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I. Preface.

During my work on Arctic lichens I became interested in the genera *Dactylina* and *Dufourea*, on account of the remarkable distribution of the two species of the latter genus. In a paper, published in cooperation with P. F. Scholander (*Lichens from North East Greenland, Skrifter om Svalbard og Ishavet*, No. 41, 1932, p. 85—87) I ventured some suggestions on their distribution which I suspected to be due to their geological history. The same idea was suggested in my paper: *Om utbredelsen av endel arktiske laver*, *Svensk Bot. Tidskrift*, 1932, p. 411.

In 1931 my friend, Dr. P. F. Scholander, had the good fortune to detect fertile plants of *D. ramulosa* in the North East Land of Svalbard and he generously allowed me to describe its apothecia, with the permission of the leader of the expedition, Professor H. W:son Ahlmann.

After that I studied in detail the distribution of the three species in question. Firstly, I had to collect as much information as possible on the localities, represented in the leading Arctic herbaria. I am much indebted to the scientific staffs of all these museums for their precise and prompt answers to my questions. The present information is based on the material of the following museums: Berlin, Genève, Harvard, Helsingfors, Krakow, København, Leningrad, London (Kew and Brit. Mus.), München, Oslo, Ottawa, Paris, Stockholm, Upsala and Wien. The very important information from Leningrad was procured for me by a foreign botanist who visited that city. — I have also received information from the Spanish *Academia de Ciencias y Artes* in Barcelona.

The literary references are based on Zahlbruckner’s *Catalogus Lichenum*, to which have been added some results from my own literary research work. Very few papers have been cited which I have not seen myself. In such cases I have tried to obtain copies of the text from my colleagues, many of whom have placed their precious time, and their literary possibilities at my disposal.

During my work many problems suggested themselves, botanical as well as geological, and I had to avail myself of the knowledge and the good-will of so many colleagues and friends that I really hesitate to mention their names, for fear of forgetting many of them. I feel
so deeply indebted to each and every one of them that I do not know how to express my gratitude. I have never published a paper the results of which were so markedly dependent on the cooperation of so many scientific friends. — I may perhaps mention that the control of one statement in literature (which proved erroneous) necessitated 10 letters, and as many answers.

At the end of this paper I have not the usual feeling of being the "author", but rather the feeling that I have been the collector of facts, a lens through which rays of many kinds have converged, to form a clear picture.

I especially beg to extend my profound thanks to the following scientists: Doctors Ahlmann, Asahina, Bergersen (and his assistants), Bouly de Lesdain, Chodat, Darbishire, Dodge, Du Rietz, Fernald, Florin, Frey, Gams, Gran, Holmboe, Holtedahl, Keissler, Linkola, Magnusson, Malmé, Motyka, Ramsbottom, Samuelsson, Scholander, Miss A. L. Smith, Suza, Szafer, Tolmatcheff, Th. Vogt, and Zahlbruckner.

I am also much indebted to the head of Norges Svalbard- og Ishavs-undersøkelser, Mr. Adolf Hoel, and to the staff of his office, for their untiring willingness to place their great Arctic experience at my disposal.

My own library contained a considerable part of the papers that had to be consulted. Others were found in our University Library, in the Oslo Botanical Museum, and in the library of Norges Svalbard- og Ishavs-undersøkelser. A few additional items were obtained through foreign friends.

Farmasøitisk institutt, Blindern, Oslo.

B. Lynge.
II. General Remarks.

The lichen genus *Dufourea* was established by Acharius in *Licheno- 
graphia Universalis*, 1810, p. 524. His diagnosis runs:

“Apothecium orbiculatum in thallo tubuloso id marginate terminale, 
ambitu affixum subitus liberum; Lamina proligera discum formante 
plano-convexa, intus similari.

Thallus membranaceus ramosus intus stuppeus fistulosus”.

He included five species under this genus. Two of them were 
simply registered as “species”, viz.:

1. *Dufourea mollusca*, later called *Combea pruinosa* by De Notaris 
(Giorn. Bot. Ital. vol. I, pars 1, 1846, p. 225), and

2. *Dufourea flammea*, now referred to the genus *Xanthoria* as 

The other species were registered as “species dubiae”, viz.:

3. *Dufourea ryssolea*, now *Parmelia ryssolea* (Ach.) Ny!., and

4. *Dufourea madreporiformis*, and lastly

5. *Dufourea obtusata*, now called *Pertusaria oculata* (Dicks.) Th. Fr.

These species are now referred to five different genera, so different 
that they belong to five different families.

It is fully clear that Acharius based his genus *Dufourea* on the 
two “species” *mollusca* and *flammea*, and not on the three “species 
dubiae”, or on any of them. — It is, of course, impossible to unite 
the two “species” in the same genus, and, that being so, it seems 
natural to regard the first mentioned “mollusca” the type of the genus 
*Dufourea* Ach.

The consequence is that we must reserve the combination *Dufourea 
mollusca* for this species, and reject the genus name *Combea* De Notrs.

The first to accept this consequence was Th. M. Fries, Genera 
Heterolichenum, 1861, p. 113: “Sub nomine *Dufoureae* variae species 
conjunctae sunt, quorum vera natura nimis est dubia. Quum vero hoc 
nomen alteri (exoticarum) specierum, ab Achario pro typo sui generis 
declaratarum (*D. molluscae = Combea pruinosae* DNtrs. et *flammeae*), 
ervari debeat neque “speciebus incertis” auctoris imponi (*D. ryssoleae, 
madreporiformis, obtusatae*)”, et cet.
This opinion was also endorsed by Tuckerman (1862, p. 396) who there reserved the genus name Dufourea for D. mollusca Ach.

It should be unnecessary to say that we cannot refer the madreporiformis to the same genus as Dufourea mollusca. Zahlbruckner placed them in different families, and with full reason, the former in the Usneaceae, the latter in the Roccellaceae, on account of its gonidia (Trentepohlia).

Our present knowledge of Dufourea mollusca is amply sufficient to justify a distinction of that kind. A little additional information was gathered from my examination of a plant from Lüderitz Bay in South Africa, collected by H. Eberlanz in 1929, a gift from the Berlin Botanical Museum to our Oslo Museum.

The excipulum of the strictly apical apothecia is uncoloured, as is also the hypothecium. The gonidia (Trentepohlia) are developed in radiating stripes under the hypothecium, in the latter I was unable to detect a double stratum. The hymenium is 75—80 µ high, the paraphyses intensely intricately ramosse and very coherent (ramoso-connexae), not incrassated at the tips. The asci are pyriform, octosporous, the spores parallel in their asci, uncoloured, three-septated, 17—20 × 5 µ. — The pycnides are very numerous, ostiole not protruding. The perifolium pale yellow, brown around the ostiole. The pycnoconidia are slightly arcuated, at times more so, cylindrical or a little narrower towards the apices, 8—10 µ long. They are detached from the tips of very short and much branched fulcra (pycnoconidia exobasidialia).

The genus Dactylina was established by Nylander, Synopsis Lichenum, 1858—60, p. 286, a genus, closely related to Dufourea Ach. These genera are Nos. 3 and 4 in Nylander's Tribus IX, Ramalinei, his Tribus VIII is the Usnei. It is unnecessary to repeat Nylander's diagnosis from this well-known paper. He finds the distinguishing character in the thallus which is "cavus cylindrico-turgidus" in Dactylinina, whereas Dufourea has a thallus "intus medulla stuppea repletus".

Zahlbruckner follows Nylander. In Lichenes, Engler-Prantl, 1926, p. 239, he makes the following distinction:

"Lager aufgeblasen walzig 5. Dactylina.
Lager nicht aufgeblasen walzig 6. Dufourea".

But it is evident from the descriptions in the present paper, as well as in many earlier papers, that grave objections can be advanced against this distinction. Firstly, the thallus is not at all "medulla repletus" in the genus Dufourea, as limited by Nylander. Dufourea madreporiformis has a medulla of that kind, but not the other species, D. ramulosa. Already in the first description of the species, the excellent diagnosis by Hooker (1825, p. 424) we find "thallo . . . fistulosos",
Tuckerman also made this fully correct observation (1862, p. 397—8): “within hollow”.

In reality we find no other generic distinction than the turgid thallus of \textit{D. arctica}, against the more tiny thallus of the two other species. This difference is very important for the habitus, an excellent species character. But if characters of that kind were to be admitted for generic distinction, we should have to accept many wonderful lichen genera.

If we compare the descriptions of the apothecia, given in the present paper, it is hardly possible to find distinguishing characters of generic importance. In all the three species we find the same low hymenium, the small simple spores, the double “hypothecium”, composed of a genuine hypothecium, and under it a stratum that agrees entirely with the exterior cortex — in my opinion the remainder of the old thalline cortex which the hyphae of the paraphyses and the initiating asci have penetrated and extended when the apothecium was formed.

This opinion that the three species should belong to the same genus was already expressed in Hooker’s first description of his “\textit{Dufourea arctica}”, and also in its first name \textit{Dufourea rugosa} R. Br. (1819, p. 195, a nomen nudum). Since that time the generic agreement has been fully acknowledged by several prominent lichenologists. Tuckerman united them under the name \textit{Dactylina} (1862, p. 396). Other lichenologists, such as Vainio (1909), Elenkin and Savicz (several papers) also referred them to the same genus, but, unfortunately, these authors used the genus name \textit{Dujourea}.

Nylander would not hear of such an idea. In his paper of 1870, p. 177, he declared that the name \textit{Dufourea} should be conserved for Acharii species \textit{madreporiformis}, and in his polemic paper of 1871, p. 298—9, against his “enemies”, Müller Argoviensis and Th. M. Fries, he angrily fought for his view. But as far as I can see, he gave no valid arguments, only his authority. Sic volo, sic jubeo.

This species has been passed on from genus to genus, but fortunately enough there has never been any doubt as to its species name, \textit{madreporiformis}. The only difficulty is that this name has been used for two very different lichens, viz. the present species and \textit{Cladonia Papillaria}. It is quite clear that Wulfen’s name in Jaquin Collect. Bot., vol. III, p. 105, and tab. 3, fig. 2, stands for the \textit{Cladonia}. This is evident from his description, his figure, his reference to Dillenius Hist. Musc., tab. XVI, fig. 28 — a British plant —, and especially from his description of the locality: “Saepius hunc in sylvis abiegnis & Labaci sub Turre, & Clagenfurti intra Calvariae montem ac Ziguin, invenimus in terra argillosa, aut margacea, sterili, quam adinstar Lichenis Ericetorum, ampla per spatia, integris cauliculorum, stipatiissime aggregatorum obducit cespitibus”. 


I have been unable to check the other 3 "Lichen" madreporiformis names (p. 27), viz. Gmelin's name of 1791, Laichaiding's of 1794, and Jolyclerc's of 1799.

If we are obliged to leave out of account these three authors, which we probably must, we shall have to base the species name on Acharius Dufourea madreporiformis in Lich. Univ., 1810, p. 525. Acharius cites "Lichen madreporiformis" Wulf. as a synonym, but with a "?", expressing his well-founded doubts.

Most authors have based the species name on Wulfen's paper. The correct reference is to be found in Müller's paper of 1871, p. 394.

If we cannot use the name Dufourea, for the reasons stated above, we must fall back on the genus name Dactylina, and call them Dactylina arctica (Hook.) Nyl., Dactylina madreporiformis (Ach.) Tuck., and Dactylina ramulosa (Hook.) Tuck.

Lastly, we shall have to consider the family affinity. Nylander referred the two genera to his tribus Ramalinei (1858—60, p. 286—7). As long as the apothecia were unknown, or insufficiently studied, this opinion was quite as reasonable as any other. They agree with the Ramalinei in the structure of the cortex, built up of thick-walled palisade hyphae in a direction at right angles to the surface, forming a mighty armour around the thallus. But it seems to me that a cortex of this kind is a very natural structure for a lichen of this habitus. We find much the same structure in Sphaerophorus and Roccella (A. L. Smith, Lichens, 1921, p. 83, fig. 44 and 45), certainly not related to Dactylina. In Cornicularia aculeata the exterior brown cortex is also built up of very thick-walled hyphae at right angles to the surface. Inside of this exterior stratum we find thick-walled hyphae, running in all directions.

A cortex of this kind is, perhaps, a convergence, induced by similar physiological demands, rather than a character of systematical importance.

Müller Argoviensis was the first to find the apothecia of D. madreporiformis, in 1869. He described them in his important paper of 1870, p. 325, in Flora, vol. LIII. Müller found that "Diese Früchte sind nun in Bezug auf generische Structur- und Formverhältnisse vollkommen identisch mit denen von Cetraria und gleichen sogar auffallend denen der Cetraria juniperina". His conclusion is: "Nach obigen Erörterungen der Structurverhältnisse und der eigenthümlich complizirten Synonymie wird also unsre Flechte jetzt zu: Cetraria madreporiformis Müll. Arg."

Tuckerman who also recorded fertile plants from the Rocky Mountains (Synopsis, 1882, p. 30) referred D. madreporiformis to the genus Cetraria in that paper. But Tuckerman evidently found it difficult to arrive at definite results, for he attempted many solutions in his other papers.

With his usually keen intuition Reinke was fully convinced that Dactylina (arctica) was closely related to Cetraria. He writes (1895, p. 194): "Der Thallus ist hohl, aufgeblasen-röhrig und läßt sich von dem
Thallus einer Cetraria so leicht ableiten, wie jeder hohle Phanerogamen-stengel von einem gefüllten, wobei hier der flache in den kreisförmigen Querschnitt übergeht”.

In my opinion there is no difference of generic importance to be detected in the structures of the apothecia in the genus Dactylina, as here limited, and in the genus Cetraria. It is sufficient to compare the descriptions in the present paper with my former descriptions of Norwegian Cetrariae in my “Studies on the Lichen Flora of Norway” (Vid. Sels. Skr., Oslo, 1921, I, No. 7). In that paper I have described the apothecia of 13 different species of Cetraria. The general structure is remarkably uniform; it does not even give us specific differences which must be based on the different and characteristic exterior habitus of all these species.

On principle Müller Argoviensis always neglected characters derived from pycnides and pycnoconidia. That was particularly unfortunate in this case, for, as far as I can find, the difference between the genera Dactylina and Cetraria-Cornicularia can only be based on the pycnides. In the former genus they are more or less immersed into the thallus, such as is the case in Parmelia, or in Physcia; in the latter genera they are "papillis elevatis v. spinulis inclusae" (Th. Fries Lich. Scand. I, 1871, p. 97).

This difference was also, and with full right, sharply emphasised by Nylander in his polemic paper of 1871, p. 299: “Sufficit ut notetur, ei” (i. e. Müll. Arg.) “quidem plane ignotum esse primarium characterem generis Platysmatis, quem scilicet sistunt conceptacula spermogoniorum papilliformia h. e. papillose protrusa et prominula, quae nihil obvenit apud Dufoureas nec apud ullum aliud genus Lichenum. In Dufourea spermogonia observantur omnino externe conformia cum iis Everniarum et Parmeliarum”.

In D. madreporiformis the pycnides are not quite immersed into the thallus, for they have a protruding apex, see pl. II, fig. 1. But they are not placed in protruding papillae.

In some lichens apothecia are always present. In others they are more or less rare, often so rare that we are very glad to find them, in other species again they are entirely unknown. In the Dactylina species they are so rare that several authors have not been aware of their existence.

From my own experience I can mention some other lichens, the apothecia of which are extremely rare. In the genus Cetraria there are interesting cases of parallel development. In some species apothecia are hardly ever lacking, e. g. in Cetraria juniperina and in C. saepincola, but in the related species C. caperata (= C. pinastri) and in C. chlorophylla they are extremely rare. Though the two last mentioned species are amongst the commonest lichens in Norway, I have only seen one fertile plant in either of them.
In the genus *Alectoria* there is but one find of a fertile *A. Fremontii* in Norway, one of *A. nidulifera*, none of *A. simplicior*, one of *A. nigricans*, and one of *A. cincinnata*. On the central Norwegian mountains *A. ochroleuca* is often fertile, but apart from these mountains very few apothecia have been detected in our country, though the species is widely distributed. These apothecia of *Cetraria* and *Alectoria* have been described in my "Stud. Lich. Flora of Norway", 1921.

The most astonishing case is, perhaps, *Cornicularia divergens*. In 1928 a fertile plant was detected on the Dovre mountain in Norway, the only Norwegian find of a fertile plant. There is also one Swedish find, from Juckasjärvi in Northern Sweden. Apart from these two I only know of one fertile plant, from "Insula Åsä, Mare Ochotzk", described by Nylander in his Lich. Middend., 1867, see: Lynge "Cornicularia divergens found fertile in Europe", Nyt Mag. Naturv., vol. LXVII, 1928.

Why are some lichens so well fertile, others so sterile?

Substratum and climate could be the cause. Our government mycologist, Mr. Ivar Jørstad, has told me that the fungus *Phytophthora infestans* only develops oospores on a substratum, containing Silicium. Furthermore that "*Penicillium glaucum*" develops ascospores in concentrated solutions of sugar. Amongst the fungi numerous cases of that kind could be mentioned. — But it is difficult to understand that factors, such as substratum and climate, could act so locally, as the above-mentioned finds of fertile lichens would suggest.

It might be a better explanation if we could prove that there were different races of such lichens, different physiologically, but not morphologically. Amongst the *Micromycetes* many cases are known of differences of that kind. The idea is good enough, but we have no proofs of its validity.

Professor H. H. Gran, of Oslo University, has suggested a comparison with heterothalline fungi.

The + and — mycelia of *Mucor* are well known. We cannot distinguish between them morphologically, but they are sexually differentiated, and zygospores are formed only if either sex is present in the culture. — In some *Basidiomycetes* one basidiospore can grow out to a thallus with a complete cyclus, developing basidiospores again (homothalline species). In others this fructification is only formed in cultures, originating from two spores of different sexual polarity (heterothalline species), such as in species of *Coprinus*, cfr. researches by Brunswik and Kniep, described in Kniep's "*Die Sexualität der niederen Pflanzen*", 1928.

We know that there is a full homology between *Basidiomycetes* and *Ascomycetes* with respect to their cytology before and during the formation of asci and basidia. We also know that lichens behave like
other Ascomycetes before and during the formation of their asci, cfr. Moreau "Les Lichens", 1927, p. 66 and 74. We have the same "anse", the same dikaryon in either group.

In eventual heterothalline lichens the rareness of their apothecia would be well explained if it could be proved that one of the sexes was common, the other very rare. Cytological researches of that kind are much to be desired. The difficulty is that lichens resist the usual methods of cultivation, developed for fungi.

III. Special Part.

Dactylina (Ny!.) Tuck.


Thallus podetiiformis, podetia subcylindrica vel inflata, medulla arachnoidea repleta vel intestiniformia, textura radiantia, undique cortice firmo instructa, hyphis pachydermaticis superficii perpendicularibus formato.

Apothecia apicalia vel lateralia, thallo marginata. Hypothecium incoloratum, hymenium angustum, sporae parvae, globosae vel ellipsoidae, simplices (vel in 1 specie uniseptatae?). — Pycnides thallo plus minusve immersae, fulcra exobasidialia, pycnoconidia cylindrica, recta vel arcuata.

The genus can be divided into two sections, usually regarded as two distinct genera, viz.: Sect. Dactylina (Ny!) Lyng, with one species: D. arctica, and Sect. Dufourea (Ach.) Lyng, with (at least) three species: D. madreporiformis, D. endochrysea and D. ramulosa. The three species: Dufourea flabellata Hue, Dufourea floccosa Ny!, and Dufourea physcioides Mass. are unknown to me; neither of them is found in the Arctic.

1. Dactylina arctica (Hook.) Ny!


Nylander, W.: Synopsis Lichenum, 1858—60, p. 286 (Nylander's first description, also of apothecia).

Nylander, W.: Ad Lichenographiam Groenlandiae quaedam addenda. Flora, XLV, 1862, p. 81 (Description, especially of pycnides, but no localities).


Lindsay, W. Lauder: Lichens, in R. Brown Florula Discoana, from the Admiralty Manual of the Natural History of Greenland (1875?), p. 262 and 274. (Dactylina arctica from “Illartlek Glacier”).


Tuckerman, Edw.: Genera Lichenum: An Arrangement of the North American Lichens, Amherst 1872, p. 7. (Description of the genus Dactylina, remarks on its affinity to Dufoureana, especially D. ramulosa).


Oxner, A. N.: Etwas liber die Flechtenflora der Tschuktschenhalbinsel. (Dactylina arctica recorded from the said peninsula).

**Dufourea (?) rugosa R. Br.**


**Dufourea arctica** Hook.

Hooker, William Jackson: in John Franklin Narrative of a Journey to the Shores of the Polar Sea in the Years 1819, 20, 21 and 22, Botanical Appendix, No. VII, by John Richardson, London 1823, p. 762 (not 761, as has often been stated). (The first description of the species, fertile plants, collected on the “Barren Grounds from Point Lake to the Arctic Sea”. — I found no mention of Hooker’s name in the paper).


Savicz, V. P.: Списки лишайниковъ собранныхъ Р. Ф. Никаномъ въ Лапландіи и Новой Землѣ въ 1903 и 1908—9 г. г. (Enumerationes lichenum in Lapponia Rossica et Novaja Zemlja a cl. R. Nieman’an. 1903 et 1908—9 lectorum). «Труд. Студенч. Наук. Круж. Физ.-Мат. Фак. Сп. Университета» вып. 3 1911 г. (Distribution in Matotchkin Shar, with var. minor Elenkin).


Savicz, V. P.: Новые Виды и Формы Лищайниковъ Камчатки. (Neue Flechten aus Kamtschatka).


Savicz, V. P.: Урготеcie Лищайники изъ Коллекціи Г. А. Борисова. (Matériaux pour la flore des Lichens de la Péninsule Czukotsky). Институтъ епоровыхъ Ревеніи Императрекаго Ботаническаго Сада Петра Великаго. 1915, p. 542. (Recorded as common from the above-mentioned peninsula, with description).

Savicz, V. P.: Лищайники, собранные И. И. Тржемесскимъ въ пола­ярной сибири. (Les Lichens des cotes polaires de la Sibérie recueillis par M. J. J. Trchemesky). (Recorded from the mouth of the Jenisei, with var. minor Elenk.).

Howe, R. Heber, jr.: Classification de la Familles des Usneaceae dans l’Amérique du Nord, 1912, p. 18, tab. I, fig. 33 and tab. III, fig. 6. Thése. (Not sufficient reason for generic distinction between this species and the two species of Dufourea, fig. 33 apothecium, not good, fig. 6 good illustration of cross section).


*Evernia arctica* (Hook.) Tuck.

Tuckerman, Edw.: A Synopsis of the Lichens of New England, the other Northern States, and British America. Cambridge 1848, p. 11. (Referred to *Evernia*, description of species, recorded from Bear Lake, and elsewhere in Arctic America).
Dufourea polaris Ruprecht.


Cladonia arctica (Hook). Th. Fr.


Cetraria arctica (Hook.) Tuck.

Tuckerman, Edw.: Synopsis of the North American Lichens, vol. I, 1882, p. 30. (Description, also of apothecia and pycnoconidia, congenerical with Cetraria madreporiformis).


Thallus ex surculis repentibus vel plus minusve adscendentibus formatus. Ex his surculis (deinde emorientibus) podetia erecta exsurgunt. Podetia magnitudine valde variantia, 2-6 cm longa et usque ad 10—12 mm crassa, sed vulgo minora. Podetia saepe indivisa, sed interdum plus minusve ramosa, podetia erecta tum fuscata, ex podetis decumbentibus emorientibus rami erecti prolificant. Podetia pallide stramineo-flavescentia vel plus minusve in flavo-fuscescentem vergentia, basin versus obsurius colorata. Podetia inflata, intestiniformia, nitidiuscula, plus minusve foveolato-scrobiculata, sorediis isidiisque destituta, apice rotundata vel obtuse apiculata.


Pycnides haud frequentes, depresse globo­saes, omnino immer­saes, perifurcificum circum ostiolum fusco-nigrescentes, praeterea incoloratam. Sterigmata ut videtur pauciarticulata. Pycnoconidia recta, anguste bac­cillaria, 5—6 (—7) μ longa, 1 μ vel ad 1 μ crassa.

Thallus KOH non reagens, sed addito hypochlorite calcico intus rubescens.


The above description of the apothecia is based on the plants which Richardson collected at Bear Lake, during Franklin’s First Voyage. I have loaned the plants from the herb. Tuckerman, a courtesy for which I am very thankful.

Dr. Magnusson has allowed me to see fertile plants from Tolstoi Noss (unpublished), collected by M. Brenner in 1876. These apothecia are 3—5 mm in diam., a little smaller than in the American plants. Habitually they very much resemble the apothecia of some Cetrariae, e.g. the American C. platyphylla.

In his paper of 1861, p. 133, Lindsay described its pycnoconidia: “The spermatia are rod-shaped, about 1/6000th long, with a breadth of 1/2500th. The sterigmata are frequently about 1/300th long, and are either simple linear cells, variously bulging in their walls, or composed of two or three linear elongated cells or articulations”. In his figure, pl. VI, fig. 23, he depicts pycnoconidia of the “bayonette” type which we find in Parmelia.

If this picture were correct it would, perhaps, be difficult to include D. arctica in the same genus as the two species of “Dufourea” where the apparatus is not a little different (see Nylander’s figure of D. madre­poriformis, Synopsis, pl. VIII, fig. 23).
I did my best to clear up this intricate difficulty. The pycnides were often empty, and the pycnoconidia so easily shed from their sterigmata that it was difficult to find them in connection. But as far as I could see the apparatus was of the same type in all the three species, with very short and little branched sterigmata.

Galløe has well described its habitus (1913, p. 80, figs. 129—132). Galløe's figures are excellent, as they always are. — He finds faults with Nylander's description (Synopsis, p. 286), as well as with Reinke's description and figures (1895, p. 391 (193), fig. 111) which have been copied by many authors.

But Galløe evidently overlooked the first excellent description by Hooker in Richardson's paper (1823, p. 762): "Ex thallo vetusto fistuloso prostrato surculi subulato-ventricosi exsurgunt, sese caespitosum, sese inter muscos erigentes, thallo primordiali destructo hi surculi thallos erectos fere palmares, sulphureo-flavos, ad basin flavescenti-brunneos saepe simpliciusculos efficiunt".

The habitus was correctly described also by Lindsay (1861, p. 133).

The present writer never collected this species in nature. But to judge from herbarium plants the decumbent shoots do not live long, and these dying parts of the plants are generally not collected. Its branching is either furcate or papillata, in the latter case the branches begin as small lateral papillae which grow out to normal branches. If an erect podetium falls to the ground, it readily prolificates by new erect branches, just the same prolification as is so common in the needle-like Cladoniae.

Almquist has given valuable information on its variation in size (e. g. in his paper of 1887, p. 537). At the far Arctic Cape Tscheljuskin he found very small plants, only 1 cm long, at Irkaiipij (Nordkap) and the Preobraschenie Isl. larger plants, 3—4 cm long, and at St. Lawrence Island far south in the Bering Strait he measured 5—6 cm. Darbishire described small plants from Umanaq north of the Disko district in Greenland (1899, p. 57), farther south much larger plants have been collected, up to 6—7 cm (in the Holsteinsborg district). It is evident that the size of the plants is to some degree adapted to the surrounding conditions of life.

Two formae have been described:

Var. minor Elenkin, (1909, p. 11): "Thallo podetiis duplo aut quadruplo minoribus, obscurioribus et magis proliferis a forma typica differt", and

Var. papillata Savicz (1914, p. 119): "Thallus 1—2 cm, pallidoverescenti flavidus, ramosus, similis Dufoureae madreporiformis, sed intus vacuus. Podetia papillis vestita".

A fastigiate habitus, resembling Dufourea madreporiformis, was described by Tuckerman (1862, p. 396), evidently var. papillata Savicz. But Tuckerman did not name this modification.
To clear up the section of the thallus I applied alcohol and then chloral hydrate. The cortical hyphae are very indistinct. They are of the palissade type, perpendicular to the surface. They are more distinctly seen on a tangential section, cut near the surface. The cortex is well set off from the inner strata. The hyphae are here more and more arachnoid. This thin stratum cannot give any strength to the podetia, but its hyphae form a hold for the gonidia, and perhaps they also absorb water. The gonidia are scattered, especially near the cortex. I do not think it natural to describe a special stratum gonidiale and a medulla in this plant.

The pycnoconidia have repeatedly been described, e. g. by Nylander (1862, p. 81): "sterigmata pauci-articulata (ut saepius in genere Parmelia formata), spermatia recta, cylindrica, gracilia, $5 \times 1 \mu$", — Lindsay (1869, p. 323) also calls attention to their Parmelia structure. His figure (pl. VI, f. 23) might equally well have represented a Parmelia.

**Distribution of Daetylina arctica.**

**Europe.**


Ural. Nöunga-pai 66$\frac{3}{4}$° (Ruprecht 1850, p. 76). "Montes Uralenses" (Stizenb. 1876, p. 14).

**Siberia.**

Tobolsk. Between the rivers Chaniza and Charava (not located, leg. Sukatchev, Leningrad).


America.


Arctic coast between Alaska and Hudson Bay. King Point (leg. Lindstrøm, — Lyge 1921, p. 5).


Greenland.


Fig. 1. Distribution of *Dactylina arctica*. 

Tab. I, fig. 2, ll, fig. 1–3, text fig. 2, 4, 6.

Tuckerman, Edw., Lichens of California, Oregon and the Rocky Mountains so far as yet known. Amherst 1866, p. 12 (Recorded from the Rocky Mountains, without locality).


Tuckerman, Edw.: Genera Lichenum, Amherst 1872, p. 7 (The affinity between *Dufourea, Dactylinea* and *Cetraria* is clearly pointed out).

“*Lichen madreporiformis* Wulf.”


I have been unable to check these records, they possibly stand for *Cladonia Papillaria*.

*Dufourea madreporiformis* Ach.

Acharius, E.: Lichenographia Universalis, 1810, p. 525. (Excellent description, pycnides seen, distribution Schweiz and Kärnten, figure refers to “*Dufourea mollusca*”, not to *D. madreporiformis*).

Acharius, E.: Synopsis Lichenum, 1814, p. 247. (Description.)

Röhling, Joh. Christoph.: Deutschlands Flora, II Abt., IV Ordn., 1813, p. 119. (Description, not much of interest).


Laurer, F. in Sturm Deutschlands Flora in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen, Heft 24, Nürnberg 1832, p. 27, pl. 11. (Good description, and excellent figures: branch habitus, branch magnified and in longitudinal section).


Nylander, W.: Synopsis Lichenum, 1858—60, p. 287, tab. VIII, fig. 23 (Excellent description and figure of pycnoconidia).


Koerber, G. W.: Parerga Lichenologica, 1859, p. 15 (Description, several localities from the Alps).


Trevisan, Victore: Über Atestia, eine neue Gattung der Ramalinaceen aus Mittelamerika. Flora vol. XLIV, 1861, p. 51 (The species madreporiformis belongs to the genus Evernia, on account of the structure of the thallus).

Roumeguère, Casimir: Cryptogamie Illustriée, Lichens, 1868, p. 36, tab. VII, fig. LXII (Not seen, after Zahlbruckner Cat. Lich. VI, p. 369, and Dr. Bouly de Lesdain in litt.: Description, figure of habitus and pycnides and pycnoconidia).

Müller Argoviensis, Jean: Über Dufourea (?) madreporiformis Ach. Flora, vol. LIII, 1870, p. 325 (Important paper, often overlooked, first description of apothecia, affinity to Cetraria clearly pointed out, Acharii genus Dufourea based on Dufourea mollusca, later called Combea by De Notaris).

Müller Argoviensis, Jean: Replik auf dr. Nylander's "Circa Dufouream animadversio" in Flora 1871, p. 298. Flora, vol. LIV, 1871, p. 391—394 (The author argues for his opinion — Flora, 1870, p. 325 — that the species belongs to Cetraria, and that the genus name Dufourea must be reserved for the species Dufourea mollusca, later called Combea mollusca).


Sydow, P.: Die Flechten Deutschlands, 1887, p. 13 (Figure, not good, p. 6, description, find from Baiern).


Jatta, A.: Sylloge Lichenum Italiea, 1900, p. 61. (Description, Italian localities).


Brotherus, V. F.: Contributions à la flore lichénologique de l’Asie Centrale. Öfversikt Finska Vetenskaps Societetens Förh., vol. XL 1897—98, p. 3. (Recorded from the Alatau mountains).


Lichen squarrosus *Dufourea madreporiformis (Wulf.) Lam.

Pycnothelia madreporiformis (Wulf.) Duf.


Fries, Th. M.: Genera Heterolichenum, 1861, p. 112. (Important notice on its synonymy: Acharii genus Dufourea is based on Dufourea mollusca, later referred to Combea by de Notaris, the name Dufourea must be reserved for that species).

Cladonia madreporiformis (Wulf.) Schaer.


Parmelia madreporiformis (Wulf.) Spreng.


Siphula madreporiformis (Wulf.) Duby.


Petermann: Pflanzenreich, 1845, p. 73, tab. XVI, fig. 60. (Not seen, after Zahlbruckner Cat. Lich. VI, p. 370).

Evernia madreporiformis (Wulf.) Fr.

Fries, Elias: Lichenographia Europaea Reformata, 1831, p. 25. (Short description).


**Cetraria madreporiformis** (Wulf.).


**Not:**

1. *Lichen madreporiformis* Dill. Withering, William: A Botanical Arrang. of all the Vegetables Naturally growing in Great Britain, vol. II, 1776, p. 726. — *Dactylina madreporiformis* has never been found in Great Britain, and it was not natural that Withering's record should stand for that species. It is fully evident from his description, as well as from his quotation of Dillenius Tab. XVI, fig. 28 that Withering's plant is *Cladonia papillaria* var. *molariformis*. — I have not seen the book myself, but I am indebted to Dr.s Malme and Ramsbottom for copies from the text.


3. *Isidium madreporiforme*, Chevalier, F. F.: Flore générale des environs de Paris, 1826, p. 598. — Dr. Bouly de Lesdain has kindly communicated the contents to me. It is quite evidently a *Pertusaria*.


It is quite probable that some other references to old literature also stand for other species, e. g. *Cladonia Papillaria*. 
ON DUFIOUREA AND DACTYLINA

Podetia 1—2, rarius usque ad 3.5 cm. longa, basi emorientia, apice accrescentia, subteretia vel compresse cylindrica, apicem versus leviter claviformiter incassata et in ipso apice rotundata, usque a basin crebre divergenter ramosa vel furcata, rami dein deinde erecti vel suberecti et thallum fruticulosum plus minusve caespitosum formantes. Podetia ochroleuca vel straminea vel virescenti-straminea, saepe fusco-capitata, nitidiuscula, sorediis isidiisque destituta, epruinosa, saepe foveolato-scrobiculata.

Thallus isolateralis, undique corticatus, strato amorpho incolorato tenui, 3—4 μ lato tectus. Cortex 30—35(—40) μ crassus, satis coriaceus, fusco-flavescens (vulgo dilute), hyphis valde indistinctis, conglutinatis, superficiei perpendicularibus, formatus. Medulla sub solida, sed in centro valde arachnoidea, corticem versus crebrius contexta, hyphae medullaris ramosae, adspersae, satis pachydermatae, diam. 4—5 μ. Gonidia rotundata, diam. 12—18 μ, infra corticem plus minusve dispersa vel interdum magis glomerata, partes interiores versus mox sparsius evoluta et in centro late desunt.


Pycnides (saltem in plantis arcticis) numerosissimae, in lamina versus apicem ramorum sitae, distinctae, prominulæ, globosae vel subglobosae, diam. circiter 100 μ. Perifurctrum infusionatum, circum ostiolum obscurius coloratum. Sterigmata brevia, pauciarticulata, in apice solum pycnoconidia efferentia, pycnoconidia undulata vel leviter arcuata, acicularia, 13—18(—20)×0.5 μ.

Thallus extus et intus KOH immutatus, etiam CaCl2O2 si addito, sed cortex KOH + CaCl2O2 distincte flavescens. Asci j persistenter caeruleoscentes, gelatina hymenialis j immutata.


The apothecia of D. madreporiformis are extremely rare. I have only seen one description of fertile plants in literature, viz. Jean Müller's find from Grand Muveran ("Grand Muveran, rocher des chasseurs").
described by him in Flora, 1870, p. 325, sequ. Furthermore, I have received information of a fertile plant in the Leningrad herbarium (Satchan Char, Gams in litt.). In literature we also find a few other records of fertile plants, but without descriptions.

With his wonted generosity Professor R. Chodat, Geneve, was kind enough to send me a fertile plant for examination, out of Müller's find. My above description of the apothecium is in part based on that plant. Unfortunately it was not a good plant, and I am not quite certain whether the apothecia are lateral or terminal, in the latter case placed on the apices of short podetia with a long sympodial ramification.

I was happy enough to detect a well fertile plant in my great Novaya Zemlya collection. When I wrote my paper on the lichens of the expedition I was not aware of the importance of this find, and I made no mention of it. These apothecia are not full-grown. But nevertheless I was very glad to have them for comparison. In one of them I saw 1-septated spores, in the others I was unable to confirm that observation, but these latter apothecia were very young, with few and unripe spores.

As was to be expected, the data given by Müller have been copied by many authors, with or without citation of their sources, e. g. by Lindau, 1913, p. 200, Migula, 1925, p. 170, and by Anders, 1928, p. 178. Sydow simply states “Früchte unbekannt” (1887, p. 13). The first three authors mentioned have placed their description of the apothecia in the generic diagnosis. We are a little astonished to find that in the species diagnosis each of them states “Apothecien unbekannt”, in spite of the description by a leading lichenologist in a leading German periodical. After that we should, perhaps, not be surprised to find Migula's record “Grand Muveran oberhalb Bex fruchtend” five lines after his words “Apothecien unbekannt” in the specific description.

The pycnides are generally found to be sterile, but at last I found a fertile pycnide. Evidently the pycnoconidia are shed very quickly after maturation. My simple hand sections were not sufficient to give full information on the structure of the very delicate fulcra. I found with certainty apical pycnoconidia, and my impression is that the fulcra are very short, and that they are articulated with constricted septa and isodiametrical articuli. I was unable to detect pycnoconidia from the non-apical articuli, this agrees with the usual statement that the fulcra are exobasidial (e. g. Zahlbruckner, 1926, p. 240). Lindsay has not depicted articulated fulcra (1861, pl. VI, fig. 22); it seems to me, however, that his figure can hardly be quite correct. — If Nylander's figure (1858—59, pl. VIII, fig. 23) is correct the fulcra must be endobasidial. This is more in accord with the view that the genus should be related to Cetraria, or better to Cornicularia, where the fulcra are endobasidial.

Glück repeatedly mentions the pycnoconidia of this species. But as far as I can find from his paper (1899, p. 24, 58, and 89), he has
not examined the species on his own sections. — The difficulty could be cleared up by good microtome sections.

My friend, Professor Birger Bergersen, of our High School of Dentistry, who is one of our best experts on microtome sectioning was kind enough to cut several sections of thalli with pycnides. But unfortunately this lichen proved very difficult to section. The thin cobweb inside of the cortex could not resist the process, neither could the wall of the pycnides. The pycnoconidia were found isolated all over the pit inside of the cortex, detached from their fulcra.

Better results were obtained by a very simple method, developed by Dr. P. F. Scholander (see Lyng and Scholander "Lichens from North East Greenland", 1932, p. 60). The thallus fragment was placed in alc. abs., then in water, after which it was dried up to a convenient degree, placed between two slices of Sambucus pith, and cut directly on a microtome. He used auto blades of high quality as a knife. The sections were caught on a needle, dipped into alcohol of 60%, and placed in alcohol of the same concentration. After some minutes they were stained.

Sections of that kind cannot be cut in series, but they are quite good enough for taxonomical purposes. They can be cut down to 10 μ thin, and can be studied under a microscope of high power, even under oil immersion.

The very delicate texture of the cobweb tissue was preserved, evidently intact, by this method.

The podetia cannot be called fistulous. Towards the centre the medullary hyphae only form a very loose cobweb, and occasionally the cross sections show a rupture along the longer axis. The medulla is very distinctly limited from the coriaceous cortex with its palissade structure. The gonidia are rather scattered, at least this is the case with the glomeruli of gonidia, and we are hardly justified in describing a stratum gonidiale of the medulla.

**Distribution of Dactylina madreporiformis.**

**Arctic Europe and Asia.**


**Franz Josef Land.** Recorded by Elenkin (1909, p. 13; gives no locality).


Alpine regions in Central Europe and Asia.

Spain. In Lich. Eur. Ref., 1831, p. 25, Elias Fries records: "Evernia madreporiformis" from "In alpibus Europae mediae, inque Hispania". His references to literature are, perhaps, not quite clear, but anyhow he cites Schaer. Lich. Helv. No. 85 which is undoubtedly this species. Fries may have seen a plant from the Spanish Pyrenees, a locality like that would not have been at all improbable. But I have not had an opportunity of seeing his plant, and there is no other record of its presence in Spain. Del Amo does not mention Spanish localities (1870, p. 354). E. Fries's vague record, which is perhaps uncertain, has not been entered on the map.

I have tried to obtain information from Spain on its eventual presence there, but without much success. The Spanish Academia de Ciencias y Artes sent me the following information: "Respecto a la Dufourea madreporiformis se ha encontrado en Medina-Sidonia, Alcalá de los Gazules y Cabo de Gata sobre los árboles, las rocas y la tierra hasta 800 metros de altura sobre el mar segun nota M. Colmeiro". It seems to me that this information must stand for another species than D. madreporiformis.


"Altvater im Gesenke", Sudeten. (Lettau, 1912, p. 230, also other authors. — Suza is of opinion that this record is improbable, Suza, 1928, p. 26).

ON DUFIOREAA AND DACTYLINA


ON DUFOUREA AND DACTYLINA


Not located Turkestan finds: Werchny Syrt, elev. 12000 feet (leg. Roborovsky, hb. Leningrad), and Birdada (leg. Fedtschenko, hb. Leningrad).

f. irregularis Vain.: Manas Mountains in Western Tjanschan, elev. 8—10000 feet (Vain., 1904, p. 241).


Tibet. "Ohne nähere Angabe" (comm. Reimers in litt.).

China. Yunnan. Mt. de Li-Kiang. 4000 (m?) above sea level (leg. Delavay 1886, hb. Hue in Paris? — the specimen in herb. Nyl. in Helsingfors is D. endochrysea Lynge, p. 62 of the present paper.

America.


Utah. Grassy alpine summit at Fish Lake, Quintal Mountains (leg. Godding 1902, hb. Oslo).


It has occasionally been recorded from Greenland and from the Arctic North-Eastern Canadian regions. But all such plants which the present writer has seen, belonged to D. ramulosa, or to other lichens. So far there is no find of D. madreporiformis from these regions.

3. Dactylina ramulosa (Hook.) Tuck.

Tab. I, fig. 3, II, fig. 4—5, text fig. 3 and 6.


Tuckerman, Edw.: Lichens of California, Oregon and the Rocky Mountains so far as yet known. Amherst, 1866, p. 11. (Recorded from Rocky Mountains).

Dufournea ramulosa Hook.


Stizenberger, Ernst: Lichenes Helvetici I, p. 52, in Jahresber. der St. Gallischen naturwiss. Gesellschaft, 1881/82. (On the highest Alps near the eternal snow, with some localities).


Jatta, A.: Sylloge Lichenum Italicorum, p. 61, Trani 1900. (Short description, distribution in the nivale alpine region).


Dalla Torre et Sarntheim: Die Flechten von Tirol, p. 23, Innsbruck 1902. (Found on crystalline chalk and on calcareous mica slate, many localities).


Lynge, B.: Lichens from Novaya Zemlya, Oslo 1828, p. 211, in Report of the Scientific Res. of the Norw. Exp. to Novaya Zemlya 1921, No. 43. (Several localities from Novaya Zemlya).


Lynge, B. and P. F. Scholander: Lichens from North East Greenland. Skrift. om Svalbard og Ishavet, Nr. 41, 1932, p. 45. (Notes on
its distribution in Greenland, a circumpolar species, supposed to be a relic plant).


**Dufourea muricata** Laur.

Laurer, F.: in Sturm, Deutschlands Flora in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen, Heft 24, p. 30 und pl. 12, Nürnberg 1832. (Excellent figure, habitus, magnified branch, longitudinal section of branch, very good description, based on author’s plant from Kärnten).

Koerber, G. W.: Parerga lichenologica, Breslau 1859, p. 16. (Description, recorded from Kärnten).


Lindsay, W. Lauder: On the Lichen Flora of Greenland, with Remarks on the Lichens of other Arctic Regions. The Admiralty Manual of the Natural History of Greenland: prepared for the Use of the Arctic Expedition of 1875, p. 298. (D. m. is an American Species, not yet found in Greenland).

Darbishire, O. V.: Lichens collected during the 2nd Norwegian Polar Expedition in 1898—1902, and determined by O.V. D. Report of the Second Arctic Expedition in the “Fram” 1898—1902, No. 21, p. 37, Kristiania 1909. (Localities from Ellesmereland &c.).

Galloe, Olaf: Lichens from North-East Greenland (N of 76 N. Lat.). Medd. om Gronl., vol. XLIII, 1910, p. 190. (First find from Greenland).

*Pycnothelia muricata* (Laur.) Rabh.


*Evernia ramulosa* (Hook.) Tuck.

Tuckerman, Edw.: A Synopsis of the Lichens of New England, the other Northern States, and British America. Cambridge, 1848, p. 11. (Arctic America, with description).

*Dactylina muricata* (Laur.) Tuck.

Tuckerman, Edw.: Genera Lichenum, 1872, p. 7. (The two species of *Dufourea* are related to *Dactylina arctica*, and they are also related to *Cetraria* which has similar apothecia).

*Cetraria ramulosa* (Hook.) Tuck.

Tuckerman, Edw.: A Synopsis of the North American Lichens, vol. I, 1882, p. 30. (Description, also of apothecia, distribution, related to *C. (etraria) aculeata*).

*Podetia fragilis*, erecta vel suberecta, brevia, 1—1.5(—2) cm. longa, basi emorientia, apice accrescentia, subteretia vel compresse cylindrica, podetia majora apicem versus interdum plana et tum in margine papilloformiter dissoluta. Podetia vulgo monopodialiter ramosa, sed interdum etiam furcata, ramis divergentibus, brevibus vel etiam papillatis crebre instructa, ob ramos papillasque accrescentes thallum muricatum saepe dense caespitosum formantia, caespites diametro usque ad 3—5 cm. Rami saepe mammiformiter papillati, apice rotundati. *Podetia* superne olivaceo-fusca vel fusco-violacea, inferne flavo-fuscescentia vel glauco-fuscescentia, madefacta immutata, non vel leviter solum foveolata, soredias isidiisque destituta, sed superne plus minusve intense pruinosa, pruina albida vel in violascentem vergenti.

*Thallus* isolateralis, undique corticatus, fistulosus, strato amorpho, incolorato, 5—7 μ. Crasso tectus. Cortex 25—35, interdum usque ad 50 μ. altus, in parte exteriori late fuscus, in parte interiori anguste incoloratus. Hyphae corticis valde indistinctae, pachydermaticae, granulis minutis ut striatae videntur, superficie perpendiculares, saltem in parte colorata corticis, in parte incolorata subamorphe confusae
Hyphae medullares valde pachydermicae, 6—7 μ crassae, plus minusve adspersae, in parte interiori arachnoideae, sub corticem densius contextae.

Apothecia rarissima, sed numerosa, si evoluta, ramos interdum fere tegentia. Apothecia majuscula, diam. vulgo 2—3 mm., rarius usque ad 5—6 mm., primo apicalia, deinde podetiis sympodialiter ramosis lateralia, ramis brevibus affixa vel subsessilia. Discus subplanus, laevigatus, castaneus, nitidus, epruininosus, margine persistenti circumdatum thallo concolori, ab initio plus minusve grosse crenato, deinde usque appendiculato. Receptaculum fistulosum, lumen tamen angustum, medulla arachnoidea circumdatum, hyphae medullares 5—7 μ crassae, pachydermicae, adspersae, ramosae. Cortex receptaculi dilute flavescens, vel in parte exteriori pallide fusescens, praeterea incoloratum. Hyphae corticis intense conglutinatae, crassae, 10—12 (—15) μ, oblique striatae, crebre septatae laminis angustis ellipticoideis, superficie perpendiculares, in parte interiori superficie magis paralleles et in medullam transientes. Gonidia receptaculi pulchre laete viridia, diam. 10—15 μ, plus minusve glomerata, glomeruli infra hypothecium (sensu latiore) stratum subcontinuum formantia, infra corticem minus numerosa vel late deficiens, in ipsa medulla paucia et dispersa. Hypothecium (s.l.) duo strata continere videtur: 1. stratum inferior crassius incoloratum, corticis structura et in corticem transiens, hyphis crassis, diam. 12—15 μ, valde pachydermaticis, refractivis, ramosis, pro maiore parte hymenio perpendieularibus, et 2. stratum superior, hypothecium verum, tenuius, circiter 37—40 μ crassum, incoloratum, hyphis minus refractivis, multo tenuioribus, superficie hymenii magis parallelibus formatum. Haec strata strato tenui flavescentia distinguuntur. H y m e n i u m a n g u s t u m: 42—50 μ al tum, strato amorpho incolorato tectum, in parte superiori flavo-fuscescens, praeterea incoloratum. Paraphyses basin versus crebre ramosae, praeterea indivisae vel hinc inde furcatae vel ramosae, in apice valde incrassatae, fusco-capitatae vel fusco-clavatae, capitis diametro 4.5—5 μ, paraphyses arcu cohaerentes. Asci saccati vel pyriformes, hymenio multo breviores, 28—32 × 8—10 μ, membrana superne incrassata (ut in Parmelia). Asci sporis saeppe carentes, vel sporis 6: nis- 8: nis instructi. S p o r a e g l o b o s a e vel (abortu?) angulosae, diam. 4—5.5 μ, satis pachydermaticae, episporium 0.7—0.8 μ.

Pycnides fertiles rarissimae, in plantis apotheciiferis solum venenimus, globosae vel subglobosae. Fulcra articulata, brevia, exobasidialia. Pycnoconidia recta, cylindrica, 5—6 (—7) × 1 μ.

Thallus KOH extus et intus immutatus vel extus (plantae pallide) leviter flavescens, CaCl₂O₇ extus et intus immutatus, et his reagentiis coalitis decoloratus. Hymenium J primo caeruleascens, asci deinde mox inferne fuscescentes, et superne sordide caeruleo-nigricantes, gelatina hymenialis flavo-fuscescens (sectio tenuis). Hypothecium verum dilute
caerulescens, cortex et stratum infratenustralibus J haud colorantur. Apices paraphysum KOH fuscescentes et turgescentes, usque ad 7—8 μ, praeterea omnia decolorantur. Hymenium HNO₃ non mutatur.


I have seen one single record of its pycnides: “Auch erscheinen bei dieser Art die Spermogonien viel mehr als bräunliche, dicht gehäufte, eingesenkte Punkte, während die Endwärzchen der Spitzen gewöhnlich etwas mehr erhaben zu sein pflegen” (Koerber, 1859, p. 16). I am not quite convinced that this record really stands for the pycnides, Koerber has possibly described very young, papillate branches. — The pycnoconidia were formerly entirely unknown, and I did my best to find them in our great herbarium material, all of which was destitute of apothecia. But it was all in vain. At last the happy idea struck me that they might possibly be found in Scholander’s fertile plants, and there they were. It may be a chance, but nevertheless it seems to me that it suggests the pycnoconidia to be sexual organs (spermata). In D. madreporiformis the pycnides are much more common, at least in the Arctic plants, though the apothecia are rare enough.

D. muricata is easily distinct from D. madreporiformis in its smaller size, its colour and pruina, its muricate branching, and its fistulous thallus.

Galloe has a remark on its morphology (1913, p. 82), translated from the Danish text: “Like D. arctica it consists of decumbent podetia, forming erect, irregular shoots, it can develop small tufts with centrifugal growth”.

Most fruticulose lichens with narrow erect podetia are able to develop new erect shoots if the “mother podetium” falls to the ground. This is well known for Cladoniae, Stereocaulons, and other lichens, also for the present species. But I have never seen normally decumbent podetia (“nedliggende Podetier”) in D. muricata. Its normal branching must result in a centrifugal growth, but we never find dead podetia in the centre of the tufts.

Distribution of Dactylna ramulosa.
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to 3000 m above sea level (Frey in litt.). Pasterze (leg. Laurer, several herbaria). — Niedere Tauern: Steirischer Kalkspitz, 2400 m, and Hochgolling, on calcareous mica slates, 2840 m above sea level (Frey in litt.). Kalkspitze bei Schladming, 2400 m above sea level (leg. Baumgartner, hb. Wien).

Novaya Zemlya.


Asia.


America.


In American herbaria and literature this species is sometimes found under the name of *Dufourea madreporiformis*.

Greenland.


IV. General Distribution.

*Dactylina arctica* is a very rare species in the Atlanto-European Arctic sector. It has never been collected, and most probably it is lacking, on the North and East coast of Greenland. — It is very rare in the Svalbard region, only found in the northernmost parts of Spitsbergen and the North East Land (Nordostlandet). — There are a few finds from Novaya Zemlya and Kolgujev.

So far there is no find from the European continent. We might, perhaps, hope to find it on the Russian coast of the Polar Sea.

East of Ural that is entirely different. There are a lot of finds from the whole Siberian coast, and from the northernmost parts of the great Siberian rivers. To judge from several remarks in Almquist’s papers it must be really common there. — It is difficult for me to state the exact northern limit of the Siberian forest. But it seems to me that it is lacking in the forest region, at least we have no records from it.

*D. arctica* has a considerable distribution in the Altai mountains far eastwards, and it is not improbable that it is found continuously all the way to the Pacific Ocean along the East Siberian mountains, for we find it again in the Stanovoi Mountains, and also in Kamchatka.

It is equally common all the way along the Arctic coasts of the American continent and the American Arctic islands from the Bering Sea region to the West coast of Greenland down to the Godthaab district.
Fig. 3. Distribution of Dactylina ramulosa.
We have also several finds from the American continent south of the Arctic coast as far south as Alberta. These finds are scattered, and they possibly suggest a greater distribution than we know at the present day. These regions are difficult of access, and they have not been much investigated lichenologically.

On the whole *D. arctica* is typically a circumpolar Arctic species, only touching the northernmost land in the European sector, much more common and more widely distributed in Asia and in America.

The distribution of the two other species, *D. madreporiformis* and *D. ramulosa*, is much more interesting.

*D. madreporiformis* is extremely rare in the Atlantic Arctic sector, entirely lacking in Greenland, and recorded only from the continental part of a single fjord in Northern Spitsbergen.

We have only one record from Franz Josef Land, but in Novaya Zemlya it is “widespread and generally abundant” (Lynge, 1928, p. 211). It has also been collected in Waigatsch.

There are a few finds from the Siberian coast, where it has been collected only by Almquist during the Vega Expedition. The (3) localities are scattered over this enormous coast. Considering the well-known thoroughness of Dr. Almquist's work we are justified in concluding that *D. madreporiformis* must be rare in Arctic Siberia.

It has an extensive and evidently continuous distribution on the highest mountains in Europa and Asia from (Spain?) the Alps all the way to the Sajan mountains in the Altai.

The number of localities in the Alps is very considerable, in reality so great that it cannot be duly expressed on a map of this size. Dr. Frey writes to the present author: “*Dufourea madreporiformis* ist in den Alpen in der alpinen Stufe ganz allgemein verbreitet, aber nirgends häufig, sie sucht meistens die Kämme und Gräte und windgepflegten Rücken auf, wo sie auf steinigem, ausgeblasenen Boden oder noch häufiger in Felsnischen auf Feinerde wächst. Höchster von mir beobachteter Standort: Grosseglockner i. d. Hohen Tauern bei 3600 m, so viel ich weiß der höchste Standort, auf ziemlich kalkhaltigen Grünschiefern. In den Schweizeralpen beobachtete ich sie mehrfach bis 3300 m Meeres-höhe. Wie häufig sie in den Westalpen ist, kann ich nicht sagen, in den Schweizer- und Ost-Alpen scheint sie gleich häufig zu sein, fehlt also den Gebieten mit kalkarmen Silikaten und kompakten Kalken”. “Steigt kaum unter die Waldgrenze herab”. “Am reichsten auf eugeogenen Kiesel-Kalken der Kreide, des Doggers und des Tertiärs”.

Dr. H. Gams, Innsbruck, writes (translated): “Restricted to the most continental regions in the East and West Alps, it demands but little snow cover during the winter. Most of the localities which I know are found on calcareous rocks between 2200—2900 m above sea level especially in the Elymeta of the summits”. 
Dr. J. Suza, Brno, writes (letter to the present author) "in montibus Carpaticis in parte occidentali et austro-orientali occurrit, solum in zona alpina, in rupibus calcareis vel dolomiticis, sterilis".

Dr. J. Suza writes (1928, p. 26, translated into German by Dr. Sulma, Krakow): "Die Flechte ist eine charakteristische Leitart der terrestrischen Hochgebirgsassoziationen auf Kalkunterlage, in den Alpen, in der Bielaër Tatra etc". And furthermore on its distribution in the Tatra (1925, p. 11, translated by Dr. Sulma): "Eine für den ganzen Kalkgebirgskamm der Bielske Tatry sehr charakteristische Flechte oberhalb der oberen Knieholzgrenze, von ca. 1800 m bis zur höchsten Spitze des Hawran, 2154 m".

Dr. Suza has also been kind enough to send me a map of its distribution in the Tatra (Tatry) mountains. It shows, better than words, how strictly it is limited to the calcareous and dolomitic mountains in the N.-E. Tatra, and to Mt. Giewont farther west, whereas it is entirely lacking in the central granitic "High Tatra".

Further east there is a continuous area of distribution through the mountains of the Crimea, Caucasus, Turkestan and Western Altai as far east as the Sajan region. — There are a few localities in Tibet and in China, so far scattered, but lichenologically these parts of Asia have not been much explored.

Its distribution in America is very interesting. It is entirely lacking all over Greenland, at least we have no finds to day. Lichens have been collected in Greenland for more than 100 years, and a species
so conspicuous as this is could hardly have escaped attention if it had been there. Nor has it been found in Canada. I have revised several finds of it from Arctic Canada and from Greenland, but they stand for *D. ramulosa*, or for other species.

There are a few finds from Alaska. Unfortunately I have been unable to locate them, and I could not enter them on the map.

Finally we have a well-known area of distribution in the Southern Rocky Mountains, between 35—40° N. — I cannot estimate the intensity of the lichenological research here, and I do not know whether the area is really so isolated as it looks at the present day.

But it is an important fact that a distribution of that kind (cfr. also *D. ramulosa*) is not restricted to this (these) species alone. Some maps of distribution in a paper by the Russian botanist A. Tolmatchew called my attention to the distribution of several Vascular plants, i. a. *Lloydia serotina*. Professor M. L. Fernald, of the Gray Herbarium, was kind enough to state its distribution on a map which he sent to me, a courtesy which must have cost him a great amount of work, and for which I am glad to express my profound gratitude (fig. 5, p. 53).

In North America *Lloydia serotina* is found in several localities along the coasts of Alaska. It has also two areas of distribution farther south, chiefly in the Rocky Mountains. One in the states of Washington, Montana, and the adjacent part of Wyoming. The other in Colorado and New Mexico, with an isolated find farther west, in Nevada. This southern area agrees remarkably well with the Rocky Mountain area of *D. madreporiformis*.

Professor Fernald was kind enough to add the following remarks:

"The isolation from the Arctic and Subarctic region in the Cordilleran region far to the south is a very general one, this showing in so large a proportion of cases that I take it to be a natural isolation. North of lat. 55° or thereabouts the mountains gradually become lower and at lat. 60—65° very many of the Arctic species seem to be wanting on them".

It will be seen that the area of *D. madreporiformis*, between 35—40° N, is far to the south of the latitudes where the mountains become lower. — Even if the lichenological research of the Rocky Mountains should not be so intense as was to be desired, this analogy, and Professor Fernald's information, make it probable that our present knowledge of the American distribution of these rather conspicuous lichens is representative, and that it proves isolated centres of distribution.

The other species, *D. ramulosa*, has two distinct centres of distribution in the Atlanto-European sector.

Firstly we have the strictly northern region in North and North-East Greenland down to about 77° N on the East coast of Greenland. In addition to this we have an area along the north coast of Spitsbergen and the North East Land (Nordostlandet). In the eastern part
of this coast it is really common. There is hardly any other part of its area where we have so many finds from a small district.

It has never been found south of Danmarks Havn in East Greenland, in spite of intense lichenological research during several Norwegian and Danish expeditions. And it has never been found on the west coast of Spitsbergen. This coast has been explored by many trained lichenologists, hardly any other part of the Arctic being so well known, lichenologically. We have every reason to conclude that it is really lacking there, an important point.

Secondly there is the very limited area in the Alps from Wallis in the west to Steiermark and Kärnten in the east. Though there are

![American distribution of Lloydia serotina, as shown at Gray Herbarium. The author is indebted to Professor M. L. Fernald for this map.](image)

Fig. 5. American distribution of *Lloydia serotina*, as shown at Gray Herbarium. The author is indebted to Professor M. L. Fernald for this map.

a considerable number of finds it is not supposed to be common here. Dr. Ed. Frey, the Swiss lichenologist, writes to the present author: “In der Schweiz sammelte ich sie einzig im Gebiet des Nationalparkes, Unterengadin, auf Kalk- und Dolomitgestein, zw. 2600 und 3200 m” (we have Italian finds up to 3870 m, and Swiss finds down to 2000 m above sea level), “nur sehr vereinzelt und spärlich. In den Ostalpen scheint sie auch ziemlich spärlich”.

Dr. H. Gams, Innsbruck, never collected it in the Alps. He writes that it is found on calcareous rocks between 2200—2900 m above sea level, especially in the Elymeta of the summits, restricted to the most continental parts of the West and the East Alps. — It requires places where there is but little snow cover during the winter.

We have no literary record of finds in the European mountains east of Steiermark and Kärnten. After an extensive correspondance
with lichenologists and other botanists who know everything about the botany of these well-explored mountains, I find it highly improbable that it should be found there. Its area in the European Alps is, accordingly, isolated to an exceptional degree.

In Asia we have not a single find from the continent south of the coast. We cannot conclude with certainty that it is lacking there, but we have good reason to suppose that this is so.

There are several finds of *D. ramulosa* from the Arctic coast. To begin with (the European) Novaya Zemlya, the present writer found it “widespread, but scarce” in Novaya Zemlya (Lynge, 1928, p. 211), and Almquist writes: “Ich habe sie in Sibirien recht viel, beim Beringsmeere selten und spärlich gefunden”.

In America there is an isolated find on the coast of the Bering Strait. We have no record from the western part of the American Arctic coast which, however, has been insufficiently investigated. But there is a considerable number of finds from the Canadian Arctic islands, and also from the adjacent Canadian continent. Considering the modest intensity of the investigation, only by non-lichenologists, we are justified in supposing it to be quite common here. — There are a few finds from West Greenland.

Lastly we have some important finds from the Rocky Mountains in Alberta and in Saskatchewan, all of them just north of 50° N. So far these finds are quite as isolated as are the European alpine finds. But I am not quite convinced that the intensity of the field research work is here so great that we can exclude its presence in the alpine regions farther north.

We have no finds from the southern Rocky Mountains, in Colorado and Utah.

It is natural for me to begin a general discussion on the distribution of these species with the Svalbard region.

As formerly stated, there are but three finds of *D. arctica*, all of them from the north coast of Spitsbergen and the North East Land, and but two finds of *D. madreporiformis* from the continental part of Wijde Bay, on the north coast of Spitsbergen. — We cannot conclude much from a few isolated finds, such as these. *D. ramulosa* is very common along the whole north coast of Spitsbergen and the North East Land (Nordostlandet); in reality it is probable that we have here the greatest known density of finds in the whole world.

It is a very remarkable fact that we have not a single find of any of these species from the west coast of Spitsbergen. It cannot be due to insufficient investigation. For very many expeditions have worked along this coast, and several trained lichenologists have taken part. Each of them would have been much interested in finding these species, and it is not easily understood how three so conspicuous lichens could have
escaped the quest of so many botanists. On the north coast they have been found by a large number of collectors, lichenologists as well as non-lichenologists. I wonder whether a single botanist has collected lichens on the north coast without finding at least one of them.

Accordingly I consider their distribution exclusively in the northernmost Svalbard region to be a well-established fact which calls for an explanation.

The likeliest explanation is that they should be especially well adapted to the conditions of life in these high latitudes, being highly Arctic species. The climate is not known in detail along the Svalbard coasts. But we know that the most clement climate is found in the fjords of North West Spitsbergen, and also in the continental part of Isfjorden (Ice Fjord). It becomes ever more Arctic eastwards along the north coast of Spitsbergen proper and the North East Land, and the amplitude is supposed to be considerable. There is no reason whatever to suppose that climatic conditions should exclude any of these three species from the west coast of Spitsbergen. It is impossible to understand why the climate should be better for them along the north coast.

The sandstones of Northern Spitsbergen contain some lime; and calcareous rocks are also common in the Hecla Hook formation, which has a considerable extension in Northern Svalbard. *Dactylina madreporiformis* and *D. ramulosa* are much dependent on calcareous soil. But there is much calcareous soil in West Spitsbergen also. And the geological strike

![Fig. 6. The Svalbard distribution of the 3 Dactylina species:](image)
of the rocks is largely North-South in West Spitsbergen, we find much the same profile in Isfjorden (Ice Fjord) as we find along the north coast. It is hardly possible to explain the Svalbard distribution of these three species from the condition of the soil.

We might speak of "chance", the sum of all unknown factors. But that is, unfortunately, no explanation. Ignorance remains ignorance, even if we try to conceal it behind a fine term.

It seems to me that time factors might suggest a possible explanation. We should then have to consider two possibilities, viz.: 1. That the species should be recent introductions which had not yet reached their final distribution, and 2. That they should be old species, relic types, which for unknown reasons had lost their power of spreading under present conditions, as relic species often do.

Either of these possibilities seems equally reasonable for the two rare species, *D. madreporiformis* and *D. arctica*. But if *D. ramulosa* had been a species in vigorous spreading, it would be difficult to understand its absence on the west coast, considering the great density of finds along the north coast. I can, however, give no conclusive arguments in favour of this view, and it is evidently open to criticism.

If preference is given to the relic hypothesis we must presume unglaciated areas in Northern Svalbard at a time when the other parts of the islands were glaciated. A comparison with other parts of the Arctic lends support to this idea. We have today the greatest glaciated area in the Arctic in Greenland, but in this continent we find that the northernmost part presents very considerable unglaciated areas (Peary Land, Nyboe Land, Hall Land, Washington Land, Inglefield Land).

Glaciation is a very complicated phenomenon, dependent on the relation between precipitation, evaporation, and temperature. It is largely independent of the geographical latitude.

If Northern Svalbard had been unglaciated at a time when glaciers covered the remaining islands, it would be quite natural to expect relic plants just here, provided that they had lost their power of spreading, or had it reduced.

It is impossible for me, a botanist, to discuss geological questions of this kind. I have therefore consulted my geological friends.

Professor Olaf Holtedahl, of Oslo University, calls attention to the well-known fact that at the present day Northern Svalbard has unglaciated areas of considerable extent. He is of opinion that if there have been unglaciated areas during the last glaciation we should expect to find them in Northern Svalbard. He considers the idea of such refuges as possible, supposing the glaciers to have been valley glaciers.

Professor Thorolf Vogt, of the Technical University in Trondheim, fully agrees with my views. He has studied the geology of Northern Svalbard during his expedition of 1928. He has written to me (letter
of 23. May 1933, translated): "Alpine topography, e.g. west of Red Bay, between Wood Bay and Wijde Bay, and perhaps also in the Seven Islands (Sjuøyane) and Karl XII Island, suggests ice-free nunataks during the last glaciation. It is, however, more important that the level of the sea was much lower than at the present day, probably several hundred metres lower, and several facts favour the view that just a part of the land which is now submerged was then unglaciated. We have the analogy with North Greenland, which is remarkably unglaciated along the Arctic Ocean, certainly on account of the low precipitation. There cannot be much evaporation from an ice-covered sea, such as the Arctic Ocean north of Greenland, the air must be dry, and the air moisture from other regions must be condensed before it attains these regions. — In Spitsbergen we have the lowest amount of precipitation in the inner parts of Wijde Bay where the snow limit is very high, and where I have repeatedly seen incrustations of salts on the ground. During the last glaciation when the marine ice advanced farther south than it does today, and when the land was more extensive, we should expect a continental climate along the north coast of Spitsbergen and the North East Land, and accordingly little land ice".

The Swedish geologist, Professor Hans W:son Ahlmann, of Stockholm's Högskola, visited Northern Spitsbergen and the North East Land in 1931. He is of another opinion. He has been kind enough to write to me (letter of 26. May 1933, translated): "Nothing suggests that the north coast of the North East Land was not glaciated during the last Ice Age. But decisive proofs of the reverse are difficult to find, for moraines are rare all over the North East Land, on account of the solifluction, and all the glacial striae are lacking, on account of the intensive mechanical erosion. I think it very probable that the continental ice cap reached the Foyn Island during the last glaciation, and that it probably covered the Seven Islands (Norw.: Sjuøyane). But the Quaternary part of the expedition's results has not yet been worked up, and these remarks are only suggestions, based on my general knowledge of the facts".

The present writer might perhaps be allowed a little objection to Professor Ahlmann's remarks. He expressly calls attention to the scarcity of the moraines on the coasts of the North East Land, and he explains this fact by solifluction. But I have nowhere in the world seen mightier moraines than in Bell Sound, farther south in Spitsbergen and Mr. Adolf Hoel, our well-known expert on Spitsbergen geology, has told me that he has seen great moraines in the north part of the New Friesland peninsula, between Wijde Bay and Hinlopen Strait. Should solifluction really have been so much more ineffective in Bell Sound and in New Friesland than along the north coast of North East Land that it had left the moraines intact in Bell Sound whereas it should entirely have
destroyed them along the north coast? Would not a better explanation be that the last glaciation was so local along the north coast, for the reasons suggested above, that it had not left large moraines?

Botanists are obliged to wait until geologists have definitively solved these important problems. Anyhow, the present stage of our knowledge, geological as well as botanical, allows us to suppose a possible connection between the distribution of these plants today and the geological history of their present area.

It is not necessary to suppose a great area of ice-free land for their refuges during a glaciation, greater than the present. I have repeatedly called attention to that fact, e.g. in Svensk Botanisk Tidsskrift, 1932, p. 424. — I might here again call to mind the fact that we know about 200 different species of lichens from the strictly Antarctic regions, the continent and the nearest islands; regions which are so intensely glaciated that only very small strips of unglaciated land are left.

Also in Greenland *D. ramulosa* has a distribution which much resembles its distribution in Svalbard: Along the north coast from Disko in the west to Danmark Harbour in the east, and never collected south of these localities. The parallel is striking; we can take the field with the same arguments to explain it.

The distribution of these species on the European continent is equally interesting. *D. arctica* is entirely lacking there if we cannot regard the Ural find as European. It can possibly be expected from the Eastern Russian Arctic coast south of its Kolguev find. That would add a new locality to its map of distribution, but it would not be of general interest.

In Fenno-Scandia the two other species, *D. madreporiformis* and *D. ramulosa* are also lacking, as far as our present knowledge goes. Can we expect to find them? Scandinavian lichenologists are proud of the exploration of the lichen flora of our countries. Since the days of Linnaeus our science has witnessed days of unequal intensity, but it has never stopped for a single year. In some regions lichenological exploration is inferior to that of no other area of the world, in others the lichen flora is little known. If species, such as these, should be expected anywhere in our countries we should first think of our rich Arctic colonies on the Dovre mountains, further on the mountains of Salten, Nordreisa or Finnmark, or perhaps along the east coast of Finnmark and Petsamo. From the earliest days of lichenological research lichens have been collected just here, and no *Dactyлина* has been detected. The Lofoten mountains consist of gabbros with very little lime. If a *Dactyлина* should occur in Fenno-scandia the most probable locality would, perhaps, be the calcareous mountains in Western Finnmark, such as in Sorøya. At present I can only say that a *Dactyлина* from Norway would be one of the most surprising finds which I could imagine.
The plains of Central Europe do not offer them suitable localities, but we find them again in the Alps, on the high calcareous summits. The special localities have been enumerated in the previous text.

I have asked Dr. H. Gams, Innsbruck, whether these localities had been glaciated during the Ice Age. Dr. Gams answered (translated from the Norwegian letter of 10. April 1933 from my polyglot friend): "In the Alps there are lots of places which have never been glaciated, and in the glaciated areas were always many nunataks. Most of the Dufourea localities in the Alps are typically nunataks, they have never been glaciated, but most probably covered by snow during the greater glaciations. We have also many nunataks of lower elevation in the North, and especially in the South Alps. In my opinion the Siberian "Elyna-Flora", which also comprises the (two) species of Dufourea, immigrated during one of the earlier Glacial periods (the Riss?), but hardly during the earliest (Günz and Mindel), and not during the youngest (Würm). Many Siberian species, such as Lomatogonium carinthiacum and Clematis alpina, are typically bicentric, suggesting two refuges. The most important was evidently found in the Dolomites, where the Dufoureas are supposed to have had many localities also during the heaviest glaciations".

This information from the prominent expert on the history of the Central European plants lends strong support to my own ideas on a relic nature of the two species of Dactylina, D. madreporiformis and D. ramulosa.

It would be quite natural to look for palaeontological evidence in support of such ideas. But unfortunately we have not a single Arctic lichen fossil, so we shall have to look for analogies amongst other plants.

For that purpose I had to appeal to the assistance of my friends, the palaeontologists. Dr. Rudolf Florin, Stockholm, did not only give me references to many important papers, but he generously sent me this literature for study. I found the most valuable information in papers by Clement and Eleanor M. Reid, especially in their: The Pliocene Floras of the Dutch-Prussian Border, Mededeel. van de Rijksopsporing van Delfstoffen, No. 6, The Hague 1915. — Professor Jens Holmboe, of our University, also called my attention to that paper.

In the remains from the Reuverian Flora of the Middle Pliocene deposits (the Tertiary Age), they found "a surprising resemblance to the living flora of the mountains of western China . . . . A less close relationship exists with the flora of Europe, the Caucasus, and the Mediterranean, a still remoter with the flora of North America" (p.15—16). Special attention is called to the fact that "the nearest congeners of the Reuverian plants now inhabiting southern China, are nearly all mountain plants". Numerous instances are given of such plants.
The explanation is based also on the results obtained, firstly by Asa Gray and then by Wilson and Sargent, from their studies on the distribution of plants on the earth. All available facts "indicate three great streams of migration, radiating from some common centre in the north, and directed towards warmer climates", on account of increasing cooling during later tertiary times. "Two of these streams of migrants effected their escape to congenial latitudes. The American found its way directly open to the tropics. The East Asian, by way of the coastal plains of China, and the great valley systems of that country, ultimately reached warm temperate and sub-tropical regions". — "It would appear that the third stream of migrants, that which entered Europe, the existence of which is proved by the Reuverian fossils, was less fortunate. Driven southward by the ever-advancing cold, by no route could it unimpeded reach climates more genial than were offered by the Caucasus, and the south of France. Throughout the whole length of Europe and Asia, till the coastal plains of China were reached, the retreat to the south was cut off by one unbroken barrier of seas, deserts, and mountains, through which no rivers opened a way to the south." — The species which this wave of migration brought must have perished, cut off by the cold of the north behind and of the mountains in front. South Europe was unsuited to act as a refuge on account of its dry and hot climate.

The free southward passages in China and in America saved the Reuverian species during the Glacial Periods when the temperature was falling. During the Interglacial Periods, with their often rapidly rising temperature, the plants were again driven northwards or forced to climb the mountain slopes, from which they returned to the valley bottom when the temperature fell during the Glacial Periods.

At the present day we are living in an Interglacial Period, and we find the old tertiary plants high up the mountain slopes.

The Reid paper is exceptionally well written, and its arguments sound very convincing. It might, perhaps, be objected that there is some risk in drawing such general conclusions, based on the results of one find, however well it may be worked up. It is, therefore, highly satisfactory that also other investigations fully confirm the results, obtained in the above cited paper, cfr. i. a. Eleanor Mary Reid: A Comparative Review of Pliocene Floras, Based on the Study of Fossil Seeds, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc. London, Paleobot., vol. LXXVI, Part 2, 1920, p. 145—161.

The Reuverian flora of the Dutch-Prussian border was a flora that suggested a rather hot climate, to judge from the present distribution of its species and their congeneres.

But we must not forget the geological history of the earth during the Tertiary Period. It was during that time that the present relief of
the earth was determined. Mighty mountain chains rose up, in part in connection with more ancient alpine regions. Since then erosion has been in action, and reduced their height.

In the light of these facts we can try to understand the present distribution of *D. madreporiformis* and *D. ramulosa*. During the Tertiary Age alpine plants, driven to the valleys and to the beach by the increasing cold towards the end of the Tertiary Age, driven southward by the advancing ice cap, expelled from Fenno-Scandia, refugees on the nunataks in Central Europe (and farther east), and on eventual ice-free beaches during the greatest glaciations, driven to the highest summits by the heat of the Interglacial Ages, such as the present time. Now they live on these summits, cut off from other possible, often near, localities by hot surrounding lowlands. They are like plants living in isolated islands on the great ocean. Being alpine Tertiary plants, they live today higher than the Reuverian plants in China and in North America.

When the time comes for the high Chinese mountains to be better explored, I venture to predict a great increase of *Dactylina* finds there. The East American mountains are, perhaps, not high enough, the *Dactylinas* may have been destroyed there during a warm Interglacial Period. I do not quite understand why we should only find them so far south in the Rocky Mountains. Will a better exploration bring them to light farther north? Or is this case an analogy to Fenno-Scandia? Has the advancing ice entirely extinguished them there, and did the ice-cap retire so rapidly that they were cut off, being unable to follow the melting ice?

We know that many relic plants have a reduced power of spreading. That is just one of the reasons why they are relic. It is sufficient to call to mind plants such as *Sequoia gigantea*, and many other species, the distribution of which has been carefully mapped in several of Fernald's papers, which are too well known to necessitate special reference.

If there were no ice-free coasts, or no nunataks, in the present Arctic during the heaviest glaciations, the *Dactylina* distribution there must be due to a later immigration during interglacial or postglacial times. In that case the Ural and Novaya Zemlya must have been a very important route for *D. madreporiformis*, connecting its present Arctic distribution with its refuges in the Altai mountains. — We have no finds in Altai and Ural for *D. ramulosa*. For that species it would be more natural to consider a western route of migration, from North America by the Canadian islands, north of Greenland to Northern Svalbard, and finally to Novaya Zemlya. There are no great distances across the sea by this route.
V. Supplement.

*Dactylina endochrysea* Lyng n. sp.

Podetia 1—2 cm. longa, basi (ut videtur) emorientia, apice accrescentia, leviter appressa vel subcylindrica, apice late rotundata vel truncata. **Podetia (in specimine) flavo-fuscescentia**, nitidiuscula, sorediais isidiisque (?) destituta, laevigata vel levissime solum foveolata.

Textura thalli ut in *D. madreporijormi*. Cortex 30—40 (—50) μ crassus, medulla subsolida, hyphae medullares ramosae, adpersae, flavescentes.

Apothecia desunt.

Pycnides numerosae, distincte prominulae, pycnoconidia leviter arcuata, 14—15 × 0.5—1.0 μ.

Reactio chemica ut in *D. madreporijormi*, medulla flavida KOH non violacea, sed solutione dilutissime flavescenti solum effundenti.


On the thallus there are numerous black papilliform to disc-like, small excrescences. No structure of an apothecium could be detected in them. They might be peculiar isidia, but it seems to me that they look more like deformed pycnides.

Nylander labelled the plant "*Dufourea madreporiformis* Ach.?". It agrees with that species in its habitus, and in the size of its pycnoconidia, but it differs in its more brownish colour, and especially in its yellow medulla. The yellow colour was not changed into violet by KOH, only a faintly yellow solution was seen.

It is hardly possible to form a correct judgment on the systematical value of this species from a single herbarium plant. It may, perhaps, be a chance modification only. But if we should anywhere expect to find an interesting new species of this old type it should be in China. This is evident from the above extract from the Reid paper.

Printed, October 13th, 1933.
Pl. I.

Fig. 1. *Dactylina arctica* (Hook.) Nyl. Bear Lake, herb. Tuckerman, Harvard University.

Fig. 2. *Dactylina madreporiformis* (Ach.) Tuck. Novaya Zemlya: Northern Kristovii Island (leg. B. Lynge, herb. Oslo).

Fig. 3. *Dactylina ramulosa* (Hook.) Tuck. Novaya Zemlya: Mashigin Bay, Blomster Bay (leg. B. Lynge, herb. Oslo).

Phot. Lily Monsen.
Pl. II.

Fig. 1. *Dactylina madreporiformis* (Ach.) Tuck. Section of pycnide. Novaya Zemlya: Bessimyannii Bay (leg. B. Lynge, herb. Oslo).

Fig. 2. *Dactylina madreporiformis* (Ach.) Tuck. Section of apothecium. Same plant as fig. 1.

Fig. 3. *Dactylina madreporiformis* (Ach.) Tuck. Habitus of apothecia and pycnides. Same plant as fig. 1 and 2.

Fig. 4. *Dactylina ramalosa* (Hook.) Tuck. Fertile plant, from above. Svalbard: Nordost Landet (North East Land), Murchison Bay (leg. P. F. Scholander, herb. Oslo).

Fig. 5. *Dactylina ramalosa* (Hook.) Tuck. Same plant as fig. 4, fertile branch.

Fig. 1—3 phot. (and sect.) P. F. Scholander, fig. 4—5 phot. Lily Monsen.
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