

Proposal of a new article excepting lichens from the newly passed arts. 14, 56, 57.2, & 59

James C. Lendemer

On 21 July 2011 the Nomenclature Section passed a series of proposals that made sweeping changes to the rules governing the nomenclature of pleomorphic fungi. Unfortunately these proposals have could cause drastic and dramatic destabilization to the nomenclature of lichens *at all ranks* and including some of the most common and conspicuous taxa (e.g., *Parmelia* Ach.). This arises from the fact that these fungi had always been exempted from Art. 59. As such, lichenologists never applied a system of dual nomenclature to these organisms. Instead they consistently used the oldest name (except in cases of conservation etc.) for a taxon regardless of whether the type was based on a specimen in an anamorphic or telemorphic state. Although one may at first assume this means the changes passed yesterday would have no effect, in fact the complete opposite is true. The reason for this involves the nature of lichens and the characters used to distinguish them.

In lichens, both asexual and sexual reproductive structures are on the same thallus. As such, many lichens, including virtually all macrolichens, including such well known genera as *Parmelia*, are distinguished based on characters of the thallus (e.g., morphology, anatomy and chemistry) and *not* on reproductive characters, either asexual (i.e., pycnidia) or sexual (i.e., apothecia). As a consequence, lichenologists have seldom concerned themselves with whether the type of a given name was completely sterile (i.e., vegetative) or with either asexual or sexual reproductive structures. Therefore, the status of the vast majority of all lichen names, whether based on vegetative, asexual or sexual states have always been considered equal in terms of priority. Now, however we must determine the reproductive state of a type of a name in order to how to apply the new rules. As an example, a very common, almost cosmopolitan species, *Parmelia saxatilis*, produces both apothecia and pycnidia. All thalli produce pycnidia (i.e., the anamorph) and sometimes also produce apothecia (i.e., the telemorph), however both types of thalli are easily identified as *P. saxatilis* because the species is defined by vegetative characters. In the event that the type of *P. saxatilis* is found to have only pycnidia (and as a consequence would be considered an anamorph) and the type of another competing name is found to have apothecia (and thus be considered a telomorph) the course of action to determine which name should apply is now different under Art. 57.2 than it would have been when lichens were exempted under the old Art. 59. Further evidence is found in a current example in the Code under Art. 59:

Ex 1) [Vienna ICBN, Art. 59 Ex. 1.] The name *Crocicreomyces guttiferae* Bat. & Peres (1964) was published for a lichen-forming fungus producing only an asexual morph. When it was recognized that *C. guttiferae* is conspecific with *Byssoloma aeruginescens* Vězda (1974), based on an ascospore-producing type, and that *Crocicreomyces* Bat. & Peres (1964) is synonymous with *Byssoloma* Trevis. (1853), Batista & Peres's epithet was correctly recombined as *B. guttiferae* (Bat. & Peres) Lücking & Sérus. (1998). As Art. 59 does not apply to lichen-forming fungi, no separate generic or specific names are available for use for the asexual morph.

Because *C. guttiferae* (based on an anamorphic type) has priority over *B. aeruginescens* (based on a telemorphic type) the situation would now have to be referred to a special committee (Art. 57.2) if both names were commonly used. Note that if hypothetically *Crocicreomyces* had priority over *Byssoloma*, the same would also be true. The fact that such an example is in the Code is indicative of just how common this situation is in lichens.

Therefore, a new article is proposed below that protects the names of lichenized fungi, and those fungi traditionally associated with them, from the potential destabilization that would result from now being covered by Arts. 14, 56, 57.2, and 59.

Art. [no. to be decided] Lichenized fungi, and those fungi traditionally associated with them (e.g., *Mycocaliciaceae*) are exempted from Articles 14, 56, 57.2, and 59.

the newly passed matter
accepted