

R E M A R K S

ON THE

ABBE WULFEN'S DESCRIPTIONS OF LICHENS;

PUBLISHED AMONG HIS RARE PLANTS OF CARNIOLA, IN PROFESSOR JACQUIN'S
COLLECTANEA, VOL. II. 112.

By JAMES EDWARD SMITH, M. D. F. R. S.

AND PRESIDENT OF THE LINNEAN SOCIETY.

From the Transactions of the Linnean Society, Vol. II.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY



III. *Remarks on the Abbé Wulfen's Descriptions of Lichens; published among his rare Plants of Carniola, in Professor Jacquin's Collectanea, Vol. II. 112. By James Edward Smith, M. D. F. R. S. and P. L. S.*

Read Oct. 6, 1789.

THE more eminently a naturalist has distinguished himself by his accuracy and judgment, the more dangerous to posterity are any errors he may commit in the sequel of his enquiries. I hope therefore it will not appear altogether unimportant to the Linnean Society, if I lay before them a few remarks on some unaccountable botanical mistakes in a paper of the justly celebrated Wulfen, entitled *Plantæ Rariores Carinthiacæ*, published by Professor Jacquin in the second volume of his *Collectanea*, in 1788. Still less surely shall I be in danger of censure for presuming to point out defects in the works of such able men, for it is only authors of authority whose errors are worth pointing out.

The mistakes alluded to chiefly regard the Lichens described and figured in the volume above mentioned; and these I beg leave briefly to notice, taking the plants in the order in which they present themselves.

No. 175. *Lichen tauricus*, p. 177,
is *L. vermicularis*, *Linn. fl. meth. musc.* 37. I have found it on the alps of Switzerland.



No. 176. *L. marmoreus*. p. 178.

This plant being unknown to me, I shall not presume to make any farther remarks upon it, than to observe in general, that a red or purple colour is often not natural to crustaceous Lichens, but occasioned by the urine of some animal falling upon them, to which I suspect the colour of *Lichen Oederi* to be owing.

No. 177. *L. corallinus*. p. 180.

This appears by the description to be the true Linnean plant, although the author has not noticed the foliaceous margin so remarkable in this species, by which it is proved to belong to the crustaceous Lichens, and which no writer has yet remarked. The figure is very bad, and represents an imbricated Lichen.

No. 178. *L. pertusus*. p. 181.

The plant here figured and described is the *L. scruposus* of Schreber and Dickson, totally different from *pertusus* in all its states: indeed the figure is more like a variety of *L. parellus* which I have often found at Edinburgh, very distinct from both the above.

No. 179. *L. cinereus*. p. 183.

This is a species about which I could never satisfy myself. If this figure be right, it is a valuable acquisition to botany; but I am inclined to doubt it, because it more resembles *ater* of Hudson, and Linnæus describes the margin of his *Lichen cinereus* as *black*.

No. 180. *Lichen albo-cæruleus*. p. 184.

This beautiful Lichen is probably new, if sufficiently distinct from *L. immerfus* of Weber.

No.

No. 181. *L. atro-albus*. p. 185.

The figure of this resembles *L. cæruleo-nigricans*, more than *L. atro-albus*, but the description does not accord well with either.

No. 182. *L. atro-virens*. p. 186.

I have the plant here described for the *L. sphaeroides* of Mr. Dickson. It by no means agrees with the characters of the true *atro-virens*. The latter is generally supposed a variety of *L. geographicus*, but I know not on what grounds, nor can I quite remove the difficulty, as *atro-virens* is not in the Linnean Herbarium.

No. 183. *L. viridi ater*. p. 186.

This seems to be really new, but there is no figure of it.

No. 184. *L. rigidus*, p. 187,

is nothing else than *L. corniculatus* of Lightfoot, *radiatus* of Hudson, *tristis* of Weber. The figure is unworthy the works of a Jacquin, and far inferior to that of Dillenius or even Weber. The name given by Lightfoot is best worth retaining, and has the right of priority.

No. 185. *L. reticulatus*. p. 187.

I can scarcely agree with the ingenious author in making this specifically different from *L. lanatus*, merely because the ramuli adhere together. These kind of adhesions are common in *L. islandicus* and other species, and shew their approach to the nature of Fungi.

No. 186. *L. pustulatus*. p. 188.

About this there is no doubt or difficulty.

No.

No. 187. *L. polyphyllus*. p. 190.

Certainly not so, nor in any manner resembling it, but the most common appearance of *L. miniatus* Linn. just as I have found it in Scotland and Derbyshire, and as it is published by Mr. Dickson in his Collection of Dried Plants.

No. 188. *L. ochroleucus*. p. 192.

We have here a good figure of *L. muralis* of Schreber and Dickson, *saxicola* of Pollich. There is no reason why the name *muralis* should be changed, although not very good, especially as that of *ochroleucus* has been given with more propriety to another species by Ehrhart.

No. 189. *L. olivaceus*. p. 194.

In this the author is certainly right, and his remarks on it are very just.

No. 190. *L. omphalodes*. p. 196.

I am sorry I cannot say the same of this. It is by no means the *omphalodes* of Linn. and all authors, which is nearly allied to *saxatilis*, and perhaps not specifically distinct from that species. The plant here described by Mr. Wulfen is the variety of *L. stellaris* mentioned by Hudson and Lightfoot; probably a distinct species from the common *stellaris*, and totally different from *olivaceus*, to which Mr. Wulfen thinks it allied.

In the quotation of Micheli he is totally wrong, and corrects Linnæus extremely mal à propos; for this author rightly quotes Micheli *tab. 49. f. 2.* for real *L. omphalodes* in *Flora Lapponica* and *Flo. Suecica*; and the reason he omitted to cite him in the *Species Plantarum* was that he preferred the figures of Dillenius and Vaillant, especially as Micheli did not find the plant himself,
but

but received it from the last-mentioned author, and consequently his own information is less original.

No. 191. *L. pulchellus*. p. 199.

This appears to be the *L. tenellus* of Weber, so common on trees and bushes in England, and confounded by Linnæus with *L. ciliaris*; except that the author says it always grows on stones, and never on trees. The citation of Micheli is probably wrong, as he does not mention the ciliæ of the leaves.

The multitude of errors I have taken the liberty to notice, ought by no means to detract from the credit of this able and candid botanist, whose accuracy and care are so well known, that such errors can only be attributed to his labouring alone in the study of these very difficult plants, without the helps which conversation with others would have afforded him. Of the most eminent botanists with whom it has been my fortune to converse, scarcely more than three or four have attended carefully to Lichens; and the greater part, even of those who have written on the subject, are very much mistaken in determining the Linnean species, though assisted by Dillenius's matchless work.



but received it from the said-mentioned author, and consequently
his own information is false original.

This appears to be the account of W. to be given in
these and other in England, and corrected by L. with the
error; except that the author says it always grows on rocks, and
never on trees. The citation of L. is a possibly wrong, as he
does not mention the name of the leaves.

The multitude of errors I have taken the liberty to notice, ought
by no means to detract from the credit of this able and candid
author, whose accuracy and care are so well known, that such errors
can only be attributed to his labouring alone in the study of these
very difficult plants, without the help which conversation with
others would have afforded him. Of the most eminent botanists
with whom it has been my fortune to converse, scarcely more than
three or four have attended carefully to L. and the greater
part even of those who have written on the subject, are very
much mistaken in determining the Linnæan species, though as-
sisted by Dillenius's matches work.

