

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT
--

Edited by Dan H. Nicolson¹

Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens: new series, 2

Walter Gams²

Summary

Gams, W.: Report of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens: new series, 2. – *Taxon* 41: 99-108. 1992. – ISSN 0040-0262.

The Committee for Fungi and Lichens reports its decisions on 45 proposals to conserve/reject names, recommending 21.

After 26 years service in this Committee, including the last six years as its Secretary, Richard P. Korf had to resign for health reasons. He has given a tremendous amount of inspiration and guidance to this Committee.

The previous report of the Committee was published in *Taxon* 37: 450-461. 1988. It listed the names of 51 families, genera, and species upon which this Committee had taken action, prior to the Berlin Congress, on names proposed for conservation and rejection, since the prior report (*Taxon* 35: 552-556. 1986) on such actions. The present text reports on the activities of the Committee for Fungi and Lichens (CFL) after the Berlin Congress through December 1990 and deals with 45 proposals to conserve or reject names of fungal taxa, most of them proposed after the Berlin Congress.

Most ballots were answered by fifteen members of the Committee, and a majority of at least ten positive votes was necessary for a proposal requiring a change in the listing in the appendices of the *Code* to pass. If a proposal was rejected by 8 explicit No votes, the Committee decided to discontinue discussion (ballot of 15 June 1990). The votes are recorded in the order *Yes – No (incl. Abstain) – Continue Discussion*. Those involved in the voting were (six newly elected at Berlin marked with an asterisk): L. Holm (Sweden, Chairman), V. Demoulin (Belgium), W. Gams (Netherlands; secretary from 20 Feb 1991), D. L. Hawksworth (U.K.), P. M. Jørgensen* (Norway), R. P. Korf (U.S.A.; secretary, until 31 Dec 1990), Th. W. Kuyper* (Netherlands), E. Parmasto* (Estonian S.S.R.), D. N. Pegler (U.K.; until 1 Jul 1990), Z. Pouzar (Czechoslovakia), M. A. Rifai (Indonesia), R. Singer* (U.S.A.; until 14 Jul 1990), B. C. Sutton (U.K.; until 18 Jan 1990), J. Walker* (Australia), and R.-y. Zheng* (P.C.R.; until 26 Feb 1990). Four new members were coopted to succeed those retiring: B. J. Coppins and L. M. Kohn (1 May 1990), G. Redeuilh and S. C. Redhead (15 Aug 1990).

The Committee recommends 21 proposals and voted with at least eight votes against 24 proposals (two of which were withdrawn by the proposers). Other proposals which did not receive either a two-thirds majority for or eight votes against are

¹ Department of Botany, NHB-166, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560, USA.

² Centraalbureau voor Schimmelcultures, P. O. Box 273, NL-3740 AG Baarn, The Netherlands.

still under discussion by the Committee, and will remain so until such a majority is achieved.

For bibliographical references cited in the comments, the original proposals should be consulted.

Proposal 454: Ceratocystis Ellis & Halsted vs. *Sphaeronaemella* P. Karsten. Proposed by H. P. Upadhyay (Taxon 27: 553-554. 1978). Votes: 3–10–1 (not recommended).

The available literature makes it clear that *Sphaeronaemella* and *Ceratocystis* are not synonyms, and the proposer presents no convincing evidence to the contrary.

Proposal 567: Phaeographina Müller Arg. vs. several other generic names. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & M. A. Sherwood (Taxon 30: 343. 1981). Votes: 2–11–1 (not recommended).

Taxonomy must precede the nomenclatural process. Changes in the entry may be expected after a taxonomic revision in the future. It has been known for more than 50 years that this and the following name are illegitimate, with many older legitimate synonyms. It has not occurred to anyone to take up any of the latter, and the risk seems minimal. A postponement of conservation until the group is revised can hardly be dangerous.

Proposal 568: Phaeographis Müller Arg. vs. several other generic names. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & M. A. Sherwood (Taxon 30: 343-344. 1981). Votes: 1–12–1 (not recommended).

Taxonomy must precede the nomenclatural process. Otherwise it might happen that the conserved type proves to be a member of a minority group, should the genus have to be split. There is a particular risk for this in *Phaeographis*.

Proposal 585: Stemonitis Roth vs. *Stemonitis* Gled. and *Stemonitis* Gled. sensu Wigg. Proposed by M. L. Farr & C. J. Alexopoulos (Taxon 30: 357-358. 1981). Votes: 2–11–1 (not recommended).

The aim of the proposal, to keep *Stemonitis* in the current sense, is supported by the Committee. But the original *Stemonitis*, i.e. *Stemonitis* Gled., can stand with the type *S. fusca* Roth, which was based on Micheli's "Clathroidastrum obscurum minus".

Proposal 718: Conserve Baeomyces Pers. with *Lichen fungiformis* as type. Proposed by E. Sérusiaux (Taxon 32: 646-648. 1983). Votes: 1–12–1 (not recommended).

As *Baeomyces* is sanctioned, the proposal is unnecessary. Clements & Shear (1931: 320) correctly chose *Baeomyces byssoides* (L.) Schwerin, generally regarded as identical with *B. rufus*, as the type of the generic name. Only a good lecto/neotypification of *B. byssoides* is needed to keep *Baeomyces* in its current sense.

Proposal 766: Lentinus Fries vs. *Digitellus* Paulet. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth (Taxon 33: 733-734. 1984). Votes: 0–13–1 (not recommended).

Lentinus is sanctioned in Fries's *Elenchus fungorum* and thus does not need protection against *Digitellus*, which is not. Moreover, as *Digitellus* is considered an anamorph, it cannot threaten the teleomorph name.

Proposal 768: Phellinus Quélet vs. *Mison* Adanson. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth (Taxon 33: 734. 1984). Votes: 9(+3)–2–0 (recommended): 9 for Type: *P. igniarius* (3: no reply – counted as agreeing with the majority); 2 for *P. rubriporus*.

Conservation of *Phellinus* had earlier been accepted and was incorporated in the Berlin Code; but the typification of *Phellinus* was changed by the Editorial Committee from *P. rubriporus* to *P. igniarius*. This committee, asked for its opinion on whether the change was acceptable, voted with a majority to reaffirm the Editorial Committee's action.

Proposal 770: Pulcherricium Parmasto vs. *Terana* Adanson. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth (Taxon 33: 735. 1984). Votes: 2–11–1 (not recommended).

Even the author of *Pulcherricium* agrees that the name of such a unispecific genus should not be conserved.

Proposal 772: Amend the entry for Ramaria (Fries) Bonorden, nom. cons., by adding *Coralloidea* (Pers.) Roussel. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth (Taxon 33: 735-736. 1984). Votes: 3–9–3 (not recommended).

There is no *Coralloidea* (Pers.) Roussel, only a superfluous and illegitimate *Coralloidea* Roussel, intended as congruent with Holmskjöld's *Ramaria*.

Proposal 792: Reject Lichen subfuscus L. Proposed by O. Vitikainen (Taxon 34: 533-534. 1985). Votes: 11–2–1 (recommended).

Lichen subfuscus has been a nomen ambiguum since its introduction; it has been widely and persistently used for a number of unrelated taxa, and only recently a neotypification was proposed. Several original specimens are, however, preserved in the Dillenian herbarium. The material marked "Table XVIII, 16B" consists of four different *Lecanora* species on three pieces of bark, and one of *Caloplaca*. It is impossible to say with certainty on which specimen Dillenius's illustration was based. The illustration only can be regarded as the lectotype, as this was the only element seen by Linnaeus, who interpreted it to be identical with the *Lichen subfuscus* he knew from Sweden (containing several species in our sense). The most plausible "typotype" specimen: "Lichenoides . . . subfuscis", Tab. XVIII, f. 16. second specimen from left (OXF: herb. Dillenius), has been found to be *Lecanora allophana* Nyl., a well-known species that had been correctly named for over a century.

Proposal 830: Reject Scleroderma aurantium (L. : Pers.) Pers. Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 35: 600. 1986). Votes: 10–3–2 (recommended).

Scleroderma aurantium had consistently been misapplied to the commonest species of the genus, now known as *S. citrinum* Pers. : Pers., whilst Vaillant's fungus on which it is based probably is *S. verrucosum*. The entry in Appendix IV should read:

Scleroderma aurantium (Linnaeus : Persoon) Persoon, Syn. Meth. Fung. 153. 1801 (*Lycoperdon aurantium* Linnaeus, Sp. Pl. 1053. 1753).

LT.: Vaillant, Bot. Paris. t. XVI, f. 9, 10. 1727 (vide Demoulin, Bull. Jard. Natl. Belgique 37: 289-304. 1967).

Proposal 829: Propolis Fries 1849 vs. *Propolis* (Fries) Corda 1838. Proposed by L. Holm, J. A. Nannfeldt & E. Müller (Taxon 35: 599-600. 1986). Votes: 3–10–1 (not recommended).

Conservation turns out to be unnecessary. The present *Code* makes it clear that typifications must be explicit. Under Art. 8.3 Corda did not typify *Propolis*. Originally no holotype was designated, so excluding *Stictis versicolor* (the subsequent lectotype of *Propolis*) does not cause the formation of a new generic name to be credited to Corda alone. What Corda did was only to raise the Friesian taxon to generic rank. Consequently we can use the first designated lectotype of *Propolis* (Fries : Fries) Corda 1838 and retain *Propolis* without conservation. *Propolomyces* Sherwood must therefore be considered illegitimate.

Proposal 848: Otidea (Pers.) Bonorden vs. *Otidia* Lindley ex Sweet (*Geraniaceae*). Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 35: 740. 1986). Votes: 0–14–0 (not recommended).

We do not regard *Otidia* and *Otidea* as homonyms since in spite of their similarity they are not likely to be confused. The use of *Otidia*, a synonym of *Pelargonium*, has long been discontinued. *Otidea* is therefore not endangered.

Proposal 850: Conserve the spelling of Schizophyllum Fries. Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 35: 743. 1986). Votes: 1–12–1 (not recommended).

A sanctioned name is sanctioned with its spelling. A proposal H to change Art. 14 (see Taxon 36: 203. 1987) with an opposite effect was rejected at Berlin (Taxon 36: 860. 1987), and the present proposal is unnecessary.

Proposal 851: Conserve the spelling of Thelebolus Tode : Fries. Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 35: 743-744. 1986). Votes: 1–12–1 (not recommended).

Same arguments as under *Prop. 850*; the proposal is superfluous.

Proposal 853: Courtoisia Nees (*Cyperaceae*) vs. *Courtoisia* Marchand (Lichenes). Proposed by P. Vorster (Taxon 35: 745-746. 1986). Votes: 11–2–1 (no objection).

Lichenologists do not need *Courtoisia* Marchand. This Committee therefore has no objection to the conservation of *Courtoisia* Nees. The Committee for Spermatophyta has, however, decided that they can do with the substitute *Courtoisia* and that *Courtoisia* is not worth conservation (Taxon 38: 300. 1989).

Proposal 857: Antennaria Gaertner (*Compositae*) vs. *Antennaria* Link : Fries (Fungi). Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 35: 749-750. 1986). Votes: 4–8–2 (not recommended).

The proposal is based on the understanding, by Rauschert, that sanctioning protects fungal names adopted by Fries against all other competing botanical names. Rauschert's view was and is not shared by the majority of members of this Committee. It was never the mycologists' intention that Fries's or Persoon's names should have precedence over non-fungal names. The heading of Art. 13.1(d) indicates that we are dealing with Fungi and their names solely. The Committee for Spermatophyta Report No. 36 (Taxon 38: 301-302. 1989) voted 9–2 in favour of this proposal, which was since endorsed by the General Committee (Taxon 40: 459-460. 1991). But the present Com-

mittee still feels that an amendment of the *Code* would have been a better solution in order to save the name *Antennaria* for the *Compositae*.

Proposal 859: Botryosporium Corda 1839 vs. *Botryosporium* Corda 1831. Proposed by M. A. Vincent & W. H. Blackwell (Taxon 36: 158-159. 1987). Votes: 1-10-3 (not recommended).

Botryosporium with its 4 to 5 species is considered a too small genus to have its name conserved. Moreover, in Icon. Fung. 5: 13. 1842, Corda still regarded the genus as erected by himself in 1831 without excluding the original type. As long as *Botrytis diffusa* cannot be definitely excluded from the generic concept, conservation is not needed. A careful neotypification of *Botrytis diffusa* might be sufficient.

Proposal 862: Laetiporus Murray vs. *Cladoporus* (Pers.) Chevall. Proposed by L. Ryvar den (Taxon 36: 160-161. 1987). Votes: 11-3-0 (recommended).

This Committee tries to avoid the conservation of names of unispecific genera whenever possible. In the present case, however, (1) the name *Cladoporus* became valid only through the deletion of Art. 71 at Leningrad, 1975, whilst the name *Laetiporus* was correct for about 70 years; (2) *Cladoporus* was only recognized for a short time by its author, Chevallier; (3) *Laetiporus sulphureus* is a very important wood decomposer; (4) the name *Laetiporus* has been used in almost every manual or monograph on polypores published after 1953; and (5) this case has nothing to do with the change in starting-point date.

Proposal 863: Schizopora Velen. vs. *Physisporus* Chevall. Proposed by L. Ryvar den (Taxon 36: 161-162. 1987). Votes: 1-13-0 (not recommended).

According to Art. 63, *Physisporus* is a superfluous, illegitimate name for *Poria* which was cited as a synonym in the protologue. Therefore no conservation is needed to save *Schizopora*.

Proposal 864: Siphula Fries 1831 vs. *Siphula* Fries 1824. Proposed by F. A. Brusse (Taxon 36: 162-164. 1987). Votes: 10-2-2 (recommended).

Siphula Fries 1831 is needed for a well known genus of mainly southern hemisphere macrolichens, which probably includes about 25 species. The name has been used in that sense since 1831. *Siphula* Fries 1831 is a homonym of and distinct from *Siphula* Fries 1824, which had been introduced as a replacement for *Dufourea* Achar.; the latter is listed as a nomen rejiciendum under *Xanthoria*.

Proposal 865: Conserve Trametes Fries with a conserved type. Proposed by S. Rauschert (Taxon 36: 164-165. 1987). Votes: 2-12-1 (not recommended).

Three different questions are involved, viz., (1) should *Trametes* be preserved for a group of annual polypores with hyaline spores; (2) what is the type of *Trametes* Fries 1835; (3) which is the identity of *T. suaveolens*, and what is the correct author citation? The Committee agrees that *Trametes* should be maintained for annual species. In various publications, Fries apparently considered *Polyporus suaveolens* L. to be based on two elements: a perennial northern species, cited by reference to Linnaeus's *Flora lapponica*, which is now classified in *Haploporus*, and an annual southern taxon.

Trametes suaveolens Fries 1838 is considered a legitimate name of a new species, based on *P. suaveolens* Fries 1828 : Fries [non L. 1753 : Fries] and applying to the annual species.

Proposal 871: Buellia De Not. vs. *Gassicurtia* Fée. Proposed by A. Aptroot (Taxon 36: 474. 1987). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

The now abolished Art. 70 had been invoked by Hawksworth (Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 65: 222–223. 1975) to reject *Gassicurtia*. A study of additional collections made by Fée made it clear, however, that it is the *Buellia* and not the *Chiodecton* component that Fée had intended to characterize the genus. *Buellia* is a well established name that must be conserved, while *Gassicurtia* has not been in use.

Proposal 880: Conserve Hyaloscypha Boud. with *H. vitreola* (P. Karsten) Boud. as conserved type. Proposed by S. Huhtinen & P. F. Cannon (Taxon 36: 649–651. 1987). Votes: 12–2–0 (recommended).

The type of the generic name must be one of the two species named in Boudier's protologue. Clements & Shear's 1931 lectotypification by *Peziza dentata* causes much nomenclatural mischief. Raitviir in 1970 designated the other eligible syntype, *Helotium vitreolum*, as lectotype and this selection is to be preserved by conservation. Thus the name *Hyaloscypha* can be saved for a large genus defined in a sense adopted by all specialists since Nannfeldt's treatment in 1932. This also saves the otherwise endangered *Cistella* (nom. cons.).

Proposal 895: Arthopyreniaceae Watson vs. *Xanthopyreniaceae* Zahlbr. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 190. 1988). Withdrawn by the proposers.

Proposal 896: Dimeriaceae E. Müller & von Arx vs. *Pseudoperisporiaceae* Toro. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 190. 1988). Votes: 0–13–2 (not recommended).

Once the typification of *Dimerium* has been settled, the proposal may be resubmitted. There is a prior need for a proposal to safeguard the generic name. The type of *Dimerium* must be one of the four species originally included in *Dimerosporium* subg. *Dimerium* Sacc. & Sydow (Syll. Fung. 16: 410. 1902), viz. *Dimerosporium pangerangense* Hennings & Nyman, *D. cetotrichum* Pat. & Hariot, *D. tasmanicum* Masee, and *D. occultum* Racib. These species are now assigned to three different genera, but none is still considered a member of the genus *Dimerium*! Theissen (Beih. Bot. Centralbl. 29(2): 45–73. 1912) does not designate a lectotype of *Dimerium*. The choice of *D. pulveraceum* (Speg.) Theissen by E. Müller & von Arx, one of many species included by Theissen in *Dimerium*, has no status. Theissen excluded two of the four original species of *Dimerosporium* subg. *Dimerium*; as for the other two, he treated *D. cetotrichum* under "species dubiae" and *D. tasmanicum* as a species he didn't know, and possibly synonymous with *D. psilostomatis* (Thümen) Sacc. [& D. Sacc.]. The correct author citation for the generic name is *Dimerium* (Sacc. & Sydow) McAlpine. "Saccardo & D. Saccardo", cited as authors of *Dimerium* in the protologue of the name *Dimeriaceae* E. Müller & von Arx in von Arx & E. Müller (1975), merely re-published the same generic name, creating a later "isonym" with no nomenclatural status.

Proposal 897: Gnomoniaceae Winter vs. *Obryzaceae* Körber. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 191. 1988). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

Gnomoniaceae is an important family name of widespread use in plant pathology. Its coincidence with the *Obryzaceae* was only recently detected in lichenological studies.

Proposal 898: Lophiaceae Zogg vs. *Mytiliniaceae* Kirschstein. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 191. 1988). Votes: 4–11–0 (not recommended).

Kirschstein's name is as appropriate as is Zogg's, and merely adoption of the latter "for about 20 years in major treatments of ascomycete families" is no sufficient reason to set aside priority of publication.

Proposal 899: Mycosphaerellaceae Lindau vs. *Ascosporaceae* Bonorden. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 191. 1988). Votes: 13–1–0.

This is another very important family name that needs conservation. The name *Ascosporaceae* has been ignored since its introduction.

Proposal 900: Physciaceae Zahlbr. vs. *Pyxinaceae* (Fries) Stizenberger. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 191. 1988). Votes: 12–1–1 (recommended).

This is a major and well known family of macrolichens the name of which was consistently used in the present century. Only a few recent authors have (apparently reluctantly) accepted the earlier name *Pyxinaceae*, but it was not adopted in any of the standard works on Lecanorales.

Proposal 902: Rhytismataceae Chevall. vs. *Xylomataceae* Fries. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 192. 1988). Votes: 11–2–1 (recommended).

Hawksworth & David in *Family names*, in line with Art. 18.2, accepted Fries's category "ordo" as equivalent to "ordo naturalis", and thus to family; any taxa below that rank, in the "Introductio" to Fries's *Systema mycologicum* must be considered as infrafamilial categories. "*Xylomataceae*" was not published at family rank in 1821 in the *Systema*, and its listing in *Family names*, where other similar cases were cited correctly, was an unfortunate oversight. Fries, however, published *Xylomataceae* validly at family rank (as "Ordo") in Syst. Orb. Veg.: 120 (1825), and also already in 1820, in a hidden place: on the reverse of the title page of his exsiccata "Scleromyceti Sveciae", fascicle 2 – which pre-dates the publication of *Rhytismataceae* by Chevallier (1826). The entry for the rejected name should read:

(=) *Xylomataceae* E. M. Fries, Scleromyceti Sveciae 2, reverse of title page. 1820 (as "*Xylomaceae*").

T.: *Xyloma* Persoon : E. M. Fries.

Proposal 903: Taphrinaceae Gäumann & Dodge vs. *Exoascaceae* Winter. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 192. 1988). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

The name *Taphrinaceae* is widely used, particularly by plant pathologists, and is based on a generic name in current use. *Taphrinaceae*, and Taphrinales, are adopted in

the textbooks of e.g. Ainsworth & al., Alexopoulos, Bessey, Gäumann, Moreau, and Webster, not to speak of the literature on the group, where *Taphrinaceae* is prevailing, at least since the monograph by Mix in 1949.

Proposal 904: Thelotrema (Nyl.) Stizenberger vs. *Urceolariaceae* Chevall. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 192. 1988). Withdrawn by the proposers.

Proposal 905: Trapeliaceae Hertel vs. *Saccomorpha* Elenkin. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & O. Eriksson (Taxon 37: 192-193. 1988). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

The family name applies to one of the best known of the “*Lecideaceae*” segregates, even though only 20 years old. It designates a fairly large, widespread family, and is a well established, very familiar name among lichenologists. *Saccomorpha*, in contrast, appears to have been used by only one author since 1912. This was a “hidden” name when Hertel reestablished (validated) *Trapeliaceae*.

Proposal 909: Pseudocyphellaria Vainio vs. several names. Proposed by D. J. Galloway & J. R. Laundon (Taxon 37: 480-482. 1988). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

Pseudocyphellaria, though illegitimate (Art. 63.1), has been widely accepted and used extensively over the last 90 years. Apart from *Crocodia*, the generic names proposed for rejection had been distinguished on criteria no longer considered to be of generic value.

Proposal 912: Rhytidocaulon Bally (*Asclepiadaceae*) vs. *Rhytidocaulon* Nyl. (Lichenes). Proposed by P. V. Bruyns (Taxon 37: 486-487. 1988). Votes: 12–2–0 (no objection).

Lichenologists have no need to safeguard an illegitimate lichen name which has not been in use for a long time. The Committee for Spermatophyta already recommended conservation of *Rhytidocaulon* Bally (Taxon 39: 296. 1990).

Proposal 922: Cryptococcus Vuill. vs. *Cryptococcus* Kütz. Proposed by J. W. Fell, C. P. Kurtzman, & K. J. Kwon-Chung (Taxon 38: 151-152. 1989). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

The name *Cryptococcus* must be saved for the medically important anamorph of *Filobasidiella neoformans* and related basidiomycete yeasts. It is clarified that the proposers intended to neotypify *C. neoformans* (Sanfelice) Vuill. (*Saccharomyces neoformans* Sanfelice), and consequently the conserved generic name, by a specimen (BPI 72042) that is a dried-down culture of CBS 132, supposed to be Sanfelice’s original isolate and regarded as ex-type by Lodder & Kreger-van Rij, 1952.

Proposal 923: Trybliopsis P. Karsten with a conserved type (Scleromyceti Sveciae # 55 [= *T. piceae* Velen.]). Proposed by D. W. Minter (Taxon 38: 153-154. 1989). See also article by L. Holm (Taxon 38: 154. 1989) on typification of *Peziza pinastri* Pers. : Fries. Votes: 0–14–0 (not recommended).

The Committee supports Holm’s typification which avoids name changes. Holm did not cite the herbarium location of the designated lectotype, which is UPS. His

typification by a Fries specimen will save *Tryblidiopsis pinastri* in the traditional sense and obviate the need for conservation of the generic name. Minter's simultaneous lectotypification by a Persoon specimen in Leiden (L 910 261 381), allegedly based on Groves's earlier suggestion, is in the same time rejected. Groves (1952) not only refused to typify *Peziza pinastri* on L 910 261 381 but stated that this would upset specific nomenclature since what had "a long history of use as *Tympanis pinastri*" is another species [*T. truncatula* (Pers. : Fries) Rehm] and L 910 261 381 is *T. abietina*.

Proposal 925: Anema Nyl. ex Forssell vs. *Omphalaria* A. Massal. (Lichenes). Proposed by P. M. Jørgensen & R. Santesson (Taxon 38: 303-304. 1989). Votes: 10–3–1 (recommended).

Omphalaria, right from the beginning, was a name of confused application, while *Anema* has generally been correctly understood. Resurrection of a long-neglected confused name should not be stimulated and thus the proposal is supported, even though the species are rather rarely collected.

Proposal 926: Massariella Speg. vs. *Poikiloderma* Füsting. Proposed by A. Montemartini Corte (Taxon 38: 304-305. 1989). Votes: 0–13–1 (not recommended).

The indications of a phytopathological importance of *Massariella* in support of conservation are few. Moreover, the proposal as submitted does not fulfil its purpose. Eriksson & Hawksworth (Syst. Ascom. 7: 80. 1988), having examined the holotype material of *Sphaeria bufonia* Berkeley & Broome, which typifies both *Massariella* and *Poikiloderma*, confirm that they are synonyms of the already conserved earlier generic name *Amphisphaeria* Cesati & De Not. Several authors, e.g., Petrak (1924), Müller & von Arx (1962), and Eriksson & Hawksworth (1988), have also regarded *Massariella* as a synonym of *Amphisphaeria*, and the same applies to its earlier nomenclatural synonym *Poikiloderma*. A new generic name is required for *Massariella oleae* Montemartini Corte, the type of which definitely belongs to the Dothideales, not the Xylariales.

Proposal 933: Arthopyrenia A. Massal. with *A. rhyponia* as conserved type. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & J. C. David (Taxon 38: 493. 1989). Votes: 1–9–4 (not recommended).

There is no doubt that traditional use of *Arthopyrenia* A. Massal. (s. str.) should be maintained. However, conservation is unnecessary. Th. Fries (1861: 111) did not formally lectotypify the generic name. He just mentioned *Arthopyrenia analepta* as an example. Fink's (1935) formal lectotype choice (*A. analepta*) can be superseded under Art. 8.1(c) of the Berlin Code, since in his introduction, he specifically stated that he was using the "first species" method. Riedl (1961: 265) was next to lectotypify *Arthopyrenia* (by *A. rhyponia*), and this choice stands.

Proposal 936: Guignardia Viala & Ravaz with *G. bidwellii* as type. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & J. C. David (Taxon 38: 494-495. 1989). Votes: 13–1–0 (recommended).

Unless conserved, *Guignardia*, because of automatic typification by the type of its replaced synonym, *Laestadia* Auersw. non Less., would be a synonym of *Plagiostoma*

Fuckel, whilst *G. bidwellii* along with some forty congeneric species, some of which are important plant pathogens, would have to be classified in *Discochora* Höhnelt.

Proposal 937: Add *Pyrenotea* Fries as rejected name for *Lecanactis* Körber, nom. cons. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & J. C. David (Taxon 38: 495. 1989). Votes: 11–1–2 (recommended).

The Committee could not decide whether the mention of “*Pyrenotea!* Fr.” with a two-word footnote in Syst. Mycol. 1: xxiii (1 Jan. 1821) constitutes the first valid publication of the generic name, or whether it was validated somewhat later (in Kongl. Vetensk. Acad. Handl. 1821: 332. 1821). In any case the unfamiliar name *Pyrenotea* predates *Lecanactis* and must be added as a nomen rejiciendum against *Lecanactis*.

Proposal 938: *Massaria* De Not. vs. *Spilobolus* Link. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & J. C. David (Taxon 38: 495-496. 1989). Votes: 4–9–2 (not recommended).

Previous alleged lectotypifications of *Spilobolus* (Fries 1849, by *S. inquinans* (Tode : Fries) Link; Shoemaker & Le Clair 1972, by *S. xylostei* (Pers. : Fries) Link) are unacceptable. Fries’s statement of synonymy is not a formal lectotypification in the sense of Art. 8.3, nor is that of Shoemaker & Le Clair, based on the residue method (see Art. 8 Ex. 3). It is still possible to lectotypify *Spilobolus* by *S. tiliae* (Pers. : Fries) Link, thereby making *Spilobolus* Link (1833) a later synonym of *Hercospora* Fries (1825). If such an acceptable typification of *Spilobolus* is proposed, there will be no need for conservation.

Proposal 939: *Mollisia* (Fries) P. Karsten vs. *Tapesia* (Pers. : Fries) Fuckel. Proposed by D. L. Hawksworth & J. C. David (Taxon 38: 496. 1989). Votes: 12–2–0 (recommended).

It is widely recognized that the types of *Mollisia* and *Tapesia* are congeneric. Conservation will result in fewer new combinations and *Mollisia* is better known. The Committee realizes that this may not be the last proposal to conserve *Mollisia* that is needed to maintain its use.