

in the best interests of nomenclatural stability. Committee members were convinced that the complex taxonomic and nomenclatural questions were adequately explained in the proposal.

(1972) Proposal to conserve the name *Caytonia* against *Lacونيella* (fossil *Gymnospermae*, *Caytoniopsida*) (proposed by Doweld in Taxon 59: 1605–1606. 2010). [Note this proposal was erroneously numbered 1950 in the printed copy of Taxon.] Votes: 11 : 0 : 0 : 0 (recommended; 100% in favor).

Caytonia is a well known and widely used name for a genus of extinct Mesozoic seed plants. The name *Lacونيella* has long been known to predate *Caytonia*, but it has been regarded, incorrectly, as invalidly published because the publication lacked a figure. Article 38.1 of the ICBN (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006) states that “In order to be validly published, a name of a new taxon of fossil plants of specific or lower rank published on or after 1 January 1912 must be accompanied by an illustration or figure ... or by a reference to a previously and effectively published illustration or figure.” *Lacونيella* as a generic name is validly published (Art. 38.1 does not apply to generic names) and has priority over the widely known generic name *Caytonia*, which was published later. The proposal by Doweld explains the somewhat complicated history of the Article that requires an illustration for the publication of a name of a fossil plant, and details how the confusion involving *Caytonia* and *Lacونيella* arose. Doweld has also prepared a proposal to modify the *Code* that would eliminate this problem and remove the threat to the name *Caytonia* and any others in a similar situation. However, not knowing how that proposal will be decided, Doweld has proposed conservation for *Caytonia* and our Committee provides a recommendation on this proposal.

The Committee voted unanimously in support of the conservation proposal. *Caytonia* is a very well known and widely used name. *Caytonia* (and *Caytoniales*) is an enigmatic Mesozoic gymnosperm that has a prominent position in discussions of seed plant phylogeny and origin of angiosperms. Thus *Caytonia* is widely known beyond the paleobotanical literature.

(1987–1988) Proposals to conserve the name *Danaeopsis* Heer ex Schimp. (fossil *Pteridophyta*) against *Marantoidea* (fossil *Pteridophyta*) and *Danaeopsis* C. Presl (Recent *Pteridophyta*) and the name *Taeniopteris marantacea* (fossil *Pteridophyta*) with a conserved type (proposed by Zijlstra & al. in Taxon 59: 1904–1906. 2010). Votes: 8 : 3 : 0 : 0 for both proposals (recommended; 73% in favor).

The genus *Marantoidea*, with one species, *M. arenacea*, was described by Jaeger in 1827 for a fossil leaf fragment from the Triassic of Germany. The species was renamed by Presl in 1838 as *Taeniopteris marantacea*. This illegitimate name became the basis of *Danaeopsis*, a genus of fossil ferns published by Schimper in 1869. The name *Danaeopsis marantacea* became widely known. In 1921 Halle noted that the name *Danaeopsis* should be replaced by *Marantoidea*. There is an additional barrier to the use of *Danaeopsis* Heer ex Schimp.—the name is a later homonym of *Danaeopsis* Presl, which was published as a genus of extant ferns in 1845. *Danaeopsis* Presl has been long out of use. Its type is thought to be a taxonomic synonym of *Bolbitis serratifolia* Schott 1834, and no other species has been described in this genus. Thus *Danaeopsis* Presl does not present any problem to conservation of *Danaeopsis* Heer ex Schimp. The authors also proposed to conserve the name *Taeniopteris marantacea* C. Presl, which has been used as name of the type for more than 160 years. The authors of the proposal estimate that approx. 15 species are referable to the genus, the vast majority of which would need new combinations in *Marantoidea* if the proposal is not accepted.

The Committee recognized that these taxa represent a nomenclatural case that has been complicated by multiple errors and misinterpretations. The genus name has been in use for many years and a number of species would need new combinations published if the name *Marantoidea* were to be resurrected. Although some members of the Committee were not convinced by the proposal a sufficient majority voted in favor of the proposal to recommend its acceptance.

(2017) Proposal to conserve the name *Vesicularia* (Müll. Hal.) Müll. Hal. (*Bryophyta: Hypnaceae*) against *Vesicularia* P. Micheli ex Targ. Tozz. (*Algae incertae sedis*), with a new name for *Vesicularia* Vologdin (fossil *Cyanophyceae*)

Gea Zijlstra¹ & Paul C. Silva²

¹ Laboratory of Palaeobotany & Palynology, Budapestlaan 4, 3584 CD Utrecht, The Netherlands

² University Herbarium, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720-2465, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Gea Zijlstra, g.zijlstra@uu.nl

(2017) *Vesicularia* (Müll. Hal.) Müll. Hal. in Bot. Jahrb. Syst. 23: 330. 24 Nov 1896 (*Hypnum* subsect. *Vesicularia* Müll. Hal., Syn. Musc. 2: 233. 1851), nom. cons. prop.

Typus: *V. vesicularis* (Schwägr.) Broth. (in Engler & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 1(3): 1094. 10 Nov 1908) (*Hypnum vesiculare* Schwägr.).

(H) *Vesicularia* P. Micheli ex Targ. Tozz., Cat. Veg. Mar.: 71. 1826. Typus: non designatus.

Vesicularia is the name of a well-known moss. It is also the name of a previously published algal genus of uncertain identity, *Vesicularia* P. Micheli ex Targ. Tozz. No species was cited in the protologue of the name that Giovanni Targioni Tozzetti ascribed to Micheli and no one has attempted to determine its application so that its listing as a nomen rejiciendum would have no effect on botanical nomenclature except to legitimize the use of the moss name.

Because a third *Vesicularia* exists (see below), which if conserved

would cause the abandonment of *Vesicularia* as the name of a moss genus, we give some data that underscore the importance of the moss name. In the guide to the bryophytes of tropical America, Churchill & Salazar-Allen (in Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 86: 390. 2001) state that *Vesicularia* is a pantropical genus “stated to contain over 100 species, probably far fewer”. In the Moss Flora of China project at the Missouri Botanical Garden it is explained (<http://www.tropicos.org/name/35001345?projectid=22>) why Wu & He (in Moss Fl. China 8. 2005) treated only five species: “The genus consists of some 130 species in the world. Fifteen species were reported from China (Redfearn et al. 1996), but 10 of them were based on original publications only and no further information about their occurrence is available. Five species are treated here.” Iwatsuki & Noguchi in their “Index of the mosses of Japan” (in J. Hattori Bot. Lab. 37: 299–418. 1973) accept six species and mention ten *Vesicularia* combinations as synonyms, five of them synonyms of *V. ferriei* (Cardot & Thér.) Broth. We guess that several dozens of species would survive a worldwide revision of the genus.

Moreover, *Vesicularia* is of economic importance. Some species are cultivated and known by aquarium hobbyists. For example, *V. dubyana* is known under several popular names, including Singapore moss. Several pictures and microscopical images of this species can be found on the internet (<http://www.aquamoss.net/Singapore-Moss/Singapore-Moss.htm>). The Dutch name for *V. dubyana* is “java mos”, but the true Java Moss is *Taxiphyllum barbieri* (Cardot & Copp.) Z. Iwats. (see http://www.miroshaki.nl/forum/index.php?f=184&t=1248&rb_v=viewtopic&p=13368).

The Index Nominum Genericorum (Plantarum) (<http://botany.si.edu/ing/>) includes one more homonym of *Vesicularia*, published

by Vologdin (Drevn. Vodorosli SSSR: 226. 1962; title translated: “The oldest algae of the USSR”) and based on material from the Upper Precambrian (Upper Sinian) of pre-Baikal Siberia. The genus is considered a stromatolite-building cyanophyte (cyanoprokaryote) that is reported regularly, e.g., by Riding (in Geol. Croatica 61: 73–103. 2008), Turner & al. (in Palaios 15: 87–111. 2000) and Yatsenko (in a contribution to a conference on palaeontology and historical geology held at the International Geological Congress in Oslo, 2008 (see <http://www.cprm.gov.br/33IGC/1257085.html>)). This genus has been conflated with the moss genus by GBIF (<http://ecat-dev.gbif.org/usage/2276230> — if on that page one clicks ‘search Flickr’ to find all available images, one gets dozens of images of mosses). To avoid further confusion, we propose to rename Vologdin’s genus:

Vesiculostroma G. Zijlstra & P.C. Silva, **nom. nov.** for *Vesicularia* Vologdin, Drevn. Vodorosli SSSR: 226. 1962, non *Vesicularia* P. Micheli ex Targ. Tozz. 1826 (nom. rej. prop.), nec *Vesicularia* (Müll. Hal.) Müll. Hal. 1896 (nom. cons. prop.).

Type: *V. nidifica* (Vologdin) G. Zijlstra & P.C. Silva, **comb. nov.:** *Vesicularia nidifica* Vologdin, Drevn. Vodorosli SSSR: 227. 1962.

Vologdin (l.c.) established the family *Vesiculariaceae*, but in accordance with Art. 18.3 of the ICBN the name is illegitimate because it was based on an illegitimate generic name. We refrain from publishing new combinations for any species other than the generitype and from publishing a new name for the family, leaving these actions to palaeontologists who recognize these taxa. In literature, only the generic name *Vesicularia* is usually met with.

(2018) Proposal to conserve the name *Carex fracta* against *C. amplexens* (Cyperaceae)

Peter F. Zika,¹ Barbara L. Wilson² & Andrew L. Hipp³

1 Herbarium, Box 355325, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195-5325, U.S.A.

2 *Carex* Working Group, 1377 NW Alta Vista, Corvallis, Oregon 97330, U.S.A.

3 The Morton Arboretum, 4100 Illinois Route 53, Lisle, Illinois 60532-1293, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Peter F. Zika, zikap@comcast.net

(2018) *Carex fracta* Mack. in Erythea 8: 38. 2 Feb 1922 [*Monocot.*: *Cyper.*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: U.S.A., California, [Siskiyou County], Mount Shasta, 6000 ft., 23 Aug 1881, *Pringle* (US No. 817810; isotypus: NY [ex herb. Canby]).

(=) *Carex amplexens* Mack. in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 43: 611. 1917, nom. rej. prop.

Typus: U.S.A., California, El Dorado County, [Sierra Nevada], road near Lover’s Leap, 5900 ft., 22 Jul 1897, *Brainerd 209* (VT [ex herb. Brainerd]).

Carex fracta Mack. is proposed for conservation to preserve a name in widespread use, for the last 90 years, for a common sedge found throughout the mountains of California, Oregon, western Nevada, and Washington in the western United States. *Carex amplexens* Mack., now known to be the earliest name for the species involved, is proposed for rejection as it is a seldom-used name that

has formerly only been applied to a supposed rarely collected Californian endemic.

Carex fracta is one of 36 species in *C.* sect. *Ovales* Kunth from the Pacific states of western North America (Mastrogiuseppe & al. in Ball & al., Fl. N. Amer. 23: 332–378. 2002). *Carex fracta* often grows mingled with superficially similar species. They are frequently confused and misidentified in regional herbaria. We studied *C. fracta* at many sites in the field in Oregon and California. When we examined *C. amplexens* herbarium specimens, including the holotype and paratypes, we found no differences from *C. fracta*. Some of the critical perigynia of the holotype are aberrant; they are deformed or misshapen by parasites. The oddly-shaped parasitized perigynia of the holotype have puzzled *Carex* students for decades. The parasites cause the achene to expand more than normal, and the resulting perigynium is elongated and sometimes a bit ventricose. However, there are also quite normal *C. fracta* perigynia on the holotype. Many of Mackenzie’s paratypes are what we consider immature *C. fracta*. It