

## NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE REPORTS

Edited by John McNeill

### Report of the General Committee: 19

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/10.12705/664.14>

**Summary** Decisions are reported on ten previously unresolved proposals and requests from Reports 15 and 17 of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae and Report 69 from the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants. In addition the Bureau of Nomenclature is authorized to deal with any last minute requests for institutional votes before the XIX IBC.

The previous report (18) of the General Committee for Nomenclature was published in *Taxon* 66: 742–744. 2017.

General Committee (GC) membership was 25 at the time that the following proposals and requests were considered. Two members failed to vote so all voting figures total 23 votes, but the super-majority required to approve or reject remains at 15 votes (60% of the full membership). Committee voting figures are shown against each proposal in the order: For the proposal – Against the proposal – Abstain – More discussion/refer back to the relevant Committee.

#### 1. Nomenclature Committee for Algae (NCA) Report 15 (*Taxon* 66: 191–192. 2017)

The following conservation proposals under Art. 14 are referred back to the NCA to consider extra information that came to light during the GC discussions: Prop. (2273) *Gelidium bipectinatum*; (2365) *Cyanospira* G. Florenz. & al. Authors are reminded that existing usage of the names involved in these proposals should continue as far as possible until a decision has been made (Rec. 14A).

#### 2. Nomenclature Committee for Algae Report 17 (*Taxon* 66: 481–482. 2017)

Proposal (2440) cons. *Lagerheimia* (De Toni) Chodat was not recommended by the NCA while the NC Fungi made no recommendation. It is approved by the GC (15–8–0–0), i.e., the name is conserved.

The related request for a binding decision (43) on whether *Lagerheimia* Sacc. (*Fungi*) and *Lagerheimia* (De Toni) Chodat (*Algae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused came recommended by the NCA while the NC Fungi made no recommendation. It was not resolved on a second GC vote (14–8–1–0). However, Prop. (2440) was accepted so the status of *Lagerheimia* (De Toni) Chodat is settled by its conservation, as done in some past cases (see Art. 53 Ex 13). This resolution of the matter maintains nomenclatural stability and is in line with common past practice of treating eponymous generic names differing only in their *-a* and *-ia* endings as likely to be confused and therefore to be treated as homonyms, as discussed by Davydov & Berezdovska (in *Taxon* 65: 640–641. 2016).

#### 3. Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (NCVP) Report 69 (*Taxon* 66: 500–513. 2017)

##### Proposals to conserve or reject names

Proposals (2385) and (2386) were different ways to deal with the application of the name *Pteris semipinnata*, and the NCVP were divided on how to deal with them. After discussion, the GC first voted in principle (i) that we wished to find a solution that avoided adopting the name *Pteris semipinnata* as currently typified (19–3–1–0), and (ii) that resolving the application of the name by conservation would be preferable to rejection (16–5–2–0). The GC then formally voted (22–1–0–0) to accept Prop. (2385) cons. *Pteris semipinnata* (typ. cons.), i.e., the name is conserved as indicated; Prop. (2386) rej. *Pteris semipinnata* is, thereby, rejected.

Proposal (2387) cons. *Dyschoriste humilis* (typ. cons.) came without any recommendation from the NCVP. It was accepted on a second GC vote (21–2–0–0), i.e. the name is conserved as indicated.

Proposal (2461) rej. *×Laburnocytisus* is approved (19–3–1–0) as recommended by the NCVP, i.e., the name is rejected.

Conservation of nothogeneric names is currently not provided for in the Code, but rejection is possible. The GC discussed conservation of nothogeneric names and names of hybrids between subdivisions of genera and voted (16–4–3–0) that conservation should be possible, with hybrid names being defined by parentage rather than by a type as for non-hybrid names at those ranks. A majority voted (15–3–4–1) that GC members should move from the floor in Shenzhen that a note to this effect be added to Art. 14.3.

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

The following names came without any recommendation from the NCVP. They are ruled as having adequate descriptive statements, i.e., the names are validly published: (40) *Pittosporum angustifolium* G. Lodd. (20–2–1–0); (41) *Tillandsia amoena* G. Lodd. (19–4–0–0).

#### 4. Late requests for institutional votes for the XIX IBC

The GC voted (22–1–0–0) to authorize the Bureau of Nomenclature to deal with any last minute requests for institutional votes for the Nomenclature Section meetings at the XIX International Botanical Congress in Shenzhen.