnovskyaceae*; (2254) cons. *Spinosporites* (24–1–0–0); (2265) cons. *Discoaster* with that spelling; (2272) cons. *Polypodiisporites* with that spelling (24–1–0–0); (2285, 2286) cons. *Umbellina* and *Umbellinaceae*; (2301) cons. *Frenelopsis*; (2339) cons. *Ulmus laciniata* Mayr ex Schwapp.

The following conservation proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names are NOT conserved as indicated: (2242) cons. *Calamodendron* (1–24–0–0); (2244) cons. *Cladophlebis* (typ. cons.; 1–24–0–0); (2245) cons. *Pecopteris denticulata*; (2248) cons. *Dadoxylon* (the GC agrees with the NCFoss that *Megadendron* is not validly published and therefore conservation is not necessary); (2249–2250) cons. *Taeniopteris* (typ. cons.) and *T. vittata* (typ. cons.); (2251) cons. *Pitys*, nom. cons., against *Pinites*; (2253) cons. *Crassinervia*; (2266–2267) cons. *Heliodiscoaster* and *Hemidiscoaster* with those spellings (1–24–0–0); (2268) cons. *Aphlebia* (0–24–1–0); (2269) cons. *Sphenopteris princeps*; (2270) cons. *Cordaicladus*; (2271) cons. *Aphanozonatisporites*; (2287) cons. *Asterocalamites*;

**Request for a binding decision under Art. 53.5 on confusable names**

*Sycidium* (fossil *Characeae*) and *Sykidion* (extant *Chlorophyceae*) and also the family names *Sycidiaceae* (order *Sycidiales*) and *Sykidiaceae* (order *Sykidiales*) are ruled (4–20–0–0) not to be sufficiently similar to be confused. This is in line with the recommendations of both the NC Algae and NC Fossils.

**4. Nomenclature Committee for Algae (NCA) Report 14 (Taxon 65: 880–881. 2016)**

The GC accepted or rejected all of the proposals as recommended by the NCA in its report, as well as a related proposal in NCA Report 17 (*Taxon* 66: 481–482. 2017).

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are approved as recommended by the NCA, i.e., the names are conserved. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(2017) cons. *Vesicularia* (Müll. Hal.) Müll. Hal. (24–0–1–0); (2066) cons. *Hapalosiphonaceae* (24–0–1–0); (2084) cons. *Rhabdosphaera* (24–0–1–0).

The following conservation proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCA, i.e., the names are NOT conserved: (2031) cons. *Detonia* Freng. (0–24–1–0); (2067) cons. *Melobesiaceae* (0–24–1–0); (2175) cons. *Moorea* (0–24–1–0).

Proposal (1755) to conserve *Fucus baillouviana* (typ. cons.) was rejected (0–24–1–0). To finish dealing with this name, the GC then accepted (24–0–1–0) the new proposal (2452) to reject *Fucus baillouviana* (see NCA Report 17 in this issue).

**5. Nomenclature Committee for Bryophytes (NCB) Report 12 (Taxon 65: 1152. 2016)**

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are approved as recommended by the NCB, i.e., the names are conserved: (1811) cons. *Leptodontium proliferum* (24–0–1–0); (2017) cons. *Vesicularia* (Müll. Hal.) Müll. Hal.; (2384) cons. *Bryum pallescens* (23–1–1–0).

The following conservation proposal is declined, as recommended by the NCB, i.e., the name is NOT conserved: (2001) cons. *Webera tenuifolia* (1–23–1–0).

Proposal (1900) to conserve *Gertrudia validinervis* has been referred back without a formal vote to the NCB for further consideration.

## 6. Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants Report 68 (Taxon 65: 1153–1165, 2016)

### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation and rejection proposals under Art. 14 and 56 are approved as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are conserved or rejected as indicated. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(1839) cons. *Leysera* (24–0–1–0); (1840) cons. *Volularia* (23–1–1–0); (2073) cons. *Limniris* (23–0–1–1); (2292) cons. *Palhinhaea* (22–2–1–0); (2311) rej. *Trichomanes adiantoides* (24–0–1–0); (2357) rej. *Rosa ferruginea* (24–0–1–0); (2359) cons. *Clethra alnifolia* (typ. cons.) (24–0–1–0); (2361) cons. *Senecio sarracenicus* (typ. cons.; 24–0–1–0); (2362) cons. *Anisomeles* (24–0–1–0); (2364) cons. *Eucalyptus rossii* (typ. cons.; 24–0–1–0); (2366) cons. *Hemionitis plantaginea* Cav. (24–0–1–0); (2367) cons. *Carex leersii*, nom. cons., against *C. cuprina* (24–0–1–0) [note that the correct publication details for *C. leersii* are: Schultz in Flora 53: 459. 1870]; (2368) cons. *Cereus adscendens* (24–0–1–0); (2369) cons. *Sisymbrium pumilum* Stephan (24–0–1–0); (2372) rej. *Anavinga ovata* (24–0–1–0); (2374) rej. *Cestrum subsessile* (24–0–1–0); (2375) rej. *Solanum ambrosiacum* (24–0–1–0); (2376) rej. *Solanum coronatum* (24–0–1–0); (2377) rej. *Solanum diantherum* (24–0–1–0); (2378) rej. *Solanum jubeba* (24–0–1–0); (2379) rej. *Solanum multiangulatum* (24–0–1–0); (2380) rej. *Solanum perianthomega* (24–0–1–0); (2381) cons. *Goodallia* Benth. (24–0–1–0); (2388) rej. *Myosotis collina* (24–0–1–0); (2391) cons. *Razumovskia* Vologdin ex Krasnop. (24–0–1–0); (2398) cons. *Allium saxatile* (typ. cons.; 24–0–1–0); (2403) cons. *Cuscuta campestris* (24–0–1–0); (2405) cons. *Chirita hamosa* (typ. cons.) (23–0–2–0); (2406) cons. *Orobancha foetida* (typ. cons.) (24–0–1–0).

The following conservation and rejection proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the names are NOT conserved or rejected as indicated: (1920) rej. *Cupressus tortulosa* (2–22–1–0); (2345) cons. *Calamus laevigatus* (4–20–1–0); (2363) change author, place and date of publication of *Lecythidaceae* Poit., nom. cons (0–24–1–0); (2389) cons. *Acacia multipinnata* (6–18–1–0); (2401) cons. *Dianthus crassipes* (4–20–1–0); (2407) cons. *Paullinia thalictrifolia* (0–24–1–0).

Proposal (2400) to conserve *Ophrys subfusca* (typ. cons.) was rejected (0–24–1–0) because of typification problems. The GC was informed that the putative type specimen in W is not original material and therefore cannot be accepted as either a holotype or lectotype. This leaves it open to interested parties to find another solution, e.g., to find a suitable type or propose rejection of the name under Art. 56.

Two proposals without recommendation from the NCVP were accepted by the GC: (2342) cons. *Leucostegia immersa* (19–4–2–0); (2346) cons. *Calandrinia grandiflora* (21–3–1–0).

Three proposals without recommendation from the NCVP were rejected by the GC after considerable discussion: (2312) rej. *Dianthus hungaricus* (9–15–1–0); (2330) cons. *Tamarix ramosissima* (5–18–1–1; typification of *T. pentandra* needs to be resolved); (2333) cons. *Tweddia* (typ. cons.) (7–17–1–0).

Two proposals without recommendation from the NCVP are still under consideration: (2296) cons. *Maackia hupehensis*; (2323) cons. *Salsola* (typ. cons.).

### Requests for binding decisions under Art. 38.4 on adequate descriptive statements

Request (27): the descriptive statement associated with *Agave gustaviana* is considered adequate for valid publication (24–0–1–0).

The descriptive statements associated with the following names are considered inadequate for the name to be considered validly published: (30) *Alonsoa intermedia* G. Lodd. (0–24–1–0); (31) *Caladium lividum* G. Lodd. (2–22–1–0); (32) *Cerbera laurifolia* G. Lodd. (2–22–1–0); (33) *Dichorisandra picta* G. Lodd. (3–21–1–0); (37) *Govenia* Lindl. ex G. Lodd. and *Govenia superba* G. Lodd. (2–22–1–0); (38) *Hedychium flavescens* G. Lodd. (1–23–1–0); (39) *Maxillaria galeata* Lindl. ex G. Lodd. (1–23–1–0).

### Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 on confusable names

Request (22): *Habenaria rodriguezii* and *H. rodriguezii* are considered sufficiently alike to be confused (23–0–2–0).

The following names are ruled as not being sufficiently similar to be confused: (26) *Petteria* and *Peteria* (2–22–1–0); (28) *Bonania* and *Bonania* (2–22–1–0); (29) *Ceropegia oculata* and *C. occulta* (0–24–1–0).

Request (15) on *Hoppea* and *Hoppia* is still under consideration.

## 7. Nomenclature Committee on Fossils Report 11 (Taxon 66: 193–196, 2017)

### Proposals to conserve or reject names

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are approved as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names are conserved. Names for which authorship is shown involve conservation against (or on account of) earlier homonyms.

(1826) cons. *Pleuromeia* with that spelling (24–0–1–0); (2084) cons. *Rhabdosphaera* (24–0–1–0); (2420) cons. *Cathaya* Chun & Kuang (24–0–1–0); (2423, 2424) cons. *Ullmannia*, with conserved type, and *U. bronni* (both proposals 24–0–1–0); (2436, 2437) cons. *Cycadeoidea* and *C. megalophylla* (both proposals 24–0–1–0); (2438, 2439) cons. *Taeniopteris* and *T. vittata* (typ. cons.; both proposals 24–0–1–0); (2450, 2451) cons. *Selenopemphix* and *S. nephroides* (both proposals 24–0–1–0); (2489) cons. *Laricoidites* (24–0–1–0).

The following conservation proposals are declined, as recommended by the NCFoss, i.e., the names are NOT conserved: (2408) cons. *Ephedrites cheniae* (0–24–1–0); (2490) cons. *Laevigatosporites* with that spelling (1–23–1–0).

### Requests for binding decisions under Art. 53.5 on confusable names

Requests (50–52): the names in each of the pairwise comparisons between *Laevigata-sporites*, *Laevigati-sporites* and *Laevigatosporites* are ruled as not being sufficiently similar to be confusing (all three requests: 6–18–1–0).

As pointed out in the NCFoss report, declaring one or more of the fossil generic names in a group like this to be homonyms would cause considerable nomenclatural disruption. Because these generic names are only rarely used outside the palynological and biostratigraphic literature it was the unanimous view of the NCFoss that the disruption caused by such a decision would be worse than the potential for confusion by authors unaccustomed to such similar names. Perhaps a voted example could be included in the *Code* to clarify this exceptional naming convention for fossil spore/pollen names.