

<p>PROPOSALS TO CONSERVE OR REJECT</p>

Edited by Dan H. Nicolson (US)

(1302-1303) Two proposals to reject names of lichenized ascomycetes

Christian Printzen¹

While preparing an account of “corticolous”, lecideoid lichens in Europe it came to my attention that the following two names need to be rejected to avoid nomenclatural confusion.

- (1302) *Lecidea tavaresiana* H. Magn. in Brotéria Ci. Nat. 16(43): 145. 1947 [*Fungi*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*
 Holotype: [Portugal] Beira Litoral, Serra de Leousan, Quinta de Alfocheira, 250 m, sur l'écorce d' *Eucalyptus*, Aug 1943, C. Tavares (UPS).

In a recent revision of *Biatora* Th. Fr. (Printzen in Biblioth. Lichenol. 60: 228. 1995) this name proved to be synonymous with *Lecidea carrollii* Coppins & P. James (in Lichenologist 11: 149. 1979). Besides the original publication, the former name was only used once (Tavares in Portugaliae Acta Biol., Ser. B, Sist. 3: 103. 1950); its use has thus never been established. On the other hand, the name *L. carrollii* has consistently been used for this species in floras (Hawksworth & Coppins in Purvis & al., Lichen Fl. Great Britain: 325. 1992), checklists (Hafellner in Fritschiana 5: 46. 1995; Purvis & al. in Bull. Brit. Lichen Soc. 72, Suppl.: 26. 1993) and floristic papers (Etayo & al. in Nova Acta Ci. Compost. (Biol.) 2: 35. 1991, and in Nova Hedwigia 57: 188. 1993; Kalb & Hafellner in Herzogia 9: 69. 1992).

The name was recently recombined as *Japewia carrollii* (Coppins & P. James) Tønberg (in Lichenologist 22: 206. 1990). However, Kalb & Hafellner (l.c.) doubted that the species is congeneric with the type of *Japewia*, *J. tornoënsis* (Nyl.) Tønberg. As it does definitely not belong in *Lecidea* Ach., a new combination may become necessary when its systematic affinities are clarified. Introduction of *Lecidea tavaresiana* as a basionym would add to the nomenclatural confusion.

- (1303) *Lecanora anomala* var. *tenebricosa* Ach., Lichenogr. Universalis: 382. Apr-May 1810 [*Fungi*], *nom. utique rej. prop.*
 Lectotype (Printzen in Biblioth. Lichenol. 60: 228. 1995): Helvetia, s. coll. 346 (H-ACH No. 323).

Lecanora anomala var. *tenebricosa* is the basionym of *L. tenebricosa* (Ach.) Röhl. (Deutschl. Fl., ed. 2, 3(2): 78. 1812-1813) and *Lecidea tenebricosa* (Ach.) Nyl. (Lich. Lapp. Orient.: 145. 1866).

¹ Institut für Biologie und ihre Didaktik, Universität zu Köln, Gronewaldstr. 2, D-50931 Köln, Germany.

Nylander (l.c.: 146) was the first to postulate a relationship between *Lecidea tenebricosa* and *L. erythrophaea* Flörke ex Sommerf., regarding the latter as a variety that “parum vel vix differt”. Branth & Rostrup (in Bot. Tidsskr. 3: 217. 1869) reduced *Biatora erythrophaea* (Flörke ex Sommerf.) Th. Fr. to synonymy under *L. tenebricosa* (Ach.) Nyl. Fries (Lichenogr. Scand.: 466. 1874) realized that Nylander’s circumscription of the species was not in accordance with Acharius’s original concept of the taxon, stating that the material in H-ACH was extremely heterogeneous, and none of the collections identical with *L. tenebricosa* sensu Nyl. Since that time, “*Lecidea tenebricosa* auct.” has unanimously been treated as a synonym of *L. erythrophaea* Flörke ex Sommerf., while *L. tenebricosa* (Ach.) Nyl. was mostly ignored. The name was finally lectotypified by a specimen of *Bacidia naegelii* (Hepp) Zahlbr. by Printzen (l.c.: 229), who also suggested that the name should be rejected.

The material of *Lecanora anomala* var. *tenebricosa* in BM-ACH No. 468, seven bark fragments with various lecideoid lichens, were unsuited for lectotypification purposes, as no collectors or localities were given for any of the collections. The herbarium sheet H-ACH No. 323 has nine bark fragments belonging to seven or perhaps eight different collections. Two of these collections were not suitable for typification either. One (marked “164”) again has no collector or locality information. The other one is not in agreement with the protologue, as it was collected by Sprengel. The rest of the material of H-ACH No. 323 belongs to *Bacidia naegelii*, *Biatora mendax* Anzi, *Catinaria atropurpurea* (Schaer.) Vězda & Poelt, *Catinaria laureri* (Hepp ex Th. Fr.) Degel., and *Lecanora* cf. *piniperda* Körb. As these names are all well established (see e.g. the checklists of Nimis in Mus. Regionale Sci. Nat. Torino Monogr. 12. 1993; Purvis & al., l.c.: 1993; and Santesson, Lich. Lichenicol. Fungi Sweden Norway: 1993) and *Lecidea tenebricosa* (Ach.) Nyl. has priority over them all, any lectotypification will normally result in an undesirable name change. In order to avoid such a name change, it is proposed that *Lecanora anomala* var. *tenebricosa* Ach. be rejected under Art. 56.

Acknowledgements

I express my sincere thanks to Prof. Dr R. Santesson for his critical comments on the manuscript.