

Report of the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi – 20¹

Tom W. May

Royal Botanic Gardens Victoria, 100 Birdwood Avenue, Melbourne, Victoria 3004, Australia; corresponding author e-mail: tom.may@rbg.vic.gov.au

Abstract: Ratification of appointment of repositories by the International Mycological Congress is reported. The following two family names are recommended for conservation: *Chrysothricaceae* against *Pulverariaceae*; and the teleomorph-typified *Erysiphaceae* against the anamorph-typified *Oidiaceae*. The following family name is not recommended for conservation: *Dothioraceae* against *Saccotheciaceae*. The following 10 generic names are recommended for conservation: the teleomorph-typified name *Blumeria* against the conserved anamorph-typified name *Oidium*; *Catenaria* Sorokīn (*Fungi*) against *Catenaria* Roussel (*Algae*); *Chrysothrix*, nom. cons., against an additional name, *Alyphaeria*; *Flammula* (Fr. : Fr.) P. Kumm. (*Fungi*) against *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourr. (*Spermatophyta*) with a conserved type; *Fuscopannaria* against *Moelleropsis*; *Geastrum* with a conserved type; *Hebeloma* with a conserved type; *Polycaryum* with that spelling; *Pseudocyphellaria* with a conserved type; and *Talaromyces* against *Lasioderma*. Conservation of *Detonia* Freng. (*Algae*) against *Detonia* Sacc. (*Fungi*) is not opposed. The following generic name is not recommended for conservation: *Catillaria* with a conserved type. The proposal to conserve the generic name *Wickerhamomyces* against *Hansenula* was withdrawn. The following 17 species names are recommended for conservation: *Agaricus laterinus* (*Hebeloma laterinum*) against the sanctioned *A. fastibilis* (*H. fastibile*); *Agaricus tabescens* against *A. socialis*; *Alectoria fuscescens* (*Bryoria fuscescens*) against *Lichen chalybeiformis* and *A. subcana*; *Armillariella ostoyae* (*Armillaria ostoyae*) against *Agaricus obscurus*, *A. occultans*, and *Armillaria solidipes*; *Ganoderma camphoratum* with a conserved type; *Hebeloma fragilipes* against *Hebelomina domardiana* (*Hebeloma domardianum*); *Helminthosporium maydis* Y. Nisik. & C. Miyake (*Bipolaris maydis*) against *H. maydis* Brond. and *Ophiobolus heterostrophus*; *Lecidea oederi* (*Rhizocarpon oederi*) against *L. koenigii*; *Lichen fuscatus* Schrad. (*Acarospora fuscata*) against *L. fuscatus* Lam. with a conserved type; *Lichen leucomelos* (*Heterodermia leucomelos*) with that spelling; *Lichen muralis* (*Lecanora muralis*, *Protoparmeliopsis muralis*) with a conserved type; *Lichen vulgatus* (*Opegrapha vulgata*) with a conserved type; *Morchella semilibera* against *Phallus crassipes*, *P. gigas* and *P. undosus*; *Peziza ammophila* Durieu & Lév. against *P. ammophila* Saut.; *Polycaryum branchipodianum* with that spelling; *Stereocaulon pileatum* with a conserved type; and *Torula stilbospora* with a conserved type. The following 22 species names (teleomorph-typified) are recommended for conservation against anamorph-typified names: *Erysiphe arcuata* against *Oidium carpini*; *Erysiphe biocellata* against *Oidium erysiphoides*; *Erysiphe buhrii* against *Oidium dianthi*; *Erysiphe catalpae* against *Oidium bignoniae*; *Erysiphe celosiae* against *Oidium amaranthi*; *Erysiphe magnicellulata* against *O. drummondii*; *Erysiphe quercicola* against *Oidium anacardii*; *Erysiphe verbasci* against *Oidium balsamii*; *Golovinomyces sonchicola* against *Oidium sonchi-arvensis*; *Levellula rutae* against *Oidium haplophylli*; *Microsphaera azaleae* against *O. ericinum*; *Microsphaera oehrensii* against *Oidium robustum*; *Phyllactinia alni* against *Ovulariopsis alni-formosanae*; *Phyllactinia ampelopsidis* against *Ovulariopsis ampelopsidis-heterophyllae*; *Phyllactinia chubutiana* against *Oidium insolitum*; *Phyllactinia dalbergiae* against *P. subspiralis*; *Phyllactinia gmelinae* against *Ovulariopsis gmelinae-arboreae*; *Phyllactinia populi* against *Ovulariopsis salicis-warburgii*; *Podosphaera solanacearum* against *Oidium saeforthiani*; *Sphaerotheca euphorbiae-hirtae* against *Oidium pedilanthi*; *Sphaerotheca filipendulae* against *Torula botryoides*; and *Sphaerotheca leucotricha* against *Oidium farinosum*. The following two species names are not recommended for conservation: *Cylindrocladium buxicola* against *C. pseudonaviculatum*; and *Verrucaria subcerasi* (*Arthopyrenia subcerasi*) against *A. subalbicans*. It is recommended that the generic name *Aspidelia* and the species name *Lichen quisquiliaris* not be rejected under Art. 56. The following two species names are recommended for rejection under Art. 56: *Botrytis farinosa* (*Peronospora farinosa*) and *Saccharomyces sphaericus*. As a result of reference under Art. 53.5, it is recommended that the following two pairs of names are not to be treated as homonyms: *Bertia* De Not. and *Bertya* Planch.; and *Otidea* (Pers.) Bonord. and *Otidia* Sweet.

Key words:

Ascomycota
Basidiomycota
Blastocladiomycota
 conserved names
 International Code
 of Nomenclature
Oomycota
 rejected names
 typification

Article info: Submitted: 5 April 2017; Accepted: 20 April 2017; Published: 1 June 2017.

¹This report is being published in parallel in *Taxon* 66 (2) 483–495, 2017. Note that all recommendations in this and other reports of the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi are subject to approval by the General Committee on Nomenclature, which will report its' decisions in *Taxon* at a later date.

© 2017 International Mycological Association

You are free to share - to copy, distribute and transmit the work, under the following conditions:

Attribution: You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).
Non-commercial: You may not use this work for commercial purposes.
No derivative works: You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work, which can be found at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>. Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder. Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

INTRODUCTION

The previous Report (19) of the Nomenclature Committee for Fungi (NCFung), dealing with official repositories for fungal names, appeared in *Taxon* **62**: 173–174 (2013). The previous report of the NCFung (18) dealing with proposals to conserve or reject names appeared in *Taxon* **60**: 1199–1201 (2011).

Membership at the time of the last report stood at 17. In August 2014, Lorelei Norvell resigned as Secretary due to health issues, but remains a member of the Committee. Lorelei carried out the role of Secretary with distinction and the great respect of the Committee since taking up the position in 2005. Also in August 2014, Tom May was elected to the position of Secretary and Prof. Pei-Gui Liu, a valued member since 2005, resigned from the Committee, reducing the membership to 16. A vote in October 2014 agreed to raise the number of committee members from 18 to 20, and four new members (Lendemmer, Stalpers, Thines, Yang) were co-opted to fill vacancies. At that time the Committee comprised the following members: S.A. Redhead (Canada, Chair), T.W. May (Australia, Secretary), J.L. Crane (USA), J. Dianese (Brazil), M. Gryzenhout (South Africa), T. Iturriaga (Venezuela), M. Kirchmair (Austria), P.M. Kirk (UK), R. Kirschner (Taiwan), J. Lendemmer (USA), J. Melot (Iceland), A.M. Minnis (USA), L.L. Norvell (USA), S.R. Pennycook (New Zealand), S. Ryman (Sweden), J. Stalpers (The Netherlands), M. Thines (Germany), D. Triebel (Germany), Z. Yang (China) and Y.-J. Yao (China). In March 2016, M. Gryzenhout resigned and M. Kirchmair had not voted or responded to requests to vote and so, under nomenclature committee guidelines, was considered to have resigned. Current membership is 18.

After a hiatus since dealing with repositories in 2013, Committee business was re-activated in October 2014, with some 77 proposals or requests under consideration (22 relating to individual species of *Erysiphales*). Since that time a further 34 proposals or requests relating to fungi have been published. The Committee has also had to consider lists of names submitted by international working groups under Art. 14.13 (see NCFung Report 21, *Taxon* **66**: 496–499, 2017). Several measures were put in place to assist in moving through the business at hand, including creation of a closed Google Group to handle discussions, on-line casting and tabulation of votes *via* Google Forms and enforcement of deadlines for voting by the Committee (usually three weeks from distribution of the ballot). In addition, a quorum was set at 80 % of Committee members (16 of 20 or 15 of 18). If the quorum is met, the ballot is closed at the deadline; unless further votes on any individual proposal have the potential to move the percentage recommending or not recommending to the 60 % level in a final vote.

Vote counts for proposals are given, in order, as: votes for–votes against–abstentions. Note that the percentage utilised for accepting or not accepting proposals is calculated from the total membership at the time of the ballot. The vote counts often do not add up to the membership, due to some members not participating in some ballots. Numbers in square brackets in the form “[17/20]” are: members voting/total membership.

Three ballots were held in 2014 in October, November and December, in which 14 (of 16), 16 (of 20) and 17 (of

20) members voted, respectively. A ballot in September 2015 related to Art. 57.2, the results of which will be dealt with in a separate report. Further ballots were held in 2016 in March and April, in which 18 (of 20) and 18 (of 18) members voted, respectively. The percentage of votes for recommending or not recommending proposals or requests for binding decisions dealt with in this report, while always at least 60%, is often not much higher than that, primarily due to not all members voting; although in the most recent ballot all members did vote. In addition, relatively low percentages to recommend or not recommend were usually partially due to abstentions, with there being at least one (and as many as four abstentions) for all but two matters. For proposals that were recommended the No vote was zero or one in 50 of 54 matters. In contrast, for the six proposals that were not recommended the Yes vote was often comparatively higher (mean 3.33).

This report covers 61 proposals to conserve or reject (of which one was withdrawn and otherwise all but six are recommended) and two requests for binding decisions on confusability of names (in both cases resolved as not confusable); along with a brief note on confirmation of repositories. Quoted text that is unattributed is taken from the original proposals. Forty proposals to conserve or reject; four requests for binding decisions; three proposals to suppress works; and one referral under Art. 32.4 are still under consideration. Guidance in preparing this report from John McNeill and careful proof-reading by Paul Kirk, Lorelei Norvell and Shaun Pennycook is gratefully acknowledged.

RATIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF REPOSITORIES

Under Art. 42.3 of *The International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants (Melbourne Code)* (McNeill *et al.*, *Regnum Veg.* **154**, 2012), which was a new article resulting from IBC XVIII in 2011 in Melbourne, the NCFung is empowered to appoint repositories to issue the identifiers required by Art. 42.1 (dealing with registration of new names of fungi) and accession the required information. Article 42.1 came into force on 1 January 2013, and Redhead & Norvell in the previous report of the NCFung (*Taxon* **62**: 173–174, 2013) described the deliberations of the Committee leading to acceptance of three repositories: Fungal Names, Index Fungorum and MycoBank. As required under Art. 42.3, the decision to appoint these three repositories was ratified by the plenary session of the 10th International Mycological Congress in Bangkok in 2014, following near unanimous (some abstentions but no votes against) acceptance of a resolution setting out the approval of the three repositories put to the Nomenclature Session of that Congress, as reported by Redhead *et al.* (*IMA Fungus* **5**: 449–462, 2014).

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

(2031) Conserve *Detonia* Freng. (*Bacillariophyceae*) against *Detonia* Sacc. (*Ascomycota*). Proposed by Louvrou *et al.*

(*Taxon* **60**: 1768–1769, 2011). Votes: 13–4–1 [18/18] (72 % recommend conservation).

The fungal genus *Detonia* Sacc. was introduced in 1889 for three species, of which *Detonia leiocarpa* (Curr.) Sacc. has since been selected as type. Consequently *Detonia* Sacc. is now regarded as a heterotypic synonym of *Plicaria* Fuckel. Apart from the type of the generic name, the nine other species placed at some time in *Detonia* Sacc. are currently accepted as belonging in five other genera (Species Fungorum [http://www.speciesfungorum.org]). The Report 14 of the Nomenclature Committee for Algae (in *Taxon* **65**: 880, 2016) recommends against this proposal because “*Detonia* Sacc. has already been given a new legitimate name”. Discussion in the Committee also noted that continued usage of the replacement name *Neodetonia* does not seem to be disadvantageous because it was correctly introduced in 2011 and there are only two species; and, in addition, the generic name continues to honour De Toni. Nevertheless, the vote in the Committee was specifically about the desirability or otherwise of losing the fungal name *Detonia* Sacc. Because there is no suggestion at present of segregate genera of *Plicaria* being required, conservation of *Detonia* Freng. was not opposed.

(2032) Conserve *Pseudocyphellaria* (*Lobariaceae*: *Ascomycota*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Jørgensen & Galloway (*Taxon* **60**: 1769–1770, 2011). Votes: 14–0–3 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

This proposal seeks to conserve *Pseudocyphellaria* Vain. with *P. crocata* (L.) Vain. as type. This is necessary because several molecular analyses cited in the proposal place *Pseudocyphellaria aurata* (Ach.) Vain. (the currently accepted type of *Pseudocyphellaria*, based on *Sticta aurata* Ach.) within a relatively small clade (the species of which are characterised by a yellow medulla containing pulvinic acid derivatives and fernene triterpenoids) separate from the majority of species of the genus, including *P. crocata*, which mostly have a white medulla and hopane triterpenoids. Subsequent to the phylogenetic analyses cited in the proposal, Moncada *et al.* (*Lichenologist* **45**: 203–263, 2013), sampling 26 species of *Pseudocyphellaria*, also recovered a major clade containing *P. crocata* and 16 other named species, along with three other smaller clades (forming a monophyletic group sister to the main *Pseudocyphellaria* clade), one of which contained *P. aurata*. Their taxonomic scheme recognised the four clades at generic rank: a few species reside in each of *Podostictina* Clem. and *Parmostictina* Nyl., a few species are in the *P. aurata* clade, but the majority remain in the *P. crocata* clade. Therefore Moncada *et al.* (*loc.cit.*) supported conservation of *Pseudocyphellaria* with *P. crocata* as type to retain *Pseudocyphellaria* for the largest group, indicated as comprising 85 species in the proposal. The Committee agreed with this course of action. If the type of *Pseudocyphellaria* is conserved as *P. crocata*, the name *Crocodia* Link. (typified by *Sticta aurata*) becomes available for the small group of species around *P. aurata*, necessitating relatively few new combinations. *Pseudocyphellaria* would remain available for those who wish to recognise it in a broad sense (inclusive of *Crocodia*, *Podostictina* and *Parmostictina*).

The authors of the proposal note that the entry for

Pseudocyphellaria in Appendix III needs to be updated by deletion of *Stictina* Nyl. because this name is illegitimate, having been introduced by Nylander (*Syn. Meth. Lich.* **1**: 348, Apr. 1860) with inclusion of *Sticta sylvatica* (Hudson) Ach., which is the type of a previously published generic name, *Sticta* (Schreb.) Ach., according to the prior typification of this latter name by Eschweiler (*Syst. Lich.*: 20, 1824). Typification of *Stictina* with *S. crocata* (L.) Nyl. by Clements & Shear (*Gen. Fung.*: 322, 1931) does not alter the fact that the generic name is illegitimate. Nor does the update to the entry in the on-line Appendices to the *Code* (http://botany.si.edu/references/codes/propls/) that lists Nylander (*Flora* **43**: 66, 7 Feb 1860) as the place of publication of *Stictina*, because in this work Nylander also includes *Sticta sylvatica* under *Stictina*.

(2033) Conserve *Armillariella ostoyae* (*Armillaria ostoyae*) against *Agaricus obscurus*, *Agaricus occultans*, and *Armillaria solidipes*. Proposed by Redhead *et al.* (*Taxon* **60**: 1770–1771, 2011). Votes: 16–0–1 [17/20] (80 % recommend conservation).

Armillaria ostoyae (Romagn.) Herink, originally described from a collection made in Europe, was taken up in the 1970s for one of the boreal biological species that were segregated from *Armillaria mellea* (Vahl: Fr.) P. Kumm. The name *Armillaria ostoyae* was widely used in North America, until Burdsall & Volk (*N. Am. Fungi* **3**(7): 261–267, 2008) suggested synonymy of *Armillaria solidipes* Peck with *A. ostoyae*. The proposal seeks to conserve *Armillariella ostoyae* Romagn. against *A. solidipes* as a stabilizing measure, given the wider use of the former name. The proposers acknowledge that some doubt has been expressed as to the synonymy of the two by Hunt *et al.* (*Forest Pathol.* **41**: 253–254, 2011) who consider that *Armillaria solidipes* could perhaps represent one of a number of other named and unnamed species of *Armillaria*. Two much older names, described from the 18th century, *Agaricus obscurans* and *A. occultans*, must also be considered because their potential synonymy with *Armillaria ostoyae* would lead to a name change for the latter; and indeed some modern treatments list at least one of these two old names in the synonymy of *A. ostoyae* without taking the necessary step of taking up the earlier name. Lectotypification effected in the proposal means that both *Agaricus obscurus* and *A. occultans*, typified by the same plate, are synonyms of *Armillaria ostoyae* and hence also need to be rejected in order to maintain use of the latter name. The Committee recommends the proposal in order to fix the name of an important forest pathogen. If *Armillaria solidipes* turns out to represent a separate taxon to *A. ostoyae*, there is no obstacle to taking up *A. solidipes* if it is the earliest name for a different taxon of *Armillaria*.

(2044) Conserve *Agaricus tabescens* against *A. socialis* (*Basidiomycota*). Proposed by Redhead *et al.* (*Taxon* **61**: 252–253, 2012). Votes: 16–0–1 [17/20] (80 % recommend conservation).

Armillaria tabescens (Scop.) Emel is the name applied to a Northern Hemisphere tree pathogen, based on *Agaricus tabescens* Scop. – a name published in 1772, but not sanctioned. The name *Agaricus socialis* DC.: Fr., while

published later, was sanctioned, and is generally considered synonymous with *A. tabescens*. In his later works (e.g. Fries, *Hymenomyc. Eur.*: 111, 1874), Fries himself listed *A. socialis* under *A. tabescens*. However, under Art. 15.1, the sanctioned name has priority when the two are considered synonyms, which has led to occasional usage of *Armillaria socialis* (DC. : Fr.) Fayod. In the absence of original material (specimens or illustrations), the proposal includes designation of neotypes for both *Agaricus tabescens* and *A. socialis*. Conservation of the former against the latter is supported by the Committee given the extensive usage documented under the epithet *tabescens*, either as *Armillaria tabescens* or, often in older works, *Armillariella tabescens* (Scop.) Singer.

(2049) Conserve *Wickerhamomyces* against *Hansenula*. Proposed by Daniel *et al.* (*Taxon* **61**: 459–461, 2012). Proposal withdrawn.

Wickerhamomyces, introduced by Kurtzman *et al.* (*FEMS Yeast Res.* **8**: 951, 2008) is illegitimate because the protologue included the previously designated type (*H. anomala* (E.C. Hansen) Syd. & P. Syd.) of an available generic name *Hansenula* Syd. & P. Syd. This latter name was thought by Kurtzman (*Antonie van Leeuwenhoek* **99**: 13–23, 2011) not to be validly published, because he considered the basionym (*Saccharomyces anomalus* E.C. Hansen) of the name of the type to be not validly published. Furthermore, Kurtzman (*loc. cit.*) considered *Endoblastoderma* B. Fischer & Brebeck (which he mistakenly thought was typified by *E. pulverulentum* B. Fischer & Brebeck) to be synonymous with *Wickerhamomyces* (which actually meant that *Endoblastoderma* should have been taken up). The proposal includes clarification of the admittedly complex nomenclature of this group of yeasts (see also Prop. 2050 below), including demonstration that *Endoblastoderma* is a synonym of *Saccharomyces* rather than *Hansenula* (*Wickerhamomyces*), and *Hansenula* is validly published.

A further generic name, not considered in the proposal, *Waltiozyma* H.B. Mull. & Kock (*S. Afr. J. Sci.* **82**: 491, 1986), turns out to be typified by a name placed by the authors of *Wickerhamomyces* in that genus (*Waltiozyma mucosa* (Wick. & Kurtzman) H.B. Mull. & Kock). Consequently, for *Wickerhamomyces* to be adopted, it would need to be conserved also against *Waltiozyma*. In passing, it is also noted that *Williopsis* Zender 1925 is the earlier (and thus correct) name for the group of species currently placed in *Cyberlindnera* Minter (replacement name for *Lindnera* Kurtzman *et al.* 2008 non *Lindnera* Fuss. 1866) because the type (*Williopsis saturnus* (Klöcker) Zender) belongs in the same clade as the type of *Lindnera* (*L. americana* (Wick.) Kurtzman *et al.*).

In assigning names to clades in this group of yeasts, Kurtzman *et al.* (*loc. cit.*: 939–954) adopted a number of irregular nomenclatural practices, including (1) abandoning *Williopsis* because its species “are distributed among three clades and the name is not a good choice for the reasons discussed above [i.e., the morphological and physiological characters used to initially circumscribe the genus are not congruent with groups in the current phylogeny]”; (2) abandoning *Hansenula* because its use “would also lead to confusion because species previously assigned to this genus

are found in all four clades”; and (3) discounting *Waltiozyma* because it was monotypic and the “apparently unique fatty acid profile” of the type made it “an unsatisfactory choice as well”.

The proposal seeks to rectify the situation by conserving *Wickerhamomyces* because “*Hansenula sensu lato* is polyphyletic and the generic name *Wickerhamomyces* has already been adopted for a monophyletic group in the latest edition of *The Yeasts* (Kurtzman *et al.*, *loc. cit.*, 2011)”. Leaning weight to the proposal is the fact that the type of *Wickerhamomyces* is “a well-known, industrially important yeast cited in many publications and patents ... and it is currently receiving increased interest in several fields of microbiology and biotechnology such as food fermentations, biocontrol, biopreservation, enzyme production and the development of innovative therapeutics”.

Opinion within the Committee was split between accepting the proposal to continue use of *Wickerhamomyces* (given the widespread usage, at least for the species that includes the type, and the number of names already placed in the genus) and not accepting the proposal, in order to discourage replacement of legitimate names. Those opposed to conservation noted that polyphyly of *Hansenula* should not be a reason for not adopting the genus; and also noted that many of the yeasts involved have been placed in a number of different genera over the last several decades, with many combinations in *Hansenula* already available, except for species described since 2008.

During discussion of the proposal, Heide-Marie Daniel conveyed result of a vote held at the Yeast Taxonomy Workshop, CBS Fungal Biodiversity Centre, The Netherlands in April 2015. Among the 22 mycologists present at the Workshop, eight were in favour of continuing to use *Wickerhamomyces*, none was in favour of using *Hansenula*, two abstained and 13 had no opinion.

In the Committee, after two rounds of voting, voting on the proposal stood at 8–8–2 [18/18], some three votes short of reaching 60% for either Yes or No. At this point, the proposal was withdrawn by the senior authors Heide-Marie Daniel and Scott A. Redhead. Consequently, in assigning names to genera recognised among this group of yeasts, the earliest existing type-bearing names should be used, including *Hansenula*. The Committee regrets that it has taken considerable time to finalise this proposal and acknowledges the cordial communications by Heide-Marie Daniel in relation to the proposal.

(2050) Reject *Saccharomyces sphaericus* (*Ascomycota*: *Saccharomycotina*). Proposed by Daniel *et al.* (*Taxon* **61**: 459–461, 2012). Votes: 12–1–4 [17/20] (60 % recommend rejection).

A series of clarifications about various names leads to the conclusion that *Saccharomyces sphaericus* Sacc. could provide an earlier epithet for the taxon widely referred to as *Hansenula anomala* or *Wickerhamomyces anomalus* (E.C. Hansen) Kurtzman *et al.* (but see Prop. 2049 above) based on *Saccharomyces anomalus*. Firstly, the authors of the proposal establish that *Saccharomyces* Meyen (*Arch. Naturgesch.* **4**(2): 100, 1838) is validly published. Consequently *Saccharomyces sphaericus* introduced by

Saccardo in 1877 (*Michelia* 1: 89–90, 1877) cannot be regarded as not validly published due to *Saccharomyces* not being validly published at the time of publication of this particular species name. Secondly, they establish that *S. sphaericus*, although often attributed to Nägeli, was described by Saccardo in 1877. As an aside, they lectotypify *Mycoderma* Pers. by a species considered to be a fungus, meaning that the name *Mycoderma* is covered by the *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants* (and not the *Bacteriological Code*), which confirms citation of the type of *Saccharomyces* as *S. cerevisiae* (Desm.) Meyen.

Saccharomyces sphaericus cannot be excluded as a potential synonym of *S. anomalus*. Therefore, the authors propose rejection of *S. sphaericus*, without designating a type for it. Alternatives would have been (1) to conserve *S. anomalus* against *S. sphaericus* (with the latter typified by material representing *S. anomalus*), or (2) typify *S. sphaericus* with material of some other species. *Hansenula anomala* is a well-known fungus (see Prop. 2049) and therefore the Committee agrees that removal of the threat of the earlier name *S. sphaericus* by outright rejection is the best approach.

(2051) Conserve *Talaromyces* against *Lasioderma* (Ascomycota). Proposed by Seifert *et al.* (*Taxon* 61: 461–462, 2012). Votes: 18–0–0 [18/18] (100 % recommend conservation).

Introduced in 1955, *Talaromyces* C.R. Benj. is a widely used name for a genus of around 70 species, among which are human pathogens and species with potential for use in biological control and bioremediation. *Talaromyces* is proposed for conservation against *Lasioderma* Mont., the name of a monotypic genus that had been of uncertain application until a recent lectotypification of its type (*Lasioderma flavovirens* Durieu & Mont.) that results in synonymy with *Talaromyces*. Conservation of *Talaromyces* does not require any new combinations. In addition, *Lasioderma* is a homonym of a name currently in use in the animal kingdom. The Committee unanimously supported conservation.

(2052) Conserve *Lichen vulgatus* (*Opegrapha vulgata*) (lichenised Ascomycota) with a conserved type. Proposed by Linda in Arcadia & Ertz (*Taxon* 61: 462–464, 2012). Votes: 14–0–3 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

Opegrapha Ach., a large genus of lirellate lichens, is conserved with publication attributed to Acharius in his 1809 work (*Kongl. Vetensk. Acad. Nya Handl.* 30: 97–102, 1809) rather than his first usage of the name (Acharius, *Methodus Lich.*: 16, 1803). The type is listed as “*O. vulgata* (Ach.) Ach. (*Lichen vulgatus* Ach.)”. The proposers clarify that *Lichen vulgatus* Ach. and *Opegrapha vulgata* [for author citation see below] are both illegitimate, by virtue of Acharius explicitly including in their scope a previously published name, *Lichen rugosus* L. The type of *L. vulgatus* is consequently the type of *L. rugosus*. However, this latter species, based on lectotypification by Hawksworth & Punithalingam (*Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc.* 60: 503, 1973) and epitypification by Jørgensen *et al.* (*Bot. J. Linn. Soc.* 115: 352, 1994), is a non-lichenised fungus, currently known as *Ascodichaena rugosa* Butin. (syn. *Polymorphum rugosum* (L.) D. Hawksw. & Punith.), and not an *Opegrapha*.

In order to maintain long-time usage of *Opegrapha*, the option of proposing a different type for *Opegrapha* is canvassed, but because *Opegrapha vulgata* is a well-established name in current use, and “it needs a conserved type anyway” the authors propose to conserve *L. vulgatus* with a conserved type. Rather than chose the type from material seen by Acharius, an ample recent collection from which DNA sequences have been obtained is proposed as conserved type. Conservation makes *L. vulgatus* legitimate (Art. 14.1). The Committee concurs with this course of action.

Before conservation of *L. vulgatus*, the author citation of *O. vulgata* was correctly “Ach.” rather than “(Ach.) Ach.”, because even though *O. vulgata* was clearly based on *L. vulgatus*, the former name could not be treated as a new combination due to the illegitimacy of its “basionym”. However, once *L. vulgatus* is conserved, despite the fact that *O. vulgata* was “nomenclaturally superfluous when published [it] is not illegitimate on account of its superfluity” because it now has a legitimate basionym (Art. 52.3), and the correct citation is *O. vulgata* (Ach.) Ach.

(2069) Conserve *Chrysothrichaceae* [sic] against *Pulverariaceae* (Fungi). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* 61: 681–682, 2012). Votes: 15–2–1 [18/18] (83 % recommend conservation).

During discussion on this proposal it was established that name of the family based on *Chrysothrix* Mont. should not be spelt “*Chrysothrichaceae*” (as in the proposal) nor “*Chrysothricaceae*” (as in the protologue), but *Chrysothricaceae* (Stearn, *Bot. Latin*, 4th edn: 80, 1992). The proposal identifies *Pulverariaceae* Kostel. as an earlier synonym of *Chrysothricaceae* Zahlbr. and seeks to conserve the latter name based on “current usage”. Despite the lack of any supporting information about this usage, the Committee agreed that conservation is warranted for this widespread family of three genera and several dozen species (Species Fungorum [http://www.speciesfungorum.org]; Index Fungorum [http://www.indexfungorum.org/]; Cannon & Kirk, *Fungal Families of the World*, 2007). It is relevant that *Chrysothrix* is already conserved against *Pulveraria* Ach. (from which the name *Pulverariaceae* is formed).

(2070) Conserve *Dothioraceae* against *Saccoltheciaceae* (Fungi). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* 61: 681–682, 2012). Votes: 3–12–2 [17/20] (60 % recommend against conservation).

Dothioraceae Theiss. & Syd. 1918 typified by *Dothiora* Fr. 1849 (nom. cons.) non Fr. 1837 is proposed for conservation against *Saccoltheciaceae* Bonord. 1864 typified by *Saccolthecium* Fr. However, the in-depth treatment by Thambugala *et al.* (*Fungal Diversity* 68: 105–158, 2014), based on a molecular phylogeny and examination of type specimens, recognises two families in *Dothideales*: *Dothideaceae* Chevall. and the newly named *Aureobasidiaceae* Thambug. & K.D. Hyde. (in Thambugala *et al.* (*loc. cit.*)). In this arrangement, the genus *Dothiora* is placed in the *Dothideaceae*, and hence *Dothioraceae* is a synonym of *Dothideaceae*, the earlier name. The genus *Saccolthecium* is placed in the newly erected *Aureobasidiaceae*. Because *Dothioraceae* and *Saccoltheciaceae* are not names for the

same taxon under the current taxonomic arrangement for the *Dothideales*, the proposal is unnecessary, and the Committee recommends against conservation.

Incidentally, *Aureobasidiaceae* Thambug. & K.D. Hyde 2014 is an isonym of *Aureobasidiaceae* Cif. (*Man. Mic. Med.*, 2nd edn, 1: 178, 1958) because both names are based on *Aureobasidium* Viala & G. Boyer. Even with publication of *Aureobasidiaceae* dating from 1958, the correct name for the family that contains *Aureobasidium* and *Sacrothecium* is the earlier name *Sacrotheciaceae*, and this has been recognised by Liu *et al.* (*Fungal Diversity* 72: 159, 2015).

(2071) Conserve *Lichen leucomelos* (*Heterodermia leucomelos*) with that spelling (lichenised *Ascomycota*). Proposed by Linda in Arcadia (*Taxon* 61: 682–683, 2012). Votes: 14–2–1 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

For *Lichen leucomelos* L., Linnaeus used the spelling *leucomelos* in the original publication and several later ones, but some authors have spelled the epithet *leucomelas*, and other authors introduced the spelling *leucomelus*, based on an annotation by Linnaeus on the type sheet. All three spellings (*leucomelos*, *leucomelas*, *leucomelus*) have been used subsequently (in the feminine genus *Heterodermia*, they appear as *leucomelos*, *leucomelaina* [or *leucomelaena*] and *leucomela* respectively). Salisbury (*Lichenologist* 10: 132–134, 1974) argued that *leucomelos* should be corrected to *leucomelas*, but the editor of that journal [D. Hawksworth] in a footnote pointed out “it seems impossible to prove that he [Linnaeus] meant to use ‘*leucomelas*’ ... several nomenclatural specialists consulted independently agree that the original spelling of Linnaeus should be retained”. Uncertainty over the correct interpretation remains, with considerable use of each of the three possible spellings in the genus *Heterodermia*, which is where the species is currently placed.

To fix the spelling, the author proposes conservation of the name with the original spelling of Linnaeus. There was some confusion in the Committee as to the possibility of conserving an original spelling, given that no examples of this among *Fungi* could be found in the Appendices to the *Code*. Some members who agreed with use of the original spelling indicated that they would vote against the proposal because they saw it as superfluous. Therefore the vote was specifically framed as: Yes supports conservation of the original spelling / No does not support conservation of the original spelling. Between these alternatives, the majority of the Committee recommends conservation, agreeing with the proposer that without conservation “confusion and controversy about the correct spelling of the epithet in the name of this lichen are sure to continue”. For further discussion about conservation of “correct” spelling, see Prop. 2275.

(2085) Conserve *Cylindrocladium buxicola* against *C. pseudonaviculatum* (*Ascomycota*). Proposed by Henricot *et al.* (*Taxon* 61: 1119–1120, 2012). Votes: 5–12–1 [18/18] (67 % recommend against conservation).

The names *Cylindrocladium pseudonaviculatum* Crous *et al.* (from New Zealand, published 30 June 2002) and *C. buxicola* Henricot (from the UK, published 11 December 2002) were known to refer to the same species from 2004 (Crous *et*

al., *Stud. Mycol.* 50: 415–430, 2004). This proposal seeks to conserve the later name because in the subsequent decade it has been used much more widely for a plant pathogen that occurs in Europe and North America, as well as New Zealand. However, *C. pseudonaviculatum* was published in an accessible journal (*Sydowia*) from material on the same host (*Buxus* L.) as *C. buxicola*, and the publication revealing the synonymy of the two species was also readily accessible. The organism is currently placed in *Calonectria*, in which there is an existing combination *Calonectria pseudonaviculata* (Crous *et al.*) L. Lombard *et al.*, but not a combination based on *C. buxicola*. Considering the arguments for and against, the Committee opted to let priority rule in this case, which provides clear guidance that the organism should be referred as *Cylindrocladium pseudonaviculatum* or a name based on this.

(2086) Conserve *Catillaria* (lichenised *Ascomycota*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Linda in Arcadia (*Taxon* 61: 1120–1121, 2012). Votes: 3–11–4 [18/18] (61 % recommend against conservation).

Catillaria was introduced at generic rank by Massalongo (*Ric. Auton. Lich. Crost.*: 78, 1852) and the proposal argues that the basionym is *Lecidea* [unranked] *Catillaria* Ach. Santesson (*Symb. Bot. Upsal.* 12 (1): 428–429, 1952) pointed out that Massalongo’s concept of *Catillaria* and Acharius’s concept of *Lecidea* [unranked] *Catillaria* are unrelated, and none of the 80 species treated by Acharius (*Methodus Lich.*: 33, 1803) belong in *Catillaria* in the sense of Massalongo. Despite Santesson (*loc. cit.*) having lectotypified “*Catillaria* A. Massal.” with *C. chalybeia* (Borrer) A. Massal., the proposal argues that when *Catillaria* is treated as a new combination, it must consequently be typified by one of the species included by Acharius, which would go against current and previous usage of the name *Catillaria*. Consequently, the proposal seeks to conserve “*Catillaria* A. Massal.” with *C. chalybeia* as type.

On consulting the entire work in which *Catillaria* was introduced, we find two statements that indicate that Massalongo was in fact deliberately creating a name at generic rank disconnected from the original use of Acharius at infrageneric rank, and not a new combination. In reference to both *Rinodina* and *Catillaria*, Massalongo writes (*loc. cit.*: x): “sono quivi adoperati in senso affatto opposto, per cui si potranno riguardare come generi novelli” (here they are used in an absolutely opposite sense, so we may regard them as novel genera). He provides an explanation for this “recycling” of names (*loc. cit.*: ix): “che anzi desideroso di introdurre minor numero di nomi nuovi che gli fosse concesso, adotto quali generi i nomi vecchi di *Rinodina*, *Catillaria*, *Psoroma*, *Icmadophila* etc. adoperati dai loro creatori semplici divisioni” (that indeed eager to introduce fewer new names to be allowed, I adopt what kinds of old names *Rinodina*, *Catillaria*, *Psoroma*, *Icmadophila* etc. used by their creators as simple divisions). However strange this practice appears today, Massalongo was avowedly excluding the circumscription by Acharius of *Lecidea* [unranked] *Catillaria* when introducing the name *Catillaria*, which should therefore be attributed to Massalongo, despite his citing the name as “*Catillaria* (Ach.)” and the lectotypification by Santesson (*loc. cit.*) should apply.

The proposer was consulted about this interpretation, but maintains that Massalongo meant the genus *Catillaria* to have some relation to *Lecidea* [unranked] *Catillaria*. The Committee does not agree, and consequently recommends against conservation.

(2087) Conserve *Lecidea oederi* Ach. (*Rhizocarpon oederi*) against *L. koenigii* Gunnerus (lichenised *Ascomycota*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Jørgensen (*Taxon* **61**: 1121, 2012), and revised by Jørgensen (*Taxon* **62**: 642, 2013). Votes: 15–0–2 [17/20] (75 % recommend conservation).

This proposal seeks to maintain the current application of the crustose lichen *Rhizocarpon oederi* (Ach.) Körb. by conservation of the basionym *Lecidea oederi* Ach. against the synonymous *Lichen koenigii* Gunnerus. The original proposal, which included conservation against *L. oederi* Gunnerus was modified (Jørgensen, *loc. cit.*, 2013) in light of correction to the citation of *R. oederi* (with basionym *Lecidea oederi* Ach. rather than *Lichen oederi* Weber) which means that conservation against *L. oederi* Gunnerus is no longer necessary. The conserved type was also altered to be material seen by Körber when making the new combination *Rhizocarpon oederi*. Because *Rhizocarpon oederi* is a widespread species known under that name since 1860, conservation is recommended.

(2100) Conserve *Chrysothrix*, nom. cons., against an additional name, *Alysphaeria* (lichenised *Ascomycota*). Proposed by Laundon (*Taxon* **61**: 1321–1321, 2012). Votes: 14–0–3 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

The proposal seeks to add *Alysphaeria* Turpin to the two genera (*Peribotryon* Fr. and *Pulveraria* Ach.) against which *Chrysothrix* Mont. is already conserved. Typification of *Alysphaeria* by Laundon (*Lichenologist* **40**: 413, 2008) with *Alysphaeria candelaris* (Ach.) Turpin means that *Alysphaeria* is clearly a synonym of *Chrysothrix*. Because *Alysphaeria* is apparently unused since its publication and *Chrysothrix* is a well-established name that is conserved already against other generic names, it makes sense to add *Alysphaeria* to those other names.

(2101) Conserve the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* (*Taiwanofungus camphoratus*) (*Polyporales*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Wu *et al.* (*Taxon* **61**: 1321–1322, 2012). Votes: 12–3–2 [17/20] (60 % recommend conservation).

Niu-chang-chih is a polypore restricted to Taiwan of considerable medical and economic significance: it is used in cancer treatment, is the subject of more than 100 patent applications and patents (Yuan *et al.*, *Recent Patents Food, Nutr. Agric.* **5**: 62–69, 2013) and basidiocarps can cost more than US\$ 15 000 per kg. The first validly published name applied to this fungus was *Ganoderma camphoratum* M. Zang & C.H. Su (*Acta Bot. Yunnan.* **12**: 395–396, 1990) whose type (*Mr. Lan s.n.*, HKAS 22294) is a single basidioma of niu-chang-chih with spores of another unrelated fungus also present. Both these elements are represented in the original description and accompanying illustrations. Chang & Chou (*Bot. Bull. Acad. Sin.* **45**: 347–352, 2004) lectotypified *G. camphoratum*, limiting it to the spores described and illustrated by Zang and Su, the only portion of the original

type that Chang and Chou believed to belong in *Ganoderma*, and applied the name *Anrotdia cinnamomea* T.T. Chang & W.N. Chou (originally described in 1995) to niu-chang-chih. Jong (*Micol. Aplicada Int.* **24**: 43–52, 2012) also supported use of *A. cinnamomea* for niu-chang-chih. However, there has been significant continued use of *G. camphoratum* and combinations based on it (*Anrotdia camphorata* (M. Zang & C.H. Su) Sheng H. Wu *et al.*, *Taiwanofungus camphoratus* (M. Zang & C.H. Su) Sheng H. Wu *et al.*) for niu-chang-chih.

When lectotypifying *G. camphoratum*, Chang & Chou (*loc. cit.*) specifically noted “that that the *Ganoderma* element in the original material is entirely limited to the basidiospores attached to the surface of the *Anrotdia* basidiomata”. In a detailed analysis of the type material of *G. camphoratum*, Wu *et al.* (*Taxon* **61**: 1305–1310, 2012) concluded that “the spores upon which Chang and Chou’s lectotype is based are a minor admixture with the original gathering of the niu-chang-chih specimen and thus cannot serve as the lectotype for the name *Ganoderma camphoratum*”. Furthermore, Wu *et al.* (*loc. cit.*) considered that the admixed spores do not in fact match those of *Ganoderma*, but possibly belong to a taxon in the *Russulales* or are “conidia ... of an unknown anamorphic fungus”. In choosing a lectotype, Wu *et al.* (*loc. cit.*) mentioned that in cases where a type contains a mixture of more than one taxon, “the name must remain attached to the part ... that corresponds most nearly with the original description or diagnosis” (Art. 9.14). They pointed out that in the “eight sentence original description, only the last sentence described the non-niu-chang-chih spores ... [and] ... of the six illustrations ... only one (fig. 3 in Zang & Su) is of these spores”. Therefore, Wu *et al.* (*loc. cit.*) rejected the lectotypification of Chang & Chou (*loc. cit.*) and superseded it (invoking Art. 9.19(c)) with a lectotype that is the original material “Exclusive of the ‘basidiospores’ described in the last sentence of the description and illustrated in fig. 3 of Zang & Su, 1990”.

This proposal seeks to conserve *G. camphoratum* with a conserved type that is the same portion of the original material (HKAS 22294) as in the lectotypification of Wu *et al.* (*loc. cit.*), more specifically defined as “Exclusive of echinate basidiospores or any conidia consistent with those described in the last sentence of the description and illustrated in Fig. 3 of Zang & Su, *loc. cit.*” Several courses of action in relation to the proposal are put forward by the proposers: approval, taken to mean that the lectotypification is as effected by Wu *et al.* (*loc. cit.*); non approval, because this lectotypification is unambiguously warranted under the *Code*, and thus conservation of the name and type is not required; or non approval because the initial lectotypification by Chang & Chou (*loc. cit.*) is to be accepted. There is a further interpretation (V. Demoulin, *in litt.*) that lectotypification is unnecessary in the first place because Art. 8 and 9 imply that specimens are individual organisms and that spores could only be considered specimens in the context of palynology, and therefore the polypore basidioma is the holotype.

Because of the high significance of niu-chang-chih medicinally and economically, the Committee wishes to close the door to ongoing nomenclatural arguments over appropriate typification of *G. camphoratum*. Therefore, a 60 % majority of the Committee recommends acceptance of the

proposal to conserve *G. camphoratum* with a conserved type. **(2128)** Conserve *Flammula* (Fr.) P. Kumm. (*Fungi: Agaricales*) against *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourn. (*Spermatophyta: Ranunculaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Redhead (*Taxon* **62**: 401–402, 2013). Modified proposal changing the conserved type to: “*Agaricus alnicola* Fr. : Fr. (*F. alnicola* (Fr. : Fr.) P. Kumm.)”. Votes: 16–0–2 [18/18] (89 % recommend conservation).

Flammula (Fr.) P. Kumm. 1871 is a name in current use for a small group of fungi that is predated by *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourn. 1868, a name for a genus of plants in the *Ranunculaceae*. The proposal establishes that the authorship of the plant genus *Flammula* should be as cited, despite earlier interpretations that it was not validly published; arguing that it should be treated as a name at new rank for that of the pre-existing subgenus with the same circumscription (*Ranunculus* subg. *Flammula* Webb ex Spach) even though this taxon was not referred to by Fourreau.

The original proposal also sought to typify *Flammula* (Fr.) P. Kumm. with the conserved type *Agaricus flavidus* Schaeff. : Fr. (*F. flavida* (Schaeff. : Fr.) P. Kumm.). Typification of *Flammula* (Fr.) P. Kumm. is “complicated” and “long debated” but nevertheless *A. flavidus* appears to be the “correct” choice of type under the *Code*, meaning that the need to conserve it as type was questioned in discussions in the Committee. Further examination of the protologue of *A. flavidus* established that the plate in Schaeffer likely depicts a species of *Hypholoma* (S. Ryman, pers. comm.). Horak (*Syn. Gen. Agaric.*: 235, 1968) had already designated an epitype for the plate (as “lectotype”) which according to Jacobsson (*Taxon. Surv. Pholiota alnicola Group Eur.*: 140, 1986) also represents a species of *Hypholoma*. Therefore, *Agaricus alnicola* Fr. : Fr. (*Flammula alnicola* (Fr. : Fr.) P. Kumm.) was suggested as a more appropriate choice as conserved type because it is lectotypified and in current use in almost every mycota in Europe. The author of the proposal (Redhead) regarded the change of conserved type as a “friendly amendment”. In consequence the accepted conservation proposal reads:

(2128) *Flammula* (Fr.) P. Kumm., Führer Pilzk.: 22, 80. Jul–Aug 1871 (*Agaricus* “trib.” *Flammula* Fr., Syst. Mycol. 1: 11, 250. 1 Jan 1821), nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *Agaricus alnicola* Fr. : Fr. (*Pholiota alnicola* (Fr. : Fr.) Singer), typ. cons. prop.

(=) *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourn. in Ann. Soc. Linn. Lyon., ser. 2, 16: 324. 1868 (*Ranunculus* subg. *Flammula* Webb ex Spach, Hist. Nat. Vég. 7: 208. 4 Mai 1838) [*Angiosp.*: *Ranuncul.*], nom. rej. prop.

Typus: *F. ranunculus* Fourn. (= *Ranunculus flammula* L.).

Given that the fungal *Flammula* is a name in use for a “phylogenetically defined genus” but the plant *Flammula* “has been abandoned and placed in synonymy with *Ranunculus* L.”, the Committee for Fungi viewed conservation of the fungal generic name as warranted along with the new choice of conserved type as *A. alnicola*. This course of action allows continued use of the current application of *Flammula* (Fr. : Fr.) P. Kumm. It is noted that the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants in their Report 66 (*Taxon* **63**: 1358–1371, 2014) did not see any obstacles to taking up *Flammula* (Fr. : Fr.) P. Kumm. over *Flammula* (Webb ex Spach) Fourn.

and recommended acceptance of the original proposal.

(2142) Conserve *Peziza ammophila* Durieu & Lév. 1848 against *P. ammophila* Saut. 1841 (*Ascomycota: Pezizaceae*). Proposed by Pennycook *et al.* (*Taxon* **62**: 628, 2013). Votes: 14–1–2 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

Peziza ammophila Durieu & Lév. 1848 is illegitimate due to the existence of *P. ammophila* Saut., published seven years earlier. The latter is not a name in current use; its holotype has been lost; and “no subsequent collections have been reported”. *Peziza ammophila* Durieu & Lév. was not provided with a legitimate name until its transfer to *Aleuria* as *Aleuria ammophila* Gillet 1879. Without conservation, *P. ammophila* Durieu & Lév. will have to be known as *P. funerata* Cooke 1878 (confirmed as a synonym as long ago as 1942, but not used since). Given that *P. ammophila* Durieu & Lév. is a cosmopolitan species widely reported from sand dune environments, the Committee recommends conservation.

(2143) Conserve *Fuscopannaria* against *Moelleropsis* (lichenised *Ascomycota*). Proposed by Jørgensen *et al.* (*Taxon* **62**: 629, 2013). Votes: 13–0–4 [17/20] (65 % recommend conservation).

The lichen genus *Fuscopannaria* P.M. Jørg. was introduced in 1994 (*J. Hattori Bot. Lab.* **76**: 202, 1994) because at that time available information indicated that *Moelleropsis* Gyeln. (*Ann. Hist.-Nat. Mus. Natl. Hung., Bot.* **32**: 196, 1939) was unrelated. Molecular phylogeny (Ekman & Jørgensen, *Canad. J. Bot.* **80**: 625–634, 2002) suggested that *Moelleropsis nebulosa* (Hoffm.) Gyeln., type of *Moelleropsis*, falls within the *Fuscopannaria* clade, a conclusion confirmed recently by Ekman *et al.* (*Lichenologist* **46**: 627–656, 2014). Conservation of *Fuscopannaria*, the name for a genus of some 40 or more species, against *Moelleropsis*, with two species (only the type of which is congeneric with *Fuscopannaria*) is recommended.

(2176) Conserve *Coniothecium betulinum* against *Torula stilbospora* (*Ascomycota*). Proposed by Braun & Heuchert (*Taxon* **62**: 831, 2013). Modified proposal: to conserve *Torula stilbospora* with a conserved type. Votes: 16–0–2 [18/18] (89 % recommend conservation).

Torula stilbospora Corda (in Sturm, *Deutschl. Fl.*, Abt. III (*Pilze*) **2**: 99, 1829) has long been interpreted in the light of the illustration by Corda (*Icon. Fung.* **5**: 50, 1842). Corda’s later interpretation was relied on by Hughes (*Canad. J. Bot.* **36**: 628, 1958) when recombining the name in *Taeniolella*. However, the type of *Torula stilbospora* is actually conspecific with *Coniothecium betulinum* Corda 1837, widely known as *Trimmatostroma betulinum* (Corda) S. Hughes ever since this combination was introduced in 1958, also by Hughes (*loc. cit.*). The original proposal lectotypified *T. stilbospora* on original material, and proposed conservation of *C. betulinum* against *Torula stilbospora*. Under this scenario *Taeniolella stilbospora* (Corda) S. Hughes would need a new name – because it remains in current use, still based on Corda’s later misapplication of his original *Torula stilbospora*. The alternative of conserving *T. stilbospora* with a conserved type that locks in the interpretation of Corda (*loc. cit.* 1842) removes *T. stilbospora* from the synonymy of *C. betulinum*, thus rendering both *Trimmatostroma betulinum* and

Taeniolella stilbospora available. A collection cited by Corda (*loc. cit.* 1842) from Neustadt, mentioned in the proposal, is suitable as a conserved type for *Torula stilbospora*. The altered proposal, as set out below, was regarded as a “friendly amendment” by the proposers and the Committee also supported it. In consequence the accepted conservation proposal reads:

(2176) *Torula stilbospora* Corda in Sturm, *Deutschl. Fl.*, Abt. III (Pilze) 2: 99. 1829.

Typus: Central Europe; [Czech Republic, Poland or Germany], Neustadt, on wood, without date, Corda (PRM No. 155698) (typ. cons.).

(2196) Conserve *Alectoria fuscescens* (*Bryoria fuscescens*) against *Lichen chalybeiformis* and *Alectoria subcana* (*Ascomycota: Lecanorales: Parmeliaceae*). Proposed by Hawksworth & Jørgensen (*Taxon* 62: 1057, 2013). Votes: 15–0–2 [17/20] (75 % recommend conservation).

In order to protect the name *Bryoria fuscescens* (Gyeln.) Brodo & D. Hawksw., *Lichen chalybeiformis* L. (whose lectotype proved to belong to *B. fuscescens*) has already been conserved with a different type that meant that under the taxonomy accepted at the time of inclusion of *L. chalybeiformis* in App. IV of the *St Louis Code* (Greuter *et al.* in *Regnum Veg.* 138. 2000), *B. chalybeiformis* (L.) Brodo & D. Hawksw. was not conspecific with *B. fuscescens*. However, new molecular data indicate that *B. fuscescens* and *B. chalybeiformis* are conspecific. Consequently, *Alectoria fuscescens* Gyeln., basionym of *Bryoria fuscescens*, is proposed for conservation against *L. chalybeiformis* and also *A. subcana* (Nyl. ex Stizenb.) Gyeln. (based on *A. proluxa* var. *subcana* Nyl. ex Stizenb.), another likely synonym. A subsequent comprehensive treatment of boreal *Bryoria* by Velmala *et al.* (*Ann. Bot. Fenn.* 51: 345–371, 2014) based on chemical, morphological and molecular data confirms that *B. fuscescens* includes *L. chalybeiformis* and *A. proluxa* var. *subcana* Nyl. ex Stizenb. Therefore, given that the name *B. fuscescens* has been applied for more than 50 years to the most common member of the hair lichen genus in the Northern Hemisphere, conservation is recommended. It should be noted that *L. chalybeiformis* remains in the list of conserved names, and is available for use for segregate taxa, should they be recognised.

(2197) Conserve *Hebeloma* (*Basidiomycota: Agaricales: Strophariaceae*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Beker *et al.* (*Taxon* 62: 1058–1059, 2013). Votes: 16–0–1 [17/20] (80 % recommend conservation).

The long-accepted type of the generic name *Hebeloma* (Fr.) P. Kumm. is *Hebeloma fastibile* (Pers.) P. Kumm. based on *Agaricus fastibilis* Pers., which is, however, a name that has various interpretations. It was “lectotypified” by Singer (*Persoonia* 2: 25, 1961) with a collection from the Persoon herbarium that does not match the protologue, and consequently Singer’s typification is rather a neotypification. This neotypification was superseded by the lectotypification of Kuyper & Vesterholt (*Persoonia* 14: 191, 1990) who selected a plate depicting *A. laterinus* Batsch (*Elench. Fung.* 2: t. XXXIII, fig. 195a & 195b, 1789) that had been cited in the protologue of *A. fastibilis*.

The neotype of Singer (*loc. cit.*) represents *H. mesophaeum* (Pers.) Quél., a member of *Hebeloma* sect. *Hebeloma* in current classifications. However, the lectotype of *H. fastibile* does not possess characters consistent with *H. sect. Hebeloma*, but rather is consistent with *H. sect. Myxocybe* (Fayod) Konrad & Maubl. Consequently, without conservation of *Hebeloma* with a different type, the current *Hebeloma* sect. *Myxocybe* would have to be called *Hebeloma* sect. *Hebeloma*, and a new name would be necessary for the previous “section *Hebeloma*”. To avoid this confusing outcome, typification of *Hebeloma* with *H. mesophaeum* as conserved type is proposed. Given that this name is “applied consistently to a very common agaric in northern Europe”, the Committee recommends conservation. See also Prop. 2198.

(2198) Conserve *Agaricus laterinus* (*Hebeloma laterinum*) against the sanctioned *Agaricus fastibilis* (*Hebeloma fastibile*) (*Basidiomycota: Agaricales: Strophariaceae*). Proposed by Beker *et al.* (*Taxon* 62: 1059–1060, 2013). Votes: 15–0–2 [17/20] (75 % recommend conservation).

This proposal is connected with Prop. 2197. Following the lectotypification by Kuyper & Vesterholt (*Persoonia* 14: 191. 1990) of *Agaricus fastibilis* with the plate of *A. laterinus* accompanying the original description of this name by Batsch (*Elench. Fung.* 2: t. XXXIII, fig. 195a & 195b, 1789), the former name (which was published later) should be taken up because it was sanctioned and *A. laterinus* was not. The authors of the proposal mention the possibility of revisiting the typification of *A. fastibilis*, given the name was sanctioned, utilising Art. 9.10, which permits typification of sanctioned names by “elements associated with the name in the protologue and/or the sanctioning treatment”. However, they do not take up this possibility because of the multiple existing interpretations of *A. fastibilis*. It is noted that there appears to have been no take up of *H. fastibile* as the nomenclaturally correct name for *H. laterinum* despite the fact that the basionyms of these two names have the same type. Therefore, given the various interpretations of *H. fastibile* (some in different sections of the genus) compared to the stable interpretation of *H. laterinum* over the last decade, the Committee supports conservation of *A. laterinus* against *A. fastibilis*.

(2210) Conserve the teleomorph-typified name *Blumeria* against the conserved anamorph-typified name *Oidium* (*Ascomycota: Erysiphaceae*). Proposed by Braun (*Taxon* 62: 1328–1331, 2013). Votes: 17–0–1 [18/18] (94 % recommend conservation).

See next set of proposals.

(2211–2232) The set of proposals (2211–2232) proposed by Braun (*Taxon* 62: 1328–1331, 2013). These all relate to names in *Ascomycota: Erysiphaceae*.

(2211) Conserve *Erysiphe arcuata* against *Oidium carpini*
(2212) Conserve *Microsphaera azaleae* against *Oidium ericinum*

(2213) Conserve *Erysiphe buhrii* against *Oidium dianthi*

(2214) Conserve *Erysiphe catalpae* against *Oidium bignoniae*

(2215) Conserve *Erysiphe celosiae* against *Oidium amaranthi*

- (2216) Conserve *Microsphaera oehrensii* against *Oidium robustum*
 (2217) Conserve *Erysiphe quercicola* against *Oidium anacardii*
 (2218) Conserve *Erysiphe biocellata* against *Oidium erysiphoides*
 (2219) Conserve *Erysiphe magnicellulata* against *Oidium drummondii*
 (2220) Conserve *Golovinomyces sonchicola* against *Oidium sonchi-arvensis*
 (2221) Conserve *Erysiphe verbasci* against *Oidium balsamii*
 (2222) Conserve *Leveillula rutae* against *Oidium haplophylli*
 (2223) Conserve *Phyllactinia alni* against *Ovulariopsis alni-formosanae*
 (2224) Conserve *Phyllactinia ampelopsidis* against *Ovulariopsis ampelopsidis-heterophyllae*
 (2225) Conserve *Phyllactinia chubutiana* against *Oidium insolitum*
 (2226) Conserve *Phyllactinia dalbergiae* against *Phyllactinia subspiralis*
 (2227) Conserve *Phyllactinia gmelinae* against *Ovulariopsis gmelinae-arboreae*
 (2228) Conserve *Phyllactinia populi* against *Ovulariopsis salicis-warburgii*
 (2229) Conserve *Sphaerotheca leucotricha* against *Oidium farinosum*
 (2230) Conserve *Sphaerotheca euphorbiae-hirtae* against *Oidium pedilanthi*
 (2231) Conserve *Sphaerotheca filipendulae* against *Torula botryoides*
 (2232) Conserve *Podosphaera solanacearum* against *Oidium saeforthiani*

These 22 proposals were considered and voted on as a block. Votes: 16–1–1 [18/18] (89 % recommend conservation).

The proposals on one generic name and 22 names of species of powdery mildews (causal agents of numerous economically significant diseases of cultivated plants) arise from changes to Art. 59 in the *Melbourne Code* (<http://www.iapt-taxon.org/nomen/main.php>) meaning that pleomorphic fungi have one name rather than different names for different morphs (“one fungus : one name”). The proposals could have been submitted through the international working groups who have been preparing lists as set out in Art. 14.13 (see NCFung Report 21). Indeed, the author of the proposals Uwe Braun is also convenor of the NCFung/ICTF (International Commission on the Taxonomy of Fungi) formally approved working group on *Erysiphales*. Nevertheless, the proposals were published individually under Art. 14.1 and have been duly considered.

The 23 proposals seek to conserve a later name typified by a sexual morph (teleomorph) against an earlier name typified by an asexual morph (anamorph), for one genus (Prop. 2210) and 22 species (Prop. 2211–2232). Note that while most of the anamorph-typified species are in anamorph-typified genera such as *Oidium* Link, for Prop. 2226 both the conserved and the rejected names are in the genus *Phyllactinia* (teleomorph-typified) but the rejected species

Phyllactinia subspiralis (E.S. Salmon) Sawada, is specifically noted as being anamorph-typified.

The proposer provides a convincing argument that, in choosing the name for powdery mildews under “one fungus : one name”, preference should be given to teleomorph-typified names, because “It is relatively easy now to assign asexual powdery mildews to particular teleomorph genera, but at species level anamorphs are mostly poorly differentiated and of little diagnostic value.” For the 22 proposals concerning names of species, in addition, “all competing anamorph-typified names are less widely used”. For the preference of *Blumeria* Golovin ex Speer over *Oidium*, the latter “has previously been used in an extremely broad sense, covering all kinds of powdery mildew anamorphs” whereas *Blumeria graminis* (DC.) Speer (type of the monotypic genus *Blumeria*), is “causal agent of powdery mildew on cereals and grasses, and undoubtedly the economically and phytopathologically most important species of the *Erysiphaceae*”.

In ballots of the Committee, the proposals were considered as two sets, one containing Prop. 2210 on *Blumeria* against *Oidium* and the other containing the 22 proposals on names of species. All 23 proposals were recommended for conservation.

(2234) Conserve *Helminthosporium maydis* Y. Nisik. & C. Miyake (*Bipolaris maydis*) against *H. maydis* Brond. and *Ophiobolus heterostrophus* (Ascomycota: Pleosporales: Pleosporaceae). Proposed by Rossmann *et al.* (*Taxon* **62**: 1332–1333, 2013). Votes: 16–1–1 [18/18] (89 % recommend conservation).

Bipolaris Shoemaker (anamorph-typified) has been proposed for conservation against *Cochliobolus* Drechsler (teleomorph-typified) both via an individual proposal (Prop. 2233) and also by inclusion in a list from a working group under Art. 14.13. The latter action has been approved (NCFung Report 21). Therefore, without the action in this proposal, a new combination would be required in *Bipolaris* based on *Ophiobolus heterostrophus* Drechsler 1925 for the species commonly known as *Bipolaris maydis* (Y. Nisik. & C. Miyake) Shoemaker, which, however, is based on a later basionym, *Helminthosporium maydis* Y. Nisik. & C. Miyake 1926.

Bipolaris maydis (*Cochliobolus heterostrophus* (Drechsler) Drechsler) is the cause of southern corn leaf blight, a disease once extremely damaging in the midwestern United States but whose effect has been reduced due to new cultivars of the host bred for resistance to this disease. Plant pathologists tend to use the name *B. maydis* while scientists studying genetic aspects (including the genome) use the name *C. heterostrophus*. It is relevant that for *Bipolaris* (to which 115 names have been assigned) – in moving to one fungus : one name, the only name requiring change would be *B. maydis*, should it not be conserved; and *B. maydis* is the type of *Bipolaris* while *C. heterostrophus* (based on *O. heterostrophus*) is the type of *Cochliobolus*. In order to maintain use of *B. maydis* the proposal seeks to conserve *H. maydis* against *O. heterostrophus* and also an earlier homonym *H. maydis* Brond. 1856–1857. The Committee recommends conservation.

(2237) Reject *Lichen quisquiliaris* in order to protect *Leprocaulon microscopicum* (Ascomycota: Leprocaulales: Leprocaulaceae). Proposed by Hawksworth *et al.* (*Taxon* 62: 1335–1337, 2013). Votes: 3–13–2 [18/18] (72 % recommend against rejection).

Lichen quisquiliaris Leers as typified by a drawing by Micheli is “unlikely to refer to anything other than the species currently almost universally known as *Leprocaulon microscopicum* (Vill.) Gams ex D. Hawksw.” Several authors, including Dodge (*Ann. Cryptog. Exot.* 2: 129, 1929) and Lamb & Ward (*J. Hattori Bot. Lab.* 38: 526–533, 1974) considered that the protologue of *Lichen quisquiliaris* referred to more than one taxon, and under the *Code* in force at the time rejected the name as being based on heterogeneous elements. Under the current *Code*, the name is not invalid. The proposal argues that, despite knowledge that *Leprocaulon quisquiliare* (Leers) M. Choisy is the nomenclaturally correct name for *L. microscopicum*, there has been widespread usage of the latter name since 1978 when the provision to treat names as *nomina confusa* was dropped in the *Leningrad Code* (Stafleu *et al.*, *Regnum Veg.* 97, 1978). Given the wide usage, the proposal seeks to reject *Lichen quisquiliaris* in order to protect *Leprocaulon microscopicum*.

Subsequently, Lendemer (*Taxon* 63: 203–204, 2014) provided a counterpoint to the proposal, pointing out that *Leprocaulon microscopicum* had been shown by Lendemer & Hodkinson (*Mycologia* 105: 994–1018, 2013) to comprise two phylogenetic species, with allopatric distributions, in the Old and New World. Lendemer & Hodkinson (*loc. cit.*) introduced the name *L. americanum* Lendemer & B.P. Hodk. for the New World populations, while retaining *L. quisquiliare* (inclusive of *L. microscopicum*) for the Old World populations, meaning that even if *Lichen quisquiliaris* were rejected, there would be a change of name for taxonomic reasons for the occurrences in the Old² World (which were among the wide usage cited in the original proposal). Given these taxonomic changes the majority in the Committee is content to let *Leprocaulon quisquiliare* stand, and rejection of *Lichen quisquiliaris* is not recommended.

(2274) Conserve the spelling of *Polycaryum* (Fungi: Blastocladiomycota). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* 63: 429–429, 2014). Votes: 14–0–3 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

The generic name *Polycaryum* was introduced by Stempell (in Tagebl, *V Int. Zool.-Congr. Berlin Beil.* 4: 4, 1901) with the spelling “*Polycarpum*”, which was also used by Stempell (*Verhandl. V Int. Zool.-Congr. Berlin*: 685, 23 Aug 1902). *Polycaryum* was originally treated as a parasitic protist but is now considered to belong to the fungal phylum Blastocladiomycota. The spelling was changed, without comment, to “*Polycaryum*” by Stempell (*Zool. Jahrb. Syst.* 15: 591, 15 Jul 1902) and this spelling “has survived in both protistological and mycological treatises up to now”. The change in spelling is not correction of an orthographical error under Art. 60.1, because it involves a change from one Greek stem (*karpos* fruit) to another (*caryon* nut or nucleus).

The latter is presumably more apt and consistent with the observation by Stempell (*loc. cit.* 1901) of “numerous nuclei in the young protoplasm of the body of the microorganism”. Whatever the reason for the change in spelling, *Polycaryum* is the form that has been used exclusively since the change was made by Stempell (*loc. cit.*, 15 Jul 1902) just one year after he introduced the name, and the Committee therefore recommends conservation with that spelling.

(2275) Conserve the spelling of *Polycaryum branchipodanum* (Fungi: Blastocladiomycota). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* 63: 429–429, 2014). Votes: 14–0–3 [17/20] (70 % recommend conservation).

This proposal is connected to Prop. 2274 on the spelling of the generic name *Polycaryum*. In parallel to the change of spelling for the generic name, for the species name *Polycaryum branchipodanum* Stempell, the initial spelling “*branchipianum*” was changed to “*branchipodanum*” by Stempell (*Zool. Jahrb. Syst.* 15: 591, 15 Jul 1902), and the latter form has been in use ever since. Stempell (*loc. cit.*) specifically stated that the change in spelling was on etymological grounds. Therefore, unlike the situation for the generic name (where the stem word was changed), the change from “*branchipianum*” to “*branchipodanum*” is interpreted in the proposal as a correction by “adding the Greek suffix *-od-* to the initial *branchip-* compound stem base in accord with the rules of Greek classical formation of compound names when the stem of the nominative singular (*-pus* ‘footed’) differs from that of the genitive singular (*podos*) [and therefore] the latter is usually used as a component of a compound”. It is important to be aware that the base for the epithet is the generic name of the host – *Branchipus* Schaeff. (a fairy shrimp).

The Committee is in favour of retaining the spelling “*branchipodanum*” and consequently voted in support of the proposal. However, it is noted that perhaps the spelling should be corrected under Art. 60.1, without the need for conservation. Nevertheless, there is a need to one way or another permanently record correct spelling, and recommending conservation offers of much more visible means of doing this than not recommending conservation, because the latter decision is then buried away in Committee reports. Therefore, clarification is sought as to the appropriate procedure for fixing spelling in cases such as this, and in cases where the original spelling is regarded as correct and has been put forward for conservation (e.g. Prop. 2071).

(2276) Conserve *Erysiphaceae* against *Oidiaceae* (Fungi: Ascomycota: Erysiphales). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* 63: 429–429, 2014). Votes: 17–0–1 [18/18] (94 % recommend conservation).

Following from proposals 2210–2232 by Braun (*Taxon* 62: 1328–1331, 2013) to conserve teleomorph-typified names against competing anamorph-typified names at generic and species level in the powdery mildews (Ascomycota: Erysiphales: *Erysiphaceae*) this proposal deals with the appropriate family name, arguing that it should be the teleomorph-typified *Erysiphaceae* Sredinsky 1873 rather than the earlier anamorph-typified *Oidiaceae* Link 1826.

²“Old” should be “New”.

The proposal mentions Art. 57.2, but this article does not apply because it deals with cases where a proposal to conserve a teleomorph-typified name against an anamorph-typified name that has priority has been rejected (i.e., the proposal has been rejected); whereas the current proposal seeks to conserve a later teleomorph-typified name. The Committee recommends conservation of *Erysiphaceae* against the “nearly forgotten family name” *Oidiaceae*.

(2288) Reject *Botrytis farinosa* (*Peronospora farinosa*) (*Peronosporaceae*: *Oomycetes*). Proposed by Choi & Thines (*Taxon* **63**: 675–676, 2014). Votes: 13–3–1 [17/20] (65 % recommend rejection).

The name *Botrytis farinosa* Fr. : Fr. was published by Fries (*Syst. Mycol.* **3**: 404, 1832) for a structure or organism occurring on an undetermined species of *Atriplex* L. (*Chenopodiaceae*) from an unspecified locality in Sweden and later (*Summa Veg. Scand.*: 493, 1849) transferred by him to *Peronospora* Corda, without mention of any specific host species. There are three species of *Atriplex* in Sweden upon which *Peronospora* has been reported and 11 species of *Peronospora* described from *Atriplex*. It is not clear to which of these *Peronospora* species *P. farinosa* (Fr. : Fr.) Fr. should be matched. Indeed, the original description of *B. farinosa* seems to refer to a mix of organisms and certain features mentioned in the protologue do not match *Peronospora* at all. Thus, later workers on nordic *Peronosporaceae* such as Gustavsson (*Opera Bot.* **3**: 1–271, 1959) have ignored *B. farinosa* when naming species of *Peronospora* on *Atriplex*.

In addition to the uncertain application of *B. farinosa*, further reasons for its rejection come from the fact that *P. farinosa* has been very widely used for a number of quite different plant pathogens. This is because Yerkes & Shaw (*Phytopathology* **49**: 499–507, 1959) placed as synonyms under *P. farinosa* around 50 names for species of *Peronospora*, not only on *Atriplex*, but on hosts across the family *Chenopodiaceae*. However, the earlier approach of Gäumann (*Mitth. Naturf. Ges. Bern* **1918**: 45–66, 1919) and Gustavsson (*loc. cit.*) of assigning names specific to host species or host genera is supported by recent phylogenetic studies quoted in the proposal. Therefore, important plant pathogens on chenopodiaceous crops such as: *P. effusa* (Grev.) Rabenh. on spinach (*Spinacia oleracea* L.), *P. schachtii* Fuckel on beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.), and *P. variabilis* Gäum. on quinoa (*Chenopodium quinoa* Willd.) and other significant downy mildew pathogens should be recognised as distinct. Otherwise, there are unhelpful complications for biosecurity and quarantine when they are all lumped together under *P. farinosa*. Therefore, it makes sense to remove use of the name *P. farinosa*. For this reason, coupled with the uncertainty about the application of *B. farinosa*, this name is recommended for outright rejection.

(2289) Conserve *Morchella semilibera* against *Phallus crassipes*, *P. gigas* and *P. undosus* (*Ascomycota*). Proposed by Moreau *et al.* (*Taxon* **63**: 677–678, 2014). Votes: 16–0–1 [17/20] (80 % recommend conservation).

Morchella semilibera DC. : Fr., introduced by Candolle in 1805 and sanctioned by Fries (*Syst. Mycol.* **2**: 10, 1822), is an edible morel of commercial value, found across Europe

and Asia, macro-morphologically distinctive by virtue of the “half-free apothecial margin”. There are several older names that apply to the same taxon, in particular *Phallus gigas* Batsch 1783, *P. undosus* Batsch 1783 and *P. crassipes* Vent. 1799, all three of which were also sanctioned by Fries, in the genus *Morchella* Dill. ex Pers. : Fr. (*loc. cit.*: 9, 11, 1822). When competing names at the same rank are all sanctioned, the earliest takes priority. While there has also been some use of *M. hybrida* (Sowerby) Pers. for the “half-free” morel (based on *Helvella hybrida* Sowerby from 1799), this name is not sanctioned, and therefore does not have priority over *M. semilibera*. In order to retain the widespread current usage of *M. semilibera*, it is necessary to conserve it against *P. crassipes*, *P. gigas* and *P. undosus*, a course of action recommended by the Committee.

As an aside, in discussion of this proposal it was noted that there is some uncertainty about interpretation of Art. 13.1(d): “Names in *Uredinales*, *Ustilaginales*, and *Gasteromycetes* (s.l.) adopted by Persoon (*Synopsis methodica fungorum* ...) and names of other fungi (excluding slime moulds) adopted by Fries (*Systema mycologicum* ... and *Elenchus fungorum* ...), are sanctioned (see Art. 15).” This uncertainty is specifically around the term “*Gasteromycetes* (s.l.)”. Is this *Gasteromycetes* Fr. (a name not utilised by Persoon, but rather introduced by Fries in 1821) or is it the polyphyletic assemblage “gasteromycetes” of today? For the present case, the three species of *Phallus* Junius ex L. : Pers. (*P. crassipes*, *P. gigas*, *P. undosus*) were introduced in a genus currently regarded as belonging to “gasteromycetes”; but presumably not sanctioned by Persoon (*Syn. Meth. Fung.*: 1–240, 1801) because he re-combined all three species in *Morchella*, a genus of “other fungi” in the wording of the article; and consequently sanctioning can be attributed to Fries (*loc. cit.*) who also placed the three species in *Morchella*. Other cases, such as involve epithets that moved between *Lycoperdon* Pers. : Pers. (“gasteromycetes”) and *Elaphomyces* Nees : Fr. (“other fungi”), need to be followed up.

(2290) Conserve *Verrucaria subcerasi* (*Arthopyrenia subcerasi*) against *Arthopyrenia subalbicans* (lichenised *Ascomycota*: *Arthopyreniaceae*). Proposed by Ravera (*Taxon* **63**: 678–679, 2014). Votes: 1–14–3 [18/18] (78 % recommend against conservation).

Verrucaria subcerasi Vain. and *Arthopyrenia subalbicans* Bagl. & Carestia were published in 1883 and 1881 respectively, but the second name, although earlier, “has been almost completely neglected”. Lectotypification of *A. subalbicans* effected in the proposal means that the name threatens *A. subcerasi* (Vain.) Zahlbr. However, the Committee considered that this species does not have a sufficiently high profile to warrant conservation of the name *V. subcerasi*. Lichenologists on the Committee suggested that further research on the conspecificity of the two taxa seems warranted, especially given that *A. subcerasi* has a comparatively northern European distribution, frequently on *Betula* L., while the type of *A. subalbicans* is from Italy on *Abies* Mill. In relation to distribution, it was noted that the specimen in M from South Africa mentioned in the proposal is identified as *A. “cf.” subcerasi*.

(2291) Conserve *Geastrum* (*Basidiomycota: Geastrales*) with a conserved type. Proposed by Zamora (*Taxon* **63**: 679–680, 2014). Votes: 16–0–1 [17/20] (80 % recommend conservation).

The lectotypification of *Geastrum* Pers.: Pers. by Demoulin (*Taxon* **33**: 498–501, 1984) with *G. multifidum* Pers., introduced along with the generic name in the same publication (Persoon, *Neues Mag. Bot.* **1**: 85, 1794), was an appropriate choice under the *Code* then in force. Lectotypification by Demoulin (*loc. cit.*) of *G. multifidum* and *G. coronatum* Pers.: Pers. with the same illustration (fig. 2 in plate XLVI of Schmidel (*Icon. Pl.*, 2nd edn [Schreb./Palm], **2**, 1793), made the two names homotypic. New wording introduced in Art. 10.2 in the *Melbourne Code* specifies that for generic names where the original author did not designate a type and the name was sanctioned, the type may be chosen from “among the types of species names included in the sanctioning treatment” as well as from types of names that are definitely included in the protologue. Therefore, the first typification of *Geastrum* by Clements & Shear (*Gen. Fung.*: 353, 1931), who selected *G. pectinatum* Pers.: Pers. must be followed, even though this name appears only in the sanctioning work (Persoon, *Syn. Meth. Fung.*: 1–240, 1801).

All modern authors have followed Demoulin (*loc. cit.*) in regarding *G. multifidum* (routinely cited as *G. coronatum*) as the type of the genus. Indeed, the choice of *G. coronatum* goes back to Cunningham (*Gasteromycetes Australia New Zealand*: 160, 1944). Therefore, *G. coronatum* has been placed in infrageneric taxa (subgenera, sections, subsections) of *Geastrum* that are autonyms, whereas for the group of species around *G. pectinatum* names have been created for infrageneric taxa, such as *Geastrum* subg. *Pectinata* Dörfelt & Müller-Uri. The proposal seeks to conserve *Geastrum* with *G. coronatum* because otherwise *G. pectinatum* has to be accepted as type and there would be a confusing situation where “autonyms in infrageneric ranks would be applied to taxa different from current usage”. For this reason, the Committee recommends conservation.

(2341) Conserve *Lichen fuscatus* Schrad. (*Acarospora fuscata*) against *L. fuscatus* Lam. with a conserved type (lichenised *Ascomycota: Acarosporaceae*). Proposed by Linda in Arcadia *et al.* (*Taxon* **64**: 168–169, 2015). Votes: 17–0–1 [18/18] (94 % recommend conservation).

Lichen fuscatus Schrad. 1794 is proposed for conservation against *L. fuscatus* Lam. 1792, a long-forgotten name with no modern applications, but the essence of the proposal is the conserved type for *L. fuscatus* that locks in the interpretation of this name as referring to a species of *Acarospora*. *Lichen fuscatus* was a nomen novum for *L. badius* Pers. 1794 non J.G. Gmel 1792. Because *L. fuscatus* was itself also a later homonym (of *L. fuscatus* Lam.), transfer of *L. fuscatus* Schrad. to *Parmelia* by Acharius created the nomen novum *Parmelia fuscatus* Ach.; but its type still tracks back to *L. badius* Pers. Persoon's *L. badius* was independently combined in *Verrucaria* by Hoffmann, creating the nomen novum *Verrucaria badia* Hoffm., again with type tracking back to *L. badius* Pers. Hoffmann's name is now considered to refer to a species of *Protoparmelia*. Thus, there are two modern names, treated in different genera, that track back

to *L. badius* Pers. and are consequently obligate synonyms. In order to retain current use of the epithet *fuscatus* in *Acarospora*, the proposal breaks the link with *Lichen badius* (whatever the type of that name represents) and typifies *L. fuscatus* Schrad. with a recent collection from central Europe, where Schrader worked. Given that the name applies to a common and widespread species of lichen, albeit with some misapplications, conservation with a conserved type is supported by the Committee.

(2348) Reject *Aspidelia* (*Fungi: Ascomycota: Parmeliaceae*). Proposed by Ferencova *et al.* (*Taxon* **64**: 382–382, 2015). Votes: 5–12–1 [18/18] (67 % recommend against rejection).

The generic name *Aspidelia* Stirt. had been thought by some lichenologists to be not validly published due to lack of a diagnosis. This proposal argues that the name was, in fact, validly published by Stirton in 1900 (*Trans. & Proc. New Zealand Inst.* **32**: 81). Recently, the new genus, *Notoparmelia* A. Crespo *et al.* (typified by *N. signifera* (Nyl.) A. Crespo *et al.*) was introduced by Ferencova *et al.* (*Lichenologist* **46**: 51–67, 2014), who transferred to it *Parmelia tenuirima* Hook. f. & Taylor and 15 other species from Australasia, some of which are common in the region. One year later, the type of *Aspidelia* (that of *A. beckettii* Stirt.) was found by Ferencova *et al.* (*Lichenologist* **47**: 197–203, 2015) to represent *Parmelia tenuirima*, with galls of unknown origin (not due to a lichenicolous fungus).

Without rejection of *Aspidelia*, species currently in *Notoparmelia* will need to be transferred, again, to *Aspidelia*. A second reason for rejection is that if a gall-forming organism were to be detected within the type of *Aspidelia beckettii*, rejection would preclude “the name ever being taken up for the gall-forming organism”. A third reason for rejection is to avoid confusion with the fungal genus *Aspidella* E.-J. Gilbert, which was a name at the time of the proposal in use in some classifications of the *Amanitaceae* (but recently shown to be unavailable due to homonymy with *Aspidella* E. Billings [fossil *Fungus*] [Redhead *et al.*, *IMA Fungus* **7**: 119–129, 2016]). In discussion, potential for confusion between *Aspidelia* and the monotypic lichen *Aspilidea* Hafellner (only species *Aspilidea myrinii* (Fr.) Hafellner) was also raised. However, the Committee did not consider that there was significant potential for confusability of *Aspidelia* with either *Aspidella* or *Aspilidea*. Furthermore, whilst acknowledging that it was indeed “unfortunate that it was not appreciated that *Aspidelia* was a validly published generic name when *Notoparmelia* was described” – given frequent name changes in recent times in the *Parmeliaceae*, two thirds of the members of the Committee voted against the proposal, meaning that priority should rule.

(2349) Conserve *Hebeloma fragilipes* against *Hebelomina domardiana* (*Hebeloma domardianum*) (*Fungi: Agaricales: Strophariaceae*). Proposed by Beker *et al.* (*Taxon* **64**: 383, 2015). Votes: 14–2–2 [18/18] (78 % recommend conservation).

Conservation of *Hebeloma fragilipes* Romagn. (described in 1965) would protect a name in current use over one hardly used, *Hebelomina domardiana* Maire. The latter, although placed in *Hebelomina* Maire when first described in 1935, and

type of that name (characterised by the hyaline spores), is now interpreted as manifesting a developmental aberration where the outer layer of the spore wall fails to develop normally. Other species formerly placed in *Hebelomina* belong in a range of genera, including *Gymnopilus*, *Hebeloma* and *Tubaria*. Conspecificity of *Hebeloma fragilipes* and *H. domardianum* (Maire) Beker *et al.* was established only recently and the two names have never appeared together in works on *Hebeloma*. Because *Hebeloma fragilipes* is a widely used name, and *H. domardianum* is not (and its aberrant spore form is known only from the type collection), the Committee recommends conservation of the former name.

(2393) Conserve *Catenaria* Sorokīn (*Blastocladiomycota*) against *Catenaria* Roussel (*Rhodymeniophycota*). Proposed by Doweld (*Taxon* **64**: 1314, 2015). Votes: 15–1–2 [18/18] (83 % recommend conservation).

Catenaria Sorokīn 1876, typified by the nematode-parasitic fungus *C. anguillulae* Sorokīn, is predated by *Catenaria* Roussel 1806, a genus of red algae. The latter name is not in current use and the species assigned to it are unrelated and “are now known to fall within at least five distinct genera belonging to at least two unrelated phyla”. *Catenaria* Roussel is lectotypified with *C. catenata* (L.) Roussel, which makes the genus a synonym of *Ceramium* Roth 1797. The number of species of *Catenaria* Sorokīn is mentioned as 11, but the author of the proposal had recently transferred three of those species to the newly erected genus *Nematoceromyces* Doweld (*Index Fungorum* **48**: 1, 2014), without explanation as to the reason. Nevertheless, because conservation of *Catenaria* retains eight epithets in the genus (including species used in biocontrol) and also protects the family name *Catenariaceae* Couch (which otherwise is illegitimate under Art. 18.3) the Committee recommends conservation. The Nomenclature Committee for Algae has also voted in favour of Proposal 2393 (Prud'homme van Reine, *Taxon* **66**: 481, 2017).

(2396) Conserve *Lichen muralis* (*Lecanora muralis*, *Protoparmeliopsis muralis*) with a conserved type (*Ascomycota*: *Lecanorales*: *Lecanoraceae*). Proposed by Hawksworth *et al.* (*Taxon* **64**: 1316–1317, 2015). Votes: 17–0–1 [18/18] (94 % recommend conservation).

The name *Lichen muralis* Schreb. 1771 as originally published is illegitimate due to citation in its protologue of *L. pallescens* L. 1753 as a synonym. It is necessary to conserve *L. muralis* with a conserved type because otherwise the type would have to be that of *L. pallescens*, which is not conspecific with the modern concept of *L. muralis* (in either *Lecanora* or *Protoparmeliopsis*). The epithet *muralis* has been almost exclusively used in recent times for a lichen that is “an icon of ameliorating urban environments ... used as a bioindicator of air pollution ... [and] extensively for eco-physiological investigations”. Nevertheless, conservation is needed, otherwise the later name *L. saxicola* Pollich 1777, which refers to the same species, would have to be taken up. Therefore, the Committee recommends conservation.

(2397) Conserve *Stereocaulon pileatum* (lichenised *Ascomycota*: *Lecanorales*: *Stereocaulaceae*) with a

conserved type. Proposed by Oset & Kukwa (*Taxon* **64**: 1317–1318, 2015). Votes: 16–1–1 [18/18] (89% recommend conservation).

Stereocaulon pileatum Ach. 1810 was lectotypified by Lamb in 1977, but it appears that he did not examine the collection that was chosen, which turns out not to match the modern concept of the species, but instead represents *S. condensatum* Hoffm. 1796. Thus, typification with the collection in H from *Lichenes Selecti Scandinavici Exsiccati* (with isotypes in many other collections) is proposed to prevent a name change for *S. pileatum*, “a well-established name used for more than 200 years” for a common boreal lichen that also occurs in the Southern Hemisphere. The Committee recommends conservation with a conserved type.

REQUESTS FOR BINDING DECISIONS

(17) Request for a binding decision on whether *Otidea* (Pers.) Bonord. (*Ascomycota*: *Pyronemataceae*) and *Otidia* Sweet (*Geraniaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused, with comments on other pairs of generic names ending in -ea or -ia. Request made by McNeill (*Taxon* **63**: 950–951, 2014). Votes: 4–12–1 [17/20] (60 % recommended not to treat as homonyms).

A majority of the Committee does not consider that the names *Otidea* (Pers.) Bonord. and *Otidia* Sweet are sufficiently alike to be confused, especially since the former is a name in use for a fungus in the *Pyronemataceae* while the latter refers to a taxon that is regarded as a synonym of the vascular plant genus *Pelargonium*, unlikely to be revived at generic rank.

(20) Request for a binding decision on whether *Bertia* De Not. (*Ascomycota*: *Bertiaceae*) and *Bertya* Planch. (*Euphorbiaceae*) are sufficiently alike to be confused. Request made by Machado & Medeiros (*Taxon* **64**: 179, 2014). Votes: 0–18–0 [18/18] (100 % recommended not to treat as homonyms).

The Committee unanimously agrees with the Nomenclature Committee for Vascular Plants (Report 67, *Taxon* **65**: 169–182, 2016) that the name *Bertia* De Not. 1844, referring to a widespread fungal genus, and the name *Bertya* Planch. 1845, referring to a genus of Australian endemic vascular plants, are not likely to be confused. Both genera are in use, supported by recent phylogenetic studies, and each genus has around 30 currently accepted species, according to the request. Although the request does not mention occurrence of *Bertia* in Australia, there are in fact several species known from Australia, including two based on types from that country (*Bertia antennaroidea* Z.Q. Yuan, *B. convolutispora* K.D. Hyde). However, confusion is unlikely, due to the different derivation (*Bertia* commemorates the Italian cryptogam collector Berti, *Bertya* the French botanist Lambertye) and, most significantly, the fact that one name refers to a fungus and the other to a vascular plant.

ITEMS STILL UNDER CONSIDERATION

The following 40 proposals to conserve or reject are currently under consideration (sets of proposals published together are linked): 1516, 1888, 1896, 2053, 2068, 2072, 2141, 2208, 2209, 2233, 2235, 2236, 2304, 2305–2309, 2392, 2394–2395, 2409–2410, 2411–2414, 2415, 2416–2419, 2425, 2440, 2441, 2465, 2466, 2467, 2491 and 2492. The following four requests for binding decisions are currently under consideration: 4, 5, 25 and 43. The following three proposals to suppress works are currently under consideration: 16–18. One unnumbered referral under Art. 32.4 concerning *Blastocladiomycota* Doweld, sent back to the NCFung by the General Committee in their Report 11 (*Taxon* **60**: 1211–1214, 2011), is still under consideration.

Six outstanding proposals to conserve or reject (in italics in the list above) are readily resolvable, but are held over specifically because they involve names also included in lists submitted by international working groups. Proposal 2307 will be dealt with in due course under Art. 57.2 (May, *IMA Fungus* **6**(2): (43)–(44), 2015). For the five other proposals, formal actions under Art. 14.13 have been approved by the NCFung, which means the names involved are now treated “as conserved” (see NCFung Report 21). Whether it is still necessary or desirable to conserve the five names under Art. 14.1 awaits clarification of the difference between the effect of Arts 14.1 and 14.13, and the wishes of the authors of the proposals.