

NOMENCLATURE COMMUNICATIONS

(3122) Proposal to conserve the name *Caloplaca mooreae* (lichenized *Ascomycota*) against *Caloplaca* ‘*L. B. Moorii*’Peter G. Wilson,¹  Sergei L. Mosyakin,²  Dan J. Blanchon³  & Peter J. de Lange⁴ ¹ National Herbarium of New South Wales, Locked Bag 6002, Mount Annan, NSW 2567, Australia² M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2 Tereshchenkivska Str., Kyiv 01601, Ukraine³ Auckland War Memorial Museum Tāmaki Paenga Hira, Private Bag 92018, Victoria Street West, Auckland, Aotearoa / New Zealand⁴ School of Environmental and Animal Sciences, Unitec Institute of Technology, Private Bag 92025, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1142, Aotearoa / New ZealandAddress for correspondence: Peter G. Wilson, peter.wilson@botanicgardens.nsw.gov.auDOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.70079>

(3122) *Caloplaca mooreae* D.J. Galloway in New Zealand J. Bot. 21: 192. 1983, nom. cons. prop.

Typus: New Zealand. North Auckland, Mahurangi River on *Avicennia resinifera*, Jun 1934, *L.B. Moore* ZA 628 (W 2D-code W0207548; isotypi: CHR Nos. 241722 & 373803, BM barcode BM001096535).

≡ *Caloplaca* ‘*L. B. Moorii*’ Zahlbr. in Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-Naturwiss. Kl. 104: 367. 1941, nom. rej. prop.

The name *Caloplaca* ‘*L. B. Moorii*’ [sic!] was published posthumously from Zahlbruckner’s manuscript by Karl Martin Redinger (in *Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-Naturwiss. Kl. 104: 249–380. 1941*), who declared it had been published without making his own additions (“eigene Zutaten zu unterlassen”; p. 249). From his publication history, it seems unlikely that Zahlbruckner would have published the name in this form, so that it was probably a provisional entry in his manuscript. Nevertheless, the name was validly published despite its irregular form.

Galloway (in *New Zealand J. Bot. 21: 192. 1983*) proposed a new name, *Caloplaca mooreae*, for this taxon as he considered the name *Caloplaca* ‘*L. B. Moorii*’ to be invalid (not just incorrect!), mistakenly believing that the *Code* did not allow an epithet to be formed in this way. He explained his nomenclatural decision as follows: “Since the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature does not allow 3 words to comprise a specific epithet (*L. B.* in Zahlbruckner’s epithet *L.B. Moorii* standing for Lucy Beatrice) the new name *C. mooreae* based on the same type must be used” (Galloway, l.c.). However, neither the *Leningrad Code* (Stafleu & al. in *Regnum Veg. 97. 1978*) nor the *Sydney Code* (Voss & al. in *Regnum Veg. 118. 1983*) in force at that time contains rules banning names containing three or more parts, with two or more hyphens. The relevant provision remains in the *Madrid Code* (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg. 162. 2025*), and states that “If an epithet consisted originally of two or more words, these are to be united or hyphenated” and “An epithet not so joined when originally published is not to be rejected but, when used, is to be united or hyphenated, as specified in Art. 60.12” (Art. 23.1).

However, the provisions of Art. 60.12 as well as 60.15 of the *Madrid Code* are not easily applied in this case. Blanchon & al. (in *Ukrain. Bot. J. 82: 326–335. 2025*) discussed the difficulties with applying these principles to the epithet in question. They list three alternative ways to expand the initial elements in the epithet (namely, acceptable corrected variants: ‘*lucybeatricemooreae*’, ‘*lucyae-beatriceae-mooreae*’, and ‘*luciae-beatricis-mooreae*’) and list a further two that are found in *Mycobank*: entries 107781 (‘*lucy-beatrice-mooreae*’) and 365221 (‘*lbmoorii*’). Since the *Code* does not provide clear guidance how to resolve this and, given that most of the possible alternatives are unwieldy, the present authors propose that the illegitimate name with a simplified epithet published by Galloway be conserved against the original name and all its orthographic variants.

Galloway’s name is already widely used in New Zealand, and it appears as the accepted name in several publications (Galloway, *Fl. New Zealand Lichens: 68. 1985, ed. 2, 1: 245. 2007*; Malcolm & Galloway, *New Zealand Lichens: Checklist, Key, and Glossary: 8, 61. 1997*; de Lange & al. in *New Zealand J. Bot. 50: 350. 2012*; de Lange & al. in *New Zealand Threat Classification Series 27: 43. 2018*; Blanchon in *J. Auckland Bot. Soc. 68: 23, 25. 2013*) and online databases or sources (*Biota of New Zealand* & *Flora of New Zealand Series*, both accessed 12 Sep 2025). Ecologically, it is significant since it is “likely to be a mangrove-specialist” (Reynolds & al. in *PLoS ONE 12: e0180525. 2017*).

Acceptance of this proposal will maintain current usage of a name that has been in use for over four decades. On the other hand, rejection of this proposal will require resolution of an unusually formed epithet in the absence of unambiguous guidance from Art. 60 of the *ICN* and will likely require a proposal to conserve a specific orthography.

Thus, following Art. 14 of the *Madrid Code*, we propose to conserve the name *Caloplaca mooreae* D.J. Galloway against *Caloplaca* ‘*L. B. Moorii*’ Zahlbr., and all its corrected orthographic variants.

Acknowledgements

PGW and SLM thank Melanie Schori and John H. Wiersema for useful editorial improvements and clarifications.