

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

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

(2100) Proposal to conserve *Chrysothrix*, nom. cons., against an additional name, *Alysphaeria* (lichenised *Ascomycota*)

Jack Rodney Laundon

5 Donne Close, Kettering, Northamptonshire NN16 9XS, U.K.

- (2100) *Chrysothrix* Mont. in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 3, 18: 312. Nov 1852, nom. cons.
 Typus: *C. noli-tangere* Mont., nom. illeg. (*Peribotryon pavonii* Fr.:Fr., *C. pavonii* (Fr.:Fr.) J.R. Laundon).
- (=) *Alysphaeria* Turpin in Mém. Mus. Hist. Nat. 14: 35, 63 pl. 4. 1827 (*Alysphaeria*), nom. rej. prop.
 Typus (vide Laundon in Lichenologist 40: 413. 2008): *Alysphaeria candelaris* (L.) Turpin (*Byssus candelaris* L.)

Turpin recognized seven species in his genus *Alysphaeria*, two of which were unnamed. He illustrated their morphology and microscopic details. Laundon (l.c.) selected *A. candelaris* as the type of the generic name because the species to which it applies and *A. chlorina* (Ach.) Turpin were the only two whose identity could be established.

Both are now universally accepted as belonging to the genus *Chrysothrix* Mont. nom. cons. (see Smith & al., Lichens Gr. Brit. Ireland: 307. 2009), known as *C. candelaris* (L.) J.R. Laundon and *C. chlorina* (Ach.) J.R. Laundon respectively. *Chrysothrix* was described (in Ann. Sci. Nat., Bot., sér. 3, 18: 312. 1852) 25 years later than *Alysphaeria*. Because *Chrysothrix* is already a conserved name and is widely used by many authors, it is obvious that it should be retained.

Alysphaeria is apparently unused since its original publication. It is here proposed as an addition to the two names against which *Chrysothrix* is already conserved. If *Alysphaeria* is retained it would have to displace the conserved generic name *Chrysothrix* applicable to a widespread genus of about six species, usually included in the family *Chrysothricaceae*. This is obviously undesirable because of the need for stability in nomenclature in accordance with Art. 14.2 of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006).

(2101) Proposal to conserve the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* (*Taiwanofungus camphoratus*) (*Polyporales*) with a conserved type

Sheng-Hua Wu,¹ Yi-Jian Yao,² Xin-Cun Wang,² Paul M. Kirk,³ Scott A. Redhead,⁴ Joost A. Stalpers,⁵ Yu-Cheng Dai,⁶ Lorelei L. Norvell,⁷ Zhu-Liang Yang,⁸ Leif Ryvarden,⁹ Ching-Hua Su,¹⁰ Yu Li,¹¹ Wen-Ying Zhuang,² Chee-Jen Chen,¹² Lung-Chung Chen¹³ & Zhi-He Yu¹⁴

1 Department of Botany, National Museum of Natural Science, Taichung 404, Taiwan, R.O.C.

2 State Key Laboratory of Mycology, Institute of Microbiology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China

3 Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 3AB, U.K.

4 Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 960 Carling Ave, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada

5 Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures, P.O. Box 85167, 3508 AD Utrecht, The Netherlands

6 Institute of Applied Ecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shenyang 110016, China

7 Pacific Northwest Mycology Service, LLC, 6720 NW Skyline Boulevard, Portland, Oregon 97229-1309, U.S.A.

8 Key Laboratory of Biodiversity and Biogeography, Kunming Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Kunming 650204, Yunnan, China

9 Biological Institute, University of Oslo, P.O. Box 1066, Blindern, 0316 Oslo, Norway

10 Department of Microbiology and Immunology, School of Medicine, Taipei Medical University, Taipei 110, Taiwan, R.O.C.

11 Jilin Agricultural University, Xingcheng Street, Chang-Chun City, Jilin 130118, China

12 Department of Biotechnology, Southern Taiwan University, Tainan 71043, Taiwan, R.O.C.

13 Department of Plant Pathology, National Chunghsing University, Taichung 400, Taiwan, R.O.C.

14 Department of Life Science, Yangtze University, Jingzhou 434025, Hubei, China

Author for correspondence: Sheng-Hua Wu, shwu@mail.nmns.edu.tw

- (2101) *Ganoderma camphoratum* M. Zang & C.H. Su in Acta Bot. Yunnan. 12: 395. 1990, nom. cons. prop.
 Typus: Taiwan, Miaoli County, Nanjuan Hsiang, 25 Jul 1989, *Mr. Lan s.n.* (HKAS 22294) [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, l.c.; see Wu & al. in Taxon 61: 1309. 2012], typ. cons. prop.

Niu-chang-chih is an economically and medicinally important polypore fungus endemic to Taiwan that grows on *Cinnamomum kanehirae* Hayata (*Lauraceae*). Currently this fungus species has two nomenclatures that have current usage: one with the basionym *Ganoderma camphoratum* M. Zang & C.H. Su (l.c.) (\equiv *Antrodia camphorata* (M. Zang & C.H. Su) Sheng H. Wu, Ryvarden & T.T. Chang in Bot. Bull. Acad. Sin. 38: 273. 1997 \equiv *Taiwanofungus camphoratus* (M. Zang & C.H. Su) Sheng H. Wu, Z.H. Yu, Y.C. Dai & C.H. Su in Fungal Sci. 19: 111. 2004) and one based on *Antrodia cinnamomea* T.T. Chang & W.N. Chou (in Mycol. Res. 99: 756. 1995).

The reason (reviewed in much more detail in Wu & al., l.c. 2012) for this dual nomenclature for niu-chang-chih is disagreement concerning the application of the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* (and combinations based on it) due to its holotype being based on mixed material, one element consisting of niu-chang-chih, and another element consisting of basidiospores (possibly in the *Russulales*) or conidia of an unknown fungus, these spores being the basis (Zang & Su, l.c.) for the original placement in the genus *Ganoderma*. Some (e.g., Wu & al., l.c. 1997, l.c. 2004) have argued that the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* should be applied to niu-chang-chih. Others (e.g., Chang & Chou in Bot. Bull. Acad. Sin. 45: 347–352. 2004) have argued that the name *G. camphoratum* should be applied to the element in the holotype consisting of the spores that were not from niu-chih-chang, the earliest name for niu-chiang-chih then becoming *Antrodia cinnamomea*.

The original holotype of *Ganoderma camphoratum* has been lectotypified twice, one (Chang & Chou, l.c. 2004: 348) based on the element consisting of the spores that were not from niu-chang-chih and a later one (Wu & al., l.c. 2012: 1309) based on everything on the original holotype except the spores that were not from niu-chang-chih. Each time Art. 9.12 of the *Vienna Code* (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) was cited as the justification for the lectotypification.

While the authors of this proposal are also authors of the Wu & al. paper (l.c. 2012) in which one of these lectotypifications was effected, we are proposing to conserve the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* with a conserved type, so as to make clear what the type of *G. camphoratum* is, and, thus, how this name (and combinations based on it) should be applied.

There are three possible recommendations the Committee for Fungi could make (subject to the endorsement of the General Committee and ratification of an International Botanical Congress):

1. Approve this proposal, thus making clear that the type of *Ganoderma camphoratum* is as effected by Wu & al. (l.c. 2012: 1309).

2. Reject this proposal on the grounds that the lectotypification effected by Wu & al. (l.c. 2012: 1309) that supersedes the lectotypification effected by Chang & Chou (l.c. 2004: 348) is clearly and unambiguously warranted under the *Code*, and thus conservation of the name and type is not required.

3. Reject this proposal on the grounds that Chang & Chou's initial lectotypification (l.c. 2004: 348) is to be accepted (the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* then would perhaps best be proposed for outright rejection under Art. 56, given the ambiguity of the “Ganoderma-like” spores and the history of this name only being applied to niu-chang-chih).

The first two options would meet the goal of the authors of this proposal, which is to retain the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* (and the combinations *Antrodia camphorata*, *Taiwanofungus camphoratus*) for niu-chang-chih, although we believe the first option to be more definitive. The third option—an undesirable outcome in our opinion since it would result in the name *Ganoderma camphorata* being applied to the taxon represented by the “Ganoderma-like” spores and not the basiocarp (and the spores produced by the basidiocarp) on the original type—would make *A. cinnamomea* the correct name for niu-chang-chih.

Besides what we believe to be a strong case under the *Code* for applying the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* to niu-chang-chih, a strong argument can also be made based on usage. Of the 185 articles from 2001 to 2011 on niu-chang-chih that we have identified, 129 had *Antrodia camphorata* and 10 had *Taiwanofungus camphoratus* in the title, whereas only 56 had the name *Antrodia cinnamomea* in the title.

Based on these arguments (see Wu & al., l.c. 2012 for more details) we seek to retain the name *Ganoderma camphoratum* (and *Antrodia camphorata*, *Taiwanofungus camphoratus*) for niu-chang-chih through this conservation proposal.

(2102–2103) Proposals to reject the names *Pinus californiana* and *P. adunca* (*Pinaceae*)

Alan T. Whittemore

United States National Arboretum, 3501 New York Ave NE, Washington, D.C. 20002, U.S.A.; alan.whittemore@ars.usda.gov

(2102) *Pinus californiana* Loisel. in Duhamel, *Traité Arbr. Arbust.*, ed. 2, 5: 243. 1812 [*Gymnosp.*: *Pin.*], nom. rej. prop.
Typus: non designatus.

In September of 1786, a French expedition led by le Comte de Lapérouse visited Monterey, California. The expedition botanist, Jean Nicolas Collignon (called Colladon or Colligon in some references), collected seed of local plants, following the instructions of André Thouin of the Jardin des Plantes in Paris. Most of their specimens were lost when the expedition disappeared in the western Pacific, but a package containing seeds from Monterey, California, including a pine

cone, was sent to France on 27 January 1787, probably from Macao, and reached the Jardin des Plantes in Paris later that year (McKelvey, Bot. Explor. Trans-Mississippi West 1790–1850: 3–10. 1956). Seeds from the pine cone were germinated, and twelve plants were raised. These seedlings were cultivated in the orangery for many years, and then most were given to growers in southern France.

Long after the death of H.L. Duhamel de Monceau, French botanists wrote a completely revised and expanded second edition of Duhamel's earlier compendium, *Traité des Arbres et Arbustes qui se Cultivent en France en Pleine Terre*, and the last three volumes of this seven-volume work were completed by Loiseleur-Deslongchamps.