



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper published in *Taxon*.

Citation for the original published paper (version of record):

Jørgensen, P M., Brinda, J., Wedin, M. (2021)
(2823) Proposal to reject the name *Riccia sinuata* (*Marchantiophyta*).
Taxon, 70: 897

Access to the published version may require subscription.

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:nrm:diva-4306>

PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT NAMES

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

(2823) Proposal to reject the name *Riccia sinuata* (Marchantiophyta)Per M. Jørgensen,¹  John C. Brinda²  & Mats Wedin³ ¹ Department of Natural History, Bergen University Museum, Allégt. 41, P.O. Box 7800, 5020 Bergen, Norway² Missouri Botanical Garden, 4344 Shaw Boulevard, Saint Louis, Missouri 63110, U.S.A.³ Department of Botany, Swedish Museum of Natural History, P.O. Box 50007, 10405 Stockholm, Sweden

Address for correspondence: Per M. Jørgensen, pmjorg@broadpark.no

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12545>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

(2823) *Riccia sinuata* Huds., Fl. Angl.: 441. Jan–Jun 1762, nom. utique rej. prop. [Hepatics]**Lectotypus (hic designatus):** [icon in] Dillenius, Hist. Musc.: t. 19, fig. 29. 1742.

Hudson, in the first edition of *Flora Anglica* (Hudson, Fl. Angl.: 441. 1762), described *Riccia sinuata* based solely, it seems, on a description and illustration in Dillenius's *Historia muscorum*, also citing the place of collection and collector according to that work (Dillenius, Hist. Musc.: 142–143, t. 19, fig. 29. 1742). There is no evidence that he actually studied the specimen cited by Dillenius (“Ad rupes prope Wigmore in Herefordiensi Comitatu invenit & communicavit Littl. Brown.”). On the contrary, his accommodation of this species among the hepatics shows that he did not. He would certainly have recognized that the specimen was a lichen just as indicated by Dillenius. Accordingly, the name is typified by the illustration, one which is difficult to interpret (see below).

For good reasons, *Riccia sinuata* is a name that has never established itself in British bryology (nor elsewhere), as is obvious from MacVicar's thorough standard work *Student's handbook of British hepatics* (1912) where it is not found, even among the synonyms. Likewise, there are no citations of it in any recent check-lists (e.g., Söderström & al. in *PhytoKeys* 50: 1–828. 2016; Hodgetts & al. in *J. Bryol.* 42: 1–116. 2020). It is, however, listed in *Index hepaticarum* (Geissler & Bischler, Index Hepatic. 12: 112. 1990; see also https://www.ville-ge.ch/musinfo/bd/cjb/hepatic/detail.php?no_record=19716). Nevertheless, due to the identity of the specimen upon which the type is based (see below), the name is not available for any hepatic and thus not usable in bryology.

Lichenologists, however, have apparently overlooked it, as evinced by its absence from Zahlbruckner's encyclopedic *Catalogus lichenum universalis* (1921–1940). Although *Riccia sinuata* is not included in that work, there is (Zahlbruckner, Cat. Lich. Univ. 3: 153. 1925) a *Lichen sinuatus* Huds. (Fl. Angl., ed. 2: 535. 1778), the basionym of the gelatinous *Leptogium sinuatum* (Huds.) Massal. This is a nomenclaturally independent name appearing in the second

edition of Hudson's flora (1778), referring to a different Dillenian illustration (Dillenius, l.c.: 145, t. 19, fig. 33), a species now correctly called *Scytinium gelatinosum* (With.) Otolara & al., which will not be affected by our proposed action. Hudson (l.c. 1778) does not make any mention of *Riccia sinuata* Huds. (l.c. 1762).

Likewise, Degelius in his thorough monograph on the genus *Collema* (Symb. Bot. Upsal. 13(2): 335. 1954), where the nomenclature is treated in great detail, did not include *Riccia sinuata*. We have also not been able to find the Dillenian illustration, t. 19, fig. 29, cited under the possible candidates of species represented by the specimen in the Dillenian herbarium.

However, Jacquin (Collectanea 3: 133. 1792) cited it as a synonym of a lichen species that he called *Lichen opuntioides*, presumably that of Villars (Hist. Pl. Dauphiné 3: 967. 1789), which according to Timdal (in *Opera Bot.* 10: 76. 1991) is a species of *Toninia*. Jacquin never saw either Villars's or Dillenius's specimen. Dillenius (l.c.: 142) clearly indicated that it was a gelatinous lichen, which is at variance with both Hudson's and Jacquin's interpretations. The illustration is poor and open to many interpretations.

Fortunately, the material on which the illustration was based still exists in the Dillenian herbarium. Regrettably it is a very poorly developed specimen. Though certainly belonging in the *Collemataceae*, the material is sterile and clearly a drought-form of some species. The most likely identification is one of two species now regarded as belonging in the genus *Lathagrium* by Otolara & al. (in *Fungal Diversity* 64: 267. 2013), both (*L. auriforme* and *L. fuscovirens*) occurring in the region where the illustrated material was collected. Spores or molecular data would be necessary to establish which with certainty. We believe accordingly that rejection of the name is necessary to preserve nomenclatural stability and therefore meets the criteria of Art. 56 of the *ICN* (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018).

Author informationPMJ, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3604-6532>JCB, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9083-1235>MW, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8295-5198>