

## LETTER No. 52.

### THE NAMED AND MISNAMED SPECIMENS OF THE EXSICCATAE.

By C. G. Lloyd.

(Cincinnati, June, 1914.)

This pamphlet might be titled with more accuracy "The named and misnamed specimens of the exsiccatae in the British Museum," for it records only those I have noted in this museum. There are additional exsiccatae in other museums, but nowhere else have I found as many exsiccatae and as conveniently arranged for taking off a list. Most of the important exsiccatae are to be found in the British Museum. Very little mycology is ever learned excepting from specimens, and the various exsiccatae are a practical means, for all of the important species of Europe and America are in these exsiccatae and a fair number of those of the tropics. Unfortunately the value of these exsiccatae specimens is to a large measure invalidated by the fact that so large a proportion are misnamed. These misnamed are of three kinds.

1st. We have the synonyms, viz.; names given to species that already have names. We feel quite tolerant of synonyms, for most of them originate in good faith. A local worker with limited opportunity finds a fungus he is unable to determine. He does the simplest thing possible. He announces that he has discovered a "new species" and gives it a name. In about one case out of four is it true, and in the other three cases his name in time becomes a synonym.

2nd. We have the misdetermined specimens of the exsiccatae. It is unfortunately true that men publish exsiccatae to give information to others and succeed largely in giving misinformation. So many specimens of even the common species are mislabeled in the exsiccatae that as a whole no dependence whatever can be placed on them.

3rd. Juggled names. A name juggler is one who takes a plant with a well-known and well-established name and changes it on some old, vague alleged synonym, in many cases not true, and of no importance if it is true. There is some excuse (lack of knowledge) for the makers of synonyms and the distributors of misdetermined specimens, but there is not even this excuse for a name-juggler. The process of looking up dates of old, alleged synonyms, and guessing at the identity of the vague records of the past is of little importance even historically. But to substitute for an unquestioned and settled name an alleged, doubtful synonym only leads to confusion and has not even the merit of originality, for name-jugglers have been the bane of mycology from the start.

There are two kinds of jugglers. The generic juggler who discovers every section to be a "new genus" and gives it a name, and those who juggle the specific name.



The makers of exsiccatae have paid but little attention to "generic" jugglers. Bartholomew has used some of Murrill's juggles, and Rabenhorst a few of Karsten's juggles. We do not hold generic juggling to be of enough value to warrant citation even as synonyms. Specific juggling does the most harm. Thus there is hardly a museum where *Fomes pinicola* is not found in three covers, all exactly the same plant, but passing under three different names. Such work is only confusion.

In most museums the specimens are arranged in covers as labeled, for those who lay them in are not supposed to be informed on their classification and have nothing to go by excepting the label. The result is that many species are found in several different covers, according as the names are synonyms or juggles, and also many specimens which are misdetermined are placed in covers where they do not belong. The British Museum has recently rearranged the specimens according to my notes, and it is the only museum that I recall where the specimens are arranged and labeled with enough accuracy so that they are of any value in determination of specimens.

Authentic Friesian specimens are rare in the museums. Even at Upsala there is a very imperfect set. More of them are found at Kew than in any other museum, for Fries sent to Berkeley more specimens than to any other correspondent. A number of these Berkeley divided, and deposited part in the British Museum. They are marked "Fries misit" in this list.

Blytt sold his herbarium to the British Museum, and a large part of his specimens are endorsed in Blytt's writing "Fries in litt.," as recorded in this list. Most of them are undoubtedly correct, but some are hard to reconcile with Fries' writings. Whether this is due to some error on the part of Blytt, or of Fries, or whether the usual accepted interpretation of Fries' writing is a mistake, I am unable to say. I record, however, in detail where these specimens do not coincide with my understanding of Fries' writings. The abbreviations that we use for the various exsiccatae are not explained in full, but will be recognized by those familiar with the names of the usual exsiccatae. Where the same author has issued exsiccatae under more than one title, or series, as "Saccardo Ital." and "Saccardo Ven.," we do not always specify the series, simply cite "Sacc." and the number.

In this list the species are entered under the correct generic name (*Polyporus*, *Fomes*, *Polystictus*, etc.) to my views. In the exsiccatae cited they are not always so listed generically, but I have not always noted these unimportant discrepancies. Thus all *Fomes*, *Polystictus*, and *Poria* were at one time called *Polyporus*, and it is immaterial and should cause no confusion if a given exsiccatae was labeled *Fomes connatus* or *Polyporus connatus*. The method followed in Smith's *British Basidiomycetes* (and some other English books) of writing Karsten's and Cooke's names after all (21) (alleged) species of *Fomes* (not to mention hundreds of other cases), because the men who named them called them *Polyporus* (or in very old times *Boletus*) is in my opinion a piece of misrepresentation of which the author possibly did not realize the extent.

Ravenel's fascicle numbers are not noted on the British Museum distributed sets, and I have not looked them up, but cite only the specimen numbers, which by Ravenel's cumbersome method was repeated in each



fascicle. The anonymous exsiccatae recently distributed from Vienna are cited only as (Wien).

All exsiccatae are not found in the British Museum. I think all of Roumeguère are not there, and Roumeguère had the poorest specimens and the worst misnamed of any, which is saying much. As I note other exsiccatae in future I shall make a list of additions, with a view to publication.

The specimens that are correctly named are printed in large type (pica). The misnamed specimens, in smaller type (nonpareil). Those that are to me more or less doubtful, in intermediate type (brevier).

---

abietinus Polystictus. Brinkman, 139, 192—Desm. 662—Fung.

Col. 303—Herb. Farlow—Jaczewski, 234—Karsten, 121—Krieger, 1205—Linhart, 445—N. A. F. 8—Rab. 2637, 4449—Rav. 422, Fasc. 1, No. 12—Sacc. 605, 1409—Sydow, 652, 713—de Thüm. 6, 706—Waghorn, 14, 40, 278—(Wien) 316.

Misnamed.

abietinus var. coriaceus Polyporus.  
de Thüm. 1207.

Not from the specimen (which is quite poor) but from the host (Populus). I think this must be Polystictus pergamenus, a plant that occurs rarely in Southern Europe on *frondose* wood.

Compare asserculorum, velutinus, versicolor, violaceum.

Abietis Trametes. Fung. Col. 1205—N. A. F. 2507, 2730.

A thin form of Trametes pini.

Misnamed.

adpersus, Polyporus.

Linhart 55. = Fomes laccatus. (synonym.)

Note I do not find spores, but from context color and surface I have no doubt it is as above.

adustus, Polyporus. Aust. Hung. 757—Bartholomew, 2207,

2801, (except as to juggle). Desm. 159, 313—Fuck. 1390—

Fung. Col. 206—Karsten, 116—Krieger, 1319—N. A. F. 6—Rab.

212, 412, 2729, 4148—Rav. 421—Romell, 8—Sacc. Ital. 4, 1202—

Sacc. Ven. 11, 12—Sydow, 307, 2902—de Thüm. 617—Waghorn, 14, 40, 278—(Wien) 3083, 3086.

Compare carpineus.

Misnamed.

Aesculi Daedalea.

Bartholomew, 2829 = Daedalea ambigua.

A juggle only and as inaccurate as it is absurd. It was based on a misplacement of specimen in Schweinitz' herbarium, and disagrees with Schweinitz' description as to every character.

Misnamed.

affinis, Polystictus.

(Wien) 1421 = Polystictus flabelliformis (misdetermination).

Polystictus affinis is smooth; Polystictus flabelliformis has pubescent zones.



Doubtful to me.

*albidus*, Polyporus. Brinkman, 141.

*alboleuteus*, Polyporus. Bartholomew, 1637.

Misnamed.

*albus*, Polyporus.

Oud. 224, (doubtful = *caesius*). (misdetermination.)

Sydow, 1713 = *Polystictus velutinus*. (misdetermination.)

*albus*, *Ptychogaster*. Fuckel, 1882—Rab. 800—Sydow, 919.

Misnamed.

*alligatus*, Polyporus.

Sydow, 1714 = *Polyporus fumosus*.

The identity of *alligatus* is unknown.

*ambigua*, *Daedalea*. Bartholomew, 2518—Fung. Col. 1112—  
N. A. F. 1593.

I congratulate Bartholomew for not using once at least the juggled name "*Aesculi*" for the plant, which name is so absurd that it is a joke.

Compare *Aesculi*.

*amorphus*, Polyporus. Brinkman, 140—Desm. 189—Fuck. 1372—Jaczewski, 179—Karsten, 117—Krieger, 1206—Oud. 225—Rab. 11, 2636, 3326—Syd. 712, 752.

"Fries in litt."

"Fries misit." (Brit. Museum).

Rav. Herb. (A rare find in America).

Compare *irregularis*.

Misnamed.

*Anax*, Polyporus.

Kellerman, 170 = *Polyporus frondosus*! (misdetermination).

N. A. F. 1595 = *Polyporus frondosus* (?) (misdetermination).

*Polyporus Anax* was Berkeley's mss. name for *Polyporus Berkeleyi*.

Neither of the above specimens is *Polyporus Berkeleyi*, which has echinulate spores. The Kellerman specimen is surely *Polyporus frondosus*, the Ellis specimen is probably *frondosus*, but possibly it may be *Polyporus giganteus*.

Misnamed.

*angulatus*, Polyporus.

de Thumen, 309 = *Polystictus zonatus* (synonym).

*annosus*, *Fomes*, Brinkman, 147—Briosi & Cavara, 324—Krieger, 121—Krieg. Schäd, 120—Rab. 405—Romell, 13—Sacc. Ital. 407—Sydow, 504, 1108, 3107—de Thüm. 106.

"Fries misit." Brit. Mus.

"Fries in litt." Brit. Mus.

Compare *cryptarum*, *marginatus*, *radiciperda*, *resinosus*.



applanatus, Fomes. Aust. Hung. 3541—Erb. Ital. 540—Fuck.  
1388—Jaczewski, 125—Krieger, 1207—N. A. F. 801‡—  
Rab. 1603\*, 3736‡—Sacc. 104\*—Sydow, 210, 302\*, 3329\*, 3801—  
de Thüm. 715, 1204, 1804‡—Waghorn, 126‡—(Wien) 940.

Those marked ‡ are Fomes leucophaeus with pale crust.  
Those marked \* are Fomes vegetus with interposed layers of context.  
Both are forms at best of Fomes applanatus.

Compare fulvus, Linhartii.

arcularius, Polyporus. N. A. F. 2nd, 1690—Rav. 209—Shear,  
1406—Sydow, 4201.\*

\* (Not typical. cfr. Note under Polyporus brumalis).

Australia, Bailey!!

Ceylon, Green.

Africa, Zenker, 1370a.

Compare brumalis, favoloides.

Misnamed.

asserculorum, (Persoon in litt.) Daedalea.

Mongeot, 491=Lenzites abietinus.

This seems to be a mss. name only of Persoon's.

Misnamed.

Auberianus, Polyporus.

Gaillard, 197, Caracas=Fomes lignosus (synonym).

Ule, 746, Brazil=Fomes lignosus (synonym).

Wray, 1716=Fomes lignosus (synonym).

Wright, 244, Cuba=Fomes lignosus (synonym).

Misnamed.

aurea, Daedalea.

Rav. No. 14=Daedalea unicolor (form).

aurantiaca, Poria. Compare spongiosus as var. of Polyporus nidulans.

aurantiacus, Trametes. Compare fibrillosa.

Misnamed.

barbatulus, Polyporus.

N. A. F. 2012=Polystictus pinsitus (synonym).

Rab. 3327=Polystictus pinsitus (synonym).

Rav. 212=Polystictus pinsitus (synonym).

Rav. No. 19=Polystictus pinsitus (synonym).

Misnamed.

Beatiei, Polyporus.

Rab. 3427=Polyporus Berkeleyi (synonym).

benzoinus, Polyporus. Krieger, 525—de Thüm. 1103.

“Fries misit” (as Trametes) British Museum.

Compare fuliginosus, morosus, resinosus.



*Berkeleyi*, Polyporus. Bartholomew, 2432. (Correct excepting as to the juggle of the generic name).—Ellis, 706.

Compare *Anax*, *Beatiei*.

*betulinus*, Polyporus. Aust. Hung. 3147—Brinkman, 196—Erb. Ital. 229—Fuckel, 1387—Fung. Col. 905—Jaczewski, 76—Karsten, 8—Krieger, 907—N. A. F. 1691—Oud. 228—Rab. 1510—Romell, 10—Sacc. Ital. 604—Sydow, 627—de Thuem. 313, 906.

Misnamed.

*biennis*, Polyporus.

Rab. 3033 = *Polyporus rufescens* (synonym).

Sydow, 806 = *Polystictus tomentosus*. Misdetermination. A bad mistake, for context colors are white in one species and brown in the other.

*biformis* *Polystictus*. Fung. Col. 913—N. A. F. 1596—Rab. 3428—Rav. No. 18—de Thüm. 2005, Siberia, (very ?).  
“*Polyporus biformis* Fr. vide Fries!!” in Rav. herb.

Compare *chartaceus*.

*borealis*, Polyporus. Karsten, 238—Rab. 1703 (doubtful; discolored if correct)—Romell, 115—Sydow, 51—de Thüm. 1403 (doubtful).

Misnamed.

Oud. 226 (appears to be *caesius*).

de Thüm. 1107 (appears to be *spumeus*).

(Note. de Thüm. 1403 and Rab. 1703 as *Polyporus borealis* are both doubtful to me.)

Misnamed.

*Broomei*, Polyporus.

Rab. 2004 = *Polyporus undatus* (synonym).

Zopp & Sydow. = *Polyporus undatus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*brassicaefolius*, *Merulius*.

Rav. No. 23 = *Merulius pulverulentus* (synonym).

*brasiliensis*, *Favolus*. Plant Boliv. 1951.

*brumalis*, Polyporus. Brinkman, 197—Fung. Col. 1106—Fuckel, 1396—Japp, 97—Krieger, 1458—N. A. F. 914—Sydow, 1410.

“Fries in litt.” Pores rather large, tending to *arcularius*.

*Polyporus brumalis* with small (favoloid shape) pores runs into *Polyporus arcularius* with large favoloid pores. The Blytt specimen “Fries in litt.” has larger pores than usual for *brumalis* and tends towards *arcularius*.

Misnamed.

Karsten, 114 = *Polyporus arcularius* (an intermediate specimen).

Rav. Herb. 4 collections = *Polyporus arcularius* (misdetermination).

Rav. No. 9 = (typical *arcularius*).



*Polyporus arcularius* (which is a *Favolus* in reality) can be told from *Polyporus brumalis* by its large pores. It is widespread in the tropics, but I was under the impression that it only occurred in Southern Europe. Karsten 114, with its quite large pores, should, however, be referred to *arcularius*, although the pileus is smooth as in *brumalis*, and innate scaly in southern forms of *arcularius*. In reality it is a connecting specimen.

Misnamed.

*bulbipes*, *Polystictus*.

Ule, 45, Brazil = *Polystictus luteo-nitens* (misdetermination).

*byrsinus*, *Polystictus*. Compare *crocatus*, *occidentalis*.

*caesius*, *Polyporus*. Brinkman, 193—Fuckel, 2293—Karsten, 236—Krieger, 1913—Sydow, 2815.

"Fries in litt."

Compare *albus*, *borealis*.

*carneus*, *Trametes*. N. A. F. 916 (as *Polyporus*)—Rav. 14 (as *Polyporus*).

We take this in the sense of Berkeley, not of Nees. The Java plant under this name is only known from an indefinite picture. Originally it was probably the same plant as called now *Polyporus rubidus*, a frequent plant in Java, but little resemblance to above.

Misnamed.

*carpineus*, *Polyporus*.

Sydow, 1712 = *Polyporus adustus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*Cerasi*, *Polyporus*.

de Thüm. 613.

Probably an error, there being no such species named. I cannot place it, but it is close to *Polystictus zonatus*.

*cervinus*, *Trametes*. Compare *mollis serpens*.

Misnamed.

*chartaceus*, *Polystictus*.

Fung. Col. 1011 = *Polystictus biformis* (synonym?).

N. A. F. 1703 = *Polystictus biformis* (synonym?).

Rav. 714 = Something resupinate, indeterminable.

Misnamed.

*chilensis*, *Polyporus*.

de Thüm. 2204 = *Polyporus lucidus*?

*ciliaris*, *Polyporus*. Compare *Tricholoma*.

Misnamed.

*chioneus*, *Polyporus*.

Brinkman, 194 = *Polyporus semipileatus*.

Sydow, 4704. Specimen too poor to judge.

"Fries in litt." Specimen poor, but not same plant as in sense of Brinkman, 194,

nor Fungus Kmet.

Misnamed.

*cinerea*, *Daedalea*.

Sydow, 2110 = *Daedalea unicolor*, thick form.



*cinnabarinus*, *Polystictus*. Balansa, Tonkin, 94‡—Erb. Ital. 770—Fung. Col. 205—Jack L. & S. 839—Karsten, 123\*, 423\*—Kellerman, 171—N. A. F. 502—Rab. 1210—Rav. No. 17, 419—Sacc. 410\*, 1410\*—de Thüm. 217\*, 2007.

“Fries in litt.”

“Ex herb. Fries.”

Those marked \* are *Trametes*. ‡ The tropical bright colored thin forms are *Polystictus sanguineus*.

Misnamed.

*cinnabarina*, *Trametes*.

Sydow, 625 = *Polyporus croceus* (misdetermination).

*cinnamomea-squamosus*, *Polyporus*. Zenker, 2183.

*cinnamomeus*, *Polystictus*. Compare *oblectans*.

*conchatus*, *Fomes*. Bartholomew, 2076 (excepting as to jugle)—Fuck. 1382—N. A. F. 918—Sydow, 3423—de Thüm. 510.

“Fries in litt.”

*conchifer*, *Polystictus*. Rab. 3429—Rav. No. 15, 704.

Compare *virgineus*.

Misnamed.

*conchoides*, *Polyporus*.

Fung. Col. = *Polyporus dichrous* (variety).

N. A. F. 506 = *Polyporus dichrous* (variety).

Rav. 8 = *Polyporus dichrous* (variety).

Rav. No. 22 = *Polyporus dichrous* (variety).

Note. *conchoides* is the pale colored, tropical form of *Polyporus dichrous* of Europe and United States.

Misnamed.

*confluens*, *Merulius*.

Rav. No. 23 = *Merulius Corium* (synonym).

*confluens*, *Polyporus*. Karsten, 514—de Thüm. 204, 312, 616.

“Fries in litt.”

Ravenel Herb.

*confragosa*, *Daedalea*. Bartholomew, 2519—N. A. F. 1928—Rab. 4443—Shear, 1405.

Compare *rubescens*.

*connatus*, *Fomes*. Karsten, 424 (as *Trametes*)—Sydow, 1302—de Thüm. 407.

“Fries in litt.”

Fries misit (Brit. Museum).

The Friesian specimens should settle the name for this plant. I feel there is no warrant nor evidence for not accepting it.



Misnamed.

Rab. 1410=Certainly not *Fomes connatus*, but I do not place it.  
= (*Trametes hispida*?)  
Compare *populina*, *tephroleucus*.

Misnamed.

*cornea*, *Trametes*.

Balansa, 105, Tonkin=*Trametes Persoonii* (synonym).

*Corium*, *Merulius*. Erb. Ital. 806—Fuck. 1359—Fung. Col.  
1113—Krieger, 1957—N. A. F. 316—Rav. 136—Sacc. Ital.  
808 (doubtful spec., too poor to say)—Sydow, 3429—Wien, 1142.  
“Fries in litt.”

Compare *confluens*, *papyrinus*.

*cristatus*, *Polyporus*. Erb. Ital. 1460—Fuckel, 1394—Rab. 707,  
1111—de Thüm. 1205.

Compare *flavovirens*, *poripes*, *virellus*.

*corruscans*, *Polyporus*. Compare *hispidus*.

Misnamed.

*crocatus*, *Polystictus*.

Rav. 70=*Polystictus byrsinus* (synonym).

Rav. 1708=Species not same, but misdetermination.

Misnamed.

*croceus*, *Polyporus*.

Sydow, 2107=*Polyporus rutilans*, a bad misdetermination, as the species have no possible resemblance. I noted at Berlin that Hennings habitually made this same misdetermination.

Compare *cinnabarina*, *endocrocinus*, *Pilotae*, *resinosus*.

Misnamed.

*cryptarum*, *Polyporus*.

Fuckel, 1371=*Fomes annosus* (probably).

*cryptopus*, *Polyporus*. Fung. Col. 904—N. A. F. 3406.

Misnamed.

*cupreo-roseus*, *Polyporus*.

Heller, Hawaii, 2653=*Trametes Persoonii* (misdetermination, which is a mild term to use for such a bad guess, the plants having no resemblance or analogy to each other.)

Misnamed.

*cupulaeformis*, *Polyporus*.

N. A. F. 308=*Polyporus pocula* (synonym).

Rab. 3328=*Polyporus pocula* (synonym).

Rav. 210 and No. 10=*Polyporus pocula* (synonym).

*Curtisii*, *Polyporus*. Bartholomew, 2832—N. A. F. 802—Rab.  
3430.

*cuticularis*, *Polyporus*. Karsten, 708—Sydow, 1202—de Thüm.  
2006 (excepting as to juggle).

“Fries in litt.”

Compare *radiatus*, *resincus*.



Misnamed.

dealbatus, Polyporus.

Rav. No. 10 = Polyporus mutabilis (misdetermination).  
(Cfr. Stipitate Polyporoids, page 190.)

Misnamed.

destruens, Merulius.

Desm. 125, 668 = Merulius lacrymans (synonym).

(Correct?)

destructor, Polyporus. Rab. 2302—Sydow, 403.

I cannot say the contrary, as I do not know the species. Rabenhorst states: "This species is in no ways as 'gemein' as many mycologists appear to think. The characters are zonate within, pores elongated, dentate, lacerate."

dichrous, Polyporus. Karsten, 237—de Thüm. 707.

"Fries in litt."

Compare conchoides.

Misnamed.

Drummondii, Polystictus.

Balansa, 1403 = Polystictus versatilis (misdetermination). (Changed to Polystictus Spegazzini in Saccardo, which hence becomes a synonym for Polystictus versatilis.

dryadeus, Polyporus. de Thüm. 4, 712.

Misnamed.

dubius, Polyporus.

"Fries in litt." Mss. name only. It appears to be plant called "lacteus" now.

ectypus, Polystictus. N. A. F. 2011—Rav. 716.

elegans, Polyporus. Fuck. 1395 (Pores larger than normal)—  
N. A. F. 2303.

"Fries in litt." as Polyporus nummularius, which Fries only held to be a small form of Polyporus elegans.

Misnamed.

elegans, Trametes.

Balansa, 121, Tonkin = Lenzites repanda (synonym).

Misnamed.

Ellisianus, Polyporus.

Baker, 55 = Fomes fraxinophilus (synonym).

Misnamed.

endocrocinus, Polyporus.

N. A. F. 2508, afterwards amended to Polyporus Pilotae, which is a synonym for Polyporus croceus.

Misnamed.

epileucus, Polyporus.

de Thüm. 1110. I suspect this is Polyporus salignus, as illustrated by Bulliard, but it is not the ideal form of Polyporus salignus. I do not know the specimen for certain, but it is not Polyporus epileucus, as known to me from the "type locality" Femsjö, Sweden.

"Fries in litt." If this specimen attributed to "Fries in litt." is correct, then my conclusions as to Polyporus epileucus are incorrect. These are surely Polyporus pubescens in sense of Fries' writings.

Europaeus, Favolus. Fung. Col. 1111—N. A. F. 604—Sacc. 28.



Misnamed.

Evonymi, Polyporus.

- Aust. Hung. 1153 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Briosi & Cavara, 323 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Fuck. 2603 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Krieger, 14 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Rab. 2730 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Sacc. Ven. 414 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
Sydow, 505 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).  
de Thüim. 2203 = *Fomes ribis* (synonym).

The form on *Euonymus* is often thicker and of brighter color than the form on *Ribis* species. It occurs in Europe on *Euonymus*, but not in the United States, where species of *Euonymus* are common.

Misnamed.

expansus, Polyporus.

Desm. 16 = *Fomes fomentarius* (doubtful, abnormal in a cave).

fasciculata, Solenia.

The species of *Solenia* are not listed.

Misnamed.

favoloides, Polyporus.

Zenker, 1370. Not correct. cfr. Stipitate Polyporoids, fig. 470. This is close to *Polyporus arcularius*, but thinner.

Misnamed.

favoloides as var. of *Polyporus grammocephalus*.

Zenker, No. 1342. I think this should be held as a species of *Favolus*, while excepting as to its large favoloid pores, it corresponds to *Polyporus grammocephalus*. This form occurs in Africa, where it is common.

Zenker, No. 1561. Specimen at British Museum is an Agaric, no doubt an error of enclosure.

Misnamed.

Feathermanni, Polyporus.

Rav. 6 = *Trametes hydroides* (synonym).

Misnamed.

fibrillosa, Trametes.

Karsten, 311 = *Polyporus aurantiacus*.

The story of Karsten's work with this plant is told in detail in the *Polyporus* pamphlet (section *Apus*) now in preparation.

(Doubtful to me.)

fibula, Polyporus.

Sydow, 1709.

fimbriatum, Porothelium. Brink. 200—Sydow, 1805, 2810, 4801.

"Fries in litt."

Compare *laceratus*.

Misnamed.

flavovirens, Polyporus.

Barth, 1754 = *Polyporus cristatus* (synonym).

N. A. F. 1689 = *Polyporus cristatus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

Floridanus, Polystictus.

N. A. F. 601 = *Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).

Plant Boliv. 1325—*Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).



Rav. F. Amer. No. 7 = *Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).

Rav. No. 11 = *Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).

Ule, 46, Brazil = *Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).

*focicola*, *Polystictus*. Compare *parvulus*.

*fomentarius*, *Fomes*. Brinkman, 150—Eriksson, 77—Fung. Col. 908—Karsten, 240—Krieger, 721, 1715—Krieger, Schad. 117, 118, 119—Linhart, 251—N. A. F. 1102—Sacc. Ven. 14—Syd. 303, 2901—de Thüm. 716, 2109—Waghorn, 70—(Wien) 310.

Misnamed.

Fuck. 1385, 1386, 1898 = *Fomes laccatus* (misdetermination). (cfr. note under *adpersus*.)

Compare *expansus*, *Hartigii*, *igniarius*, *Inzengae*, *nigricans*.

*fragilis*, *Polyporus*. Brink. 142.

Compare *mollis*.

*fraxineus*, *Fomes*. Rab. 1606—de Thüm. 806.

Compare *sublingueformis*.

*fraxinophilus*, *Fomes*. Fung. Col. 909—N. A. F. 3302.

Compare *Ellisianus*.

Misnamed.

*Friesiana*, *Hexagona*.

Balansa, 3402 = *Polystictus pinsitus* (synonym).

*Friesii*, *Polystictus*. Compare *Floridanus*, *ludens*, *sector*.

*frondosus*, *Polyporus*. Fuckel, 1393—Krieger, 1115—Rabenh. 907—Rab. Klotz, 13, 512—Sacc. Ital. 212—Sacc. Venet. 817—Sydow, 807—(Wien) 307.

Misnamed.

N. A. F. 2103 = *Polyporus giganteus* (misdetermination).

Rab. 3947 = *Polyporus giganteus* (misdetermination).

Ravenel Herb. = *Polyporus giganteus* (misdetermination).

Compare *Anax*.

Misnamed.

*fuliginosus*, *Polyporus*.

= *Polyporus benzoinus* (juggle).

Misnamed.

*fulvus*, *Fomes*.

Bartholomew, 2274 = *Fomes pomaceus* (a juggle).

Brinkman, 149 = *Fomes pomaceus* (an opinion only).

Krieger Schad, 169, 170 = *Fomes pomaceus* (an opinion only).

Rab. 1701 = *Fomes ribis* (misdetermination).

Sydow, 1509 = *Fomes roburneus* (misdetermination).

de Thuemen, 108 = *Fomes applanatus* (misdetermination).

"Fries in litt." = a mistake, surely, for not plant Fries so illustrated.



fumosus, Polyporus. Fuckel, 1391, thin specimen—N. A. F. 2902—Sacc. Ven. 10—Syd. 1012, 3108—de Thüm. 5 (?)—Wartman & S. 434.

Misnamed.

Rab. 3644 = Polyporus adustus (misdetermination).  
de Thuem. 604, 816 = Polyporus adustus (misdetermination).  
Compare alligatus, imberbis, pallescens.

Misnamed.

funalis, Trametes.

N. A. F. 2106 = Trametes hispida (misdetermination).

fuscus, Cyclomyces. (Wien) 607.

gibbosa, Daedalea. Aust. Hung. 3540—Fuck. 1364—Krieger, 67—Linhart, 147—Rab. 2204—Syd. 209, 2111—de Thüm. 917, 1104.

All as Trametes, but "Trametes" gibbosa is always a Daedalea. It never takes Trametes forms.

Compare Kalchbrenneri, salignus.

giganteus, Polyporus. Fuckel, 1897—Krieger, 1160—N. A. F. 306—Rab. 4, 345—(Wien) 1144.

Misnamed.

Sydow, 52 = Polyporus montanus (misdetermination).

Polyporus giganteus and montanus are similar, but the latter can be distinguished by its echinulate spores. Polyporus montanus is rare in Europe and Sydow's (misnamed) specimen is the only one I have noted in the exsiccatae.

de Thüm. 310 = (afterwards correctly emendated to Polyporus squamosus).

gilvus, Polyporus. Balansa, Paraguay, 3912—Bartholomew, 2834 (except as to generic juggle)—Fung. Col. 603—Harper, 1633a—N. A. F. 310—Rab. 3431—Ravenel, 420—Ule, Brazil, 43.

Compare isidioides.

grammocephalus, Polyporus. Ule, 14 Brazil—Zollinger, No. 15, & 2081, Java.

The Brazil collection (and it is rare in American tropics, common in the East) is correct, but is thinner, smaller pored plant than the Eastern plant.

Compare favoloides as var. of Pol. grammocephalus.

graveolens, Fomes, N. A. F. 603 (as Trametes)—Rav. Fasc. No. 8.

"ex herb. Schw." in Brit. Museum.

Guyanensis, Polyporus. Compare juruanus, as var. of Polyporus Leprieurii.



Misnamed.

Hartigii, Fomes.

Krieger, 720 = Fomes robustus (synonym).

Krieger Schäd, 77 = Fomes robustus (synonym).

Rab. 3948 = Evidently misnamed, for not Fomes robustus, for which Fomes Hartigii is a synonym. The specimen appears to be Fomes fomentarius, probably an error of enclosure, for I do not believe Fomes fomentarius ever grew "in Pino Picea."

Sacc. Ital. 1001 = Fomes robustus (synonym).

hepatica, Fistulina. Desm. 272—Fuck. rhen. 1357—Krieger, 1914—Oud. 110—Rab. 3325—Sacc. Ven. 105—Sydow, 2611—de Thüm. 623—Trog.

Australia, Miss Campbell.

hirsutus, Polystictus. Aust. Hung. 756—Fuck. 1378—Fung. Col. 204—Karsten, 515—N. A. F. 311—Rab. 510, 2103—Sacc. Venet. 16—Sydow, 714—de Thüm. 216, 1005\*—Wartman, 23.

\* de Thüm. 1005, called "var. puberulus," is a form with pale almost white hairs. Most of the European collections are the "fauve" form, called Polystictus lutescens (cfr. Myc. Notes, p. 468). In America, Polystictus hirsutus takes usually a darker color than in Europe.

Misnamed.

Sacc. Ital. = ? resupinate, too poor to distinguish.

Compare velutinus, zonatus.

hispidus, Polyporus. Fuckel, 1389—Krieger, 719—Krieger, Schäd, 19—Sacc. 213—de Thüm. 914, 1502—(Wien) 309.

Misnamed.

Rab. 406 = Polyporus Schweinitzii (misdetermination).

Syd. 1508 = Polyporus corruscans (misdetermination).

hispidula, Trametes. Cavara, 68—Erb. Ital. 1352—Sacc. 822—Sacc. Ven. 21.

Compare funalis, lutescens, Peckii, populina, Trogii.

(Correct, doubtful.)

Holmiensis, Polyporus. Romell, 11 (form of salignus for me).

hydroides, Trametes. Balansa, 3386—Fung. Col. 914—N. A. F. 505—Pittier & Durand, 110—Ule, 739.

Compare Feathermanni.

ilicincola, Polystictus. Rav. Ser. No. 17.

Only known from this exsiccatae, which has always been a puzzle. Pores much as Pol. pergamenus, or closer to Pol. Friesii. Surface smooth, minutely silky. It seems distinct, but most specimens in the various museums are badly eaten. There is a characteristic specimen at British Museum.



igniarius, Fomes. Desm. 2156—Erb. Ital. 766, 767‡—Eriksson, 78—Fuckel, 1383\*—Karsten, 96—Krieger, 1809 (Barring the generic juggle)—Krieger, Sax. 526—Krieger, Schäd. 20—N. A. F. 915—Rab. 1112—Syd. 460, 1603—de Thüm. 105.

Imperfect doubtful specimens.

Fung. Col. 401.

Migula, 143.

Rav. IV. 5.

Note. These references are made without microscopic examination, but we believe we are familiar enough with the species to recognize it, and our microscope was not at hand when we made the list. Specimen marked ‡, from its color and habitat may be *Fomes robustus*. \* This seems to have a slightly laccate surface and is probably the form *Fomes roburneus*.

Misnamed.

Aust. Hung. 755 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Desmez. 1807, 2157 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Kunze, 202 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Roumeg. 202 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Sydow, 3216 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Sydow, 4202 = *Fomes fomentarius* (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 714, 1007 = *Fomes pomaceus* (misdetermination).

Compare *salicinus*.

Misnamed.

*imberbis*, *Polyporus*.

Brinkman, 143 = *Polyporus fumosus* (synonym).

Cavara, 67 = *Polyporus fumosus* (?) (synonym).

Misnamed.

*imbricatus*, *Polyporus*.

(Wien) 609 = thick, conglobate form of *Polyporus sulphureus* (synonym).

*incarnatus*, *Merulius*. Rab. 3737—Rav. No. 22.

Compare *rubellus*.

Misnamed.

*Inzengae*, *Fomes*.

Erb. Ital. 636 = *Fomes fomentarius* (synonym).

Erb. Ital. 977 = *Fomes fomentarius* (synonym).

Rab. 1508 = *Fomes fomentarius* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*irregularis*, *Polyporus*.

Romell, 9 = *Polyporus amorphus* (synonym?).

Sowerby's illustration is too extremely doubtful to be used as a substitute for *Polyporus amorphus*.

Misnamed.

*isidiodes*, *Polyporus*.

de Thüm. 1105 = *Polyporus gilvus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*juruanus* as form of *Polyporus Leprieurii*.

Ule, 44, Brazil = *Polyporus Guyanensis* (misdetermination, cfr. *Stipitate Polyporoids*, Fig. 485).

Misnamed.

*Kalchbrenneri*, *Trametes*.

Aust. Hung. 759 = *Daedalea gibbosa* (synonym).



Rab. 1411 = *Daedalea gibbosa* (synonym).  
Syd. 813 = *Daedalea gibbosa* (synonym).  
de Thüm. 8 = *Daedalea gibbosa* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*labyrinthicus*, *Polyporus*.

N. A. F. 309. (Afterwards correctly emendated as *Polyporus obtusus*. Nothing historical exists as to the identity of *Polyporus labyrinthicus*, but it was probably *Polyporus obtusus*.)

Misnamed.

*laceratus*, *Porothelium*.

Rav. fasc. No. 19 = *Porothelium fimbriatum* (synonym).

*laccatus*, *Fomes*. Compare *adpersus*, *fomentarius*.

*lacrymans*, *Merulius*. Brinkman, 120—Briosi & Cavara, 289—

Erb. Ital. 934—Fuckel, 1361—Fung. Col. 1115—Karsten, 33—Krieger, 120, 420, 1911—Libert, 320—Linhart, 443—N. A. F. 1307—Rab. 508—Sacc. Ital. 215—Syd. 407, 4213 (very poor).

“Fries in litt.”

Compare *destruens*.

*lacteus*, *Polyporus*, compare *dubius*.

Misnamed.

*lateritius*, *Fomes*.

Alaska, Cooke's determination, British Museum = *Hydnofomes tinctorius*.

For absolute carelessness or incompetency, such determinations take the prize. Cooke was the “author” of *Fomes lateritius*, a true *Fomes* with pores. *Hydnofomes* is a *Hydnaceus* plant with large teeth. There is the same resemblance between them there is between a porcupine and a honey-comb. And they call mycology a “science” (sic), with such named specimens in the British Museum. It is only fair to state that the specimen has the teeth broken off, but even this is no excuse for such blunders.

*leprodes*, *Polyporus*.

Fries misit, British Museum. This is an imbricate form of *Polyporus varius* as found in Fries, not a form of *Polyporus melanopus* as found in Saccardo.

*leucophaeus*, *Fomes*. Compare *megaloma*.

*leucospongia*, *Polyporus*. Ellis, 1104—Rab. 3432.

*licnoides*, *Polyporus*. Compare *subtropicalis*.

*lignosus*, *Polyporus*. Compare *Auberianus*.

Misnamed.

*Linharti*, *Polyporus*.

Linhart, 252 = *Fomes applanatus* (synonym).

A description as long as the common law was issued with this “new species,” which, had the author known the simplest elements of the subject, he would have known it is the commonest “old species” that grows.

*lucidus*, *Polyporus*. Erb. Ital. 769—Fung. Col. 202 (?)—Karsten, 239—Krieger, 1116—N. A. F. 5 (?)—Rab. 1003,



1213—Rav. No. 5—Sacc. Ital. 1415—Sacc. Ven. 9—Sydow, 2106—Sydow Germ. 53—de Thüm. 104.

Most of above are undoubtedly correct, but it is difficult to refer slices surely. N. A. F. 5 and Fung. Col. 202 are more likely *Polyporus resinaceus*.

Compare *chilensis*, Tsugae.

Misnamed.

*ludens*, *Polyporus*.

Balansa, 3395 = *Polystictus Friesii* (synonym).

*luteo-nitens*, *Polystictus*. Compare *bulbipes*.

Misnamed.

*lutescens*, *Trametes*.

Sacc. Ital. 411 = *Trametes hispida* (misreference, cfr. Myc. Notes, page 468. The mistake was originally made in Fung. Kmet., and Saccardo makes it more real by distributing a specimen).

de Thüm. 311 (emended from *Polyporus ferruginosus*) = *Polyporus radiatus* (?). The "emendation" were better not made, for *Polyporus lutescens* is as bad a misdetermination as *Polyporus ferruginosus*. It has no relation or resemblance to either species.

Fuckel, 1380 = *Polyporus radiatus*. Same remarks.

Misnamed.

*Magnusii*, *Irpex*.

Rab. 3738—Irpicoid form of *Daedalea unicolor*. cfr. Myc. Notes, page 451.

Misnamed.

*marginatus*, *Polyporus*.

Fuckel, 1374 = *Fomes annosus* (misdetermination).

Fung. Col. 1204 = *Fomes pinicola* (juggle).

Linhart, 446 = *Fomes pinicola* (juggle).

*marmoratus*, *Fomes*. Compare *plebeius*.

Misnamed.

*megaloma*, *Fomes*.

Bartholomew, 2521 = *Fomes leucophaeus* (juggle).

Kellerman, 164 = *Fomes leucophaeus* (juggle).

Rab. 4445 = *Fomes leucophaeus* (juggle).

(Wien) 1143 = *Fomes leucophaeus* (juggle).

All juggles, and the first three double juggles. The name *megaloma* not only has no historical truth back of it, but is directly contrary to the collateral evidence that exists.

*melanopus*, *Polyporus*. Karsten, 617.

Misnamed.

*membranaceus*, *Polyporus*.

Ule, 2109 = a related species that I cannot place at present.

Misnamed.

*mollis*, *Polyporus*.

Karsten, 312 = *Polyporus fragilis*.

Note. *Polyporus mollis* and *fragilis* are very similar plants (cfr. Letter No. 43) as to distinction.

Misnamed.

*mollis*, *Trametes*.

N. A. F. 2506 = *Daedalea cervinus* (synonym).



Rab. 3739 = *Daedalea cervinus* (synonym).

de Thüm. 2004 = *Daedalea cervinus* (synonym).

Priority, suitability, and good faith were all violated when Fries changed Persoon's name *cervinus* to *mollis*.

Misnamed.

*molliusculus*, *Polystictus*.

Kellerman, 25 = *Polyporus pubescens* (misdetermination).

*montanus*, *Polyporus*. Compare *giganteus*.

Misnamed.

*morosus*, *Polyporus*.

Rab. 1605 = *Polyporus benzoinus* (synonym).

de Thüm. 713 = *Polyporus benzoinus* (synonym).

*mutabilis*, *Polyporus*. Rav. 109—Ule, 47, Brazil.

Compare *dealbatus*.

Misnamed.

*nidulans*, *Polyporus*.

Karsten, 115 = *Polyporus rutilans* (synonym).

N. A. F. 1598 = *Polyporus rutilans* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*nigricans*, *Fomes*.

Erb. Ital., 768 = *Fomes fomentarius* (misdetermination).

Syd. 552, 4608 = *Fomes fomentarius* (misdetermination).

Misnamed.

*nitida*, *Trametes*.

Balansa, 124, Tonkin = *Trametes Persoonii* (synonym).

*niveus*, *Merulius*.

I prefer to pass this species for the present, also *haedinus*, *aureus*, *molluscus*, *fugax*, *ambiguus*, *porinoides*, *rufus*, *serpens*, *Ravenelii*, *ceracellus*, *bellus*, *pallens*, *crispatus*. I have not studied the museum species of *Merulius* in detail. There are *exsiccatae* (so named) of all above.

*nodulosus*, *Polyporus*. Krieger, 569.

Note. *nodulosus* is a beechwood form of *Polyporus radiatus*, and Desmazières No. 800, under *Polyporus radiatus*, is a more typical collection of *Polyporus nodulosus* than this Krieger collection.

Compare *polymorphus*.

*nummularius* (see *elegans*).

*oblectabilis*, *Polystictus*. Compare *oblectans*.

Misnamed.

*oblectans*, *Polystictus*.

N. A. F. 1101 = *Polystictus cinnamomeus* (misdetermination).

Ule, Brazil, 48 = *Polystictus oblectabilis* (misdetermination).

*obliquus*, *Poria*. Sacc. 820 (not sure)—Syd. 2108 (not sure)—(Wien) 1603.

“Fries misit” (a fine specimen).

Misnamed.

*obliquus*, *Polyporus*.

Ellis, 313 (emended) wrong, but species unknown to me.

Rav. 424 (emended) wrong, but species unknown to me.



obtusus, Polyporus. N. A. F. 309 (as amended)—Rab. 3330.  
Compare labyrinthicus.

occidentalis, Polystictus. Balansa, 3399, Paraguay—Rab. 4346,  
New Guinea.

Misnamed.

occidentalis, Polyporus.

Rav. No. 18 = Polystictus byrsinus (misdetermination).

Wright, Cuba, 3062 = Polystictus byrsinus (misdetermination).

Misnamed.

occultus, Polyporus.

Rab. 617 = Polyporus rufescens (synonym).

odorata, Trametes. Erb. Ital. 805—Fuckel, 2501—Jaczewski,  
180—Karsten, 938—Krieger, 122—Rab. 2003—Sydow, 58,  
715, 1104, 4418,—de Thüm. 7, 107—(Wien) 311.

Misnamed.

officinalis, Fomes.

Erb. Ital. 291 = Fomes pinicola (misdetermination).

Rab. 211 = Fomes pinicola (misdetermination).

ohiensis, Fomes. N. A. F. 923 (as Trametes).

osseus, Polyporus. Rab. 706, 4448—Sacc. Ital. 603.

ovinus, Polyporus. Fuck. 2493—Karsten, 309—Rab. 2938—  
Syd. 1013—Trog.—Blytt in part.

Most of the specimens are correct, but the red specimens so  
named by Blytt are Polyporus confluens.

Misnamed.

papyracea, Hexagona.

Plant. Boliv. 1327 = Hexagona variegata.

Misnamed.

papyrinus, Merulius.

Brinkman, 187 = Merulius Corium (juggle).

Misnamed.

pallescens, Polyporus.

Fuckel, 1379 = Polyporus fumosus (synonym).

Sydow, 1711 = Polyporus tephroleucus (misdetermination).

pallida, Fistulina. N. A. F. 2, 1929, doubtful, more likely hepatica.

Misnamed.

pallido-fulva, Daedalea.

Fung. Col. 209 = Lenzites trabea.

Misnamed.

parvulus, Polyporus.

N. A. F. 305 = Polystictus focicola (erroneous tradition).

Rav. 8 = Polystictus focicola (erroneous tradition).

(cfr. Polyporoid issue, page 10.)

Misnamed.

Peckii, Trametes.

Fung. Col. 502 = Trametes hispida (synonym).



perennis, *Polystictus*. Brinkman, 198—Desm. 160, 253, 464, 953—Erb. Ital. 1042 (as *Trametes*)—Fuckel, 1400 (as *Trametes*)—Fung. Col. 602—Karsten, 113, 423 (as *Trametes*)—Klotzsch, 31—Krieger, 224—Linhart, 448—Mougeot, 295—N. A. F. 1701—Oud. 221—Rab. 117 (as *Trametes*), 2203—Romell, 114—Sydow, 211—de Thüm. 2108—(Wien), 608.

“Fries in litt.”

pergamenus, *Polystictus*. Fung. Col. 302—Harper, 884d, 1805b—N. A. F. 312, 1934(?)—Rab. 1304, 3331—Rav. 13, 424—Waghouse, 183.

Compare *abietinus* var. *coriaceus*, *pseudopergamenus*, *prolificans*.

Misnamed.

Fung. Col. 804 = *Polyporus pubescens* (misdetermination).

Misnamed?

*Persoonii*, *Polystictus*.

Ule, 1548, Brazil = resupinate, most doubtful. As the museums are full of *Trametes Persoonii*, there is no excuse for distributing doubtfully determined “resupinate forms.”

Compare *cornea*, *cupreo-roseus*, *nitida*.

*Pes Capreae*, *Polyporus*. Fuckel, 1399—Krieger, 1958—Sacc. Ital. 1412—Sacc. Ven. 816.

Compare *scrobinaceus*.

*picipes*, *Polyporus*. Bartholomew, 2552—Fuckel, 1397—Fung. Col. 1108—N. A. F. 705—Oud. 222.

This is only a form of *Polyporus varius*, and not distinct at that. The American form has a thinner pileus, but it is only a question of degree.

Misnamed.

*Pilotae*, *Polyporus*.

N. A. F. 2508 (as emended) = *Polyporus croceus* (synonym).

Compare *endocrocinus*.

*pinicola*, *Fomes*. Karsten, 72—Krieger, 13—Krieger, Schäd. 121—Linhart, 250—N. A. F. 1692—Rab. 3031—Romell, 116—de Thüm. 804, 1906.

Compare *marginatus officinalis*, *resinosus*, *ungulatus*.

*Pini*, *Trametes*. Erb. Ital. 133—Karsten, 242—Krieger, 78, 79—Linhart, 348—N. A. F. 602—Rab. 118, 3138—Romell, 7 (Form *Abietis*)—Seymour & Earle, 549—Welwitsch, 11—Zopf. & Syd. 3.

Misnamed.

Sacc. 1002 = *Lenzites abietinus* (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 7 = *Fomes pinicola* (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 817 = *Fomes pinicola* (?) (misdetermination).



pinsitus, Polystictus. Compare barbatulus, Friesiana, umbonatus, versicolor.

Misnamed.

plebeius, Polyporus.

N. A. F. 1702 = *Fomes marmoratus* (misdetermination).

No resemblance, however remote, to *Trametes plebeius*.

pocula, Polyporus. N. A. F. 2nd, 2728—Shear, 1407.

Compare *cupulaeformis*.

Misnamed.

polymorphus, Polyporus.

Sydow, 2109 = Poor specimen, but misdetermined. In original sense *polymorphus* is a synonym for *Polyporus nodulosus*.

pomaceus, Fomes. Compare *fulvus*, *igniarius*.

Misnamed.

populina, Trametes.

Brinkman, 146 = *Fomes connatus* (supposition).

Karsten, 709 = *Fomes connatus* (an allegation). This *exsiccatae* was probably the original of this allegation.

Roum. 203 = *Trametes hispida* (misdetermination).

Sydow, 1710 = *Trametes connatus* (supposition).

populinus, Polyporus, var. vel n. s.

"Fries in litt." I would not wish to express an opinion without examination by microscope, but most certainly if this was near Fries' idea of *populinus*, there are no possible grounds to refer *Fomes connatus* as a synonym for *Fomes populinus*, in sense of Fries, at least.

Misnamed.

populina, Trametes.

Fuck. 2495 = too poor to decide, but misdetermination.

Sacc. 415 = *Trametes hispida* (misdetermination).

Misnamed.

poripes, Polyporus.

Rav. 4 = *Polyporus cristatus* (synonym).

No type of *Polyporus poripes* exists, but it was probably based on *Polyporus cristatus*, which has also been known in American mycology as *Polyporus flavo-virens*.

Misnamed.

pseudopergamenus, Polyporus.

de Thüm. 1102 = *Polystictus pergamenus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

prolificans, Polystictus.

Bartholomew, 2513, 2825, 2924 = *Polystictus pergamenus* (juggle).

A juggle for which there was not the slightest excuse. The "type" was a distortion, not "proliferous" and not recognized by Fries, who always called the plant in normal form *Polystictus pergamenus*.

Misnamed.

protracta, Trametes.

Syd. 4611 = Too poor to determine.

pubescens, Polyporus. Aust. Hung. 3146 (typical)—Fung. Col. 907, 1109—N. A. F. 803, 1933—Syd. 313 (?).

Fries misit. Brit. Museum.

The Friesian type specimen at British Museum is a thin plant with the surface (worn) smooth. I believe *Polyporus pubescens* and



*Polystictus velutinus* to be synonyms. The American *exsiccatae* are called "var. *Grayii*," but are a doubtful variety.

Compare *epileucus*, *molliusculus*, *pergamenus*.

*pulverulentus*, *Merulius*. Sacc. 1406.

A thin *Merulius lacrymans*.

Compare *brassicaefolius*.

*quercinus*, *Daedalea*. Aust. Hung. 760—Desm. 465—Flora Gal-  
liae C. B. 700—Fuckel, 1162 (doubtful as to one)—Fung.  
Col. 1015—Jack. L. & S. 934—Karsten, 71, 426—Krieger, 162—  
Linhart, 53—N. A. F. 315—Rab. 4444—Roumg. 102—Sacc. 23,  
24, 25—de Thüm. 316—Wartmann, 223—(Wien) 312.

"Fries in litt."

*radiatus*, *Polyporus*. Brinkman, 144—Desm. 800\*—Karsten,  
516 (as *Trametes*)—Krieger, 422—Rab. 509—Syd. 202,  
1604, 4609—de Thüm. 2110—Zopf. & Syd. 17.

\* Desm. No. 800 is *Polyporus nodulosus*, a beechwood form  
of *Polyporus radiatus*.

Misnamed.

N. A. F. 405 = *Polyporus cuticularis* (misdetermination). The abundant colored  
spores of *cuticularis* distinguish it from *radiatus*; the two species are liable to be confused  
otherwise.

Sydow, 3484 = Misnamed evidently, but I would not wish to refer it.

Compare *lutescens*.

Misnamed.

*radiciperda*, *Trametes*.

Kunze, 1 = *Fomes annosus* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*ramosissimus*, *Polyporus*.

Krieger, 859 = *Polyporus umbellatus* (juggle).

Misnamed.

*Ravenelii* *Daedalea*.

Rab. 1943 = *Irpex tabacinus* (misdetermination).

Rav. 113 = *Irpex tabacinus* (misdetermination).

And neither is same as "*Daedalea Ravenelii*" type in British Museum, otherwise  
unknown to me.

*repanda*, *Lenzites*. Compare *elegans*.

Misnamed.

*resinosus*, *Polyporus*.

Fuckel, 1385 = *Fomes pinicola* (misdetermination).

Fung. Col. 203, 906, 1304 = *Polyporus fuscus* (synonym).

Karsten, 118 = *Polyporus benzoinus* (synonym?).

Kellerman, 105 = *Polyporus fuscus* (synonym).

N. A. F. 406 = *Polyporus fuscus* (synonym).

Oud. 227 = *Fomes annosus* (misdetermination).

Rab. 3332 = *Polyporus fuscus* (synonym).

Sacc. Ven. 13 = *Polyporus croceus* (misdetermination).



Sydow, 404 = *Polyporus cuticularis* (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 1106 = *Fomes pinicola* (misdetermination).

"Fries in litt." = *Polyporus benzoinus* (synonym?).

*Polyporus resinosus* in the original sense of Schrader was probably *Fomes lacatus* of modern mycology; in sense of Fries, the frondose wood form of *Polyporus fuscus* of Persoon; in American mycology (mostly), *Polyporus fuscus* not exactly same plant as the European analogue.

*rheades*, *Polyporus*. Sacc. 1203. This is the form on *Tamarix*, called *Polyporus tamaricis*, which is a synonym for *Polyporus rheades*.

*rhypidium*, *Polyporus*. N. A. F. 920 (as *Favolus*)—Rav. Fasc. No. 9 (as *Favolus*)—Ule, 992 (as *Gloeoporus*).

*ribis*, *Fomes*. Aust. Hung. 754—Brinkman, 199—Desm. 314, 566—Erb. Ital. (1264)—Fuckel, 1381\*—Krieger, 423—Krieger Schäd, 171—Kunze, 2\*—Linhart, 349—N. A. F. 1693—Rab. 2937—Sacc. 20\*—de Thüm. 315\*, 509—Zopf & Sydow, 68\*.

Those marked \* were called *Trametes Ribis*. All are on species of *Ribis*.

Compare *Evonymus, fulvus*.

*rigidus*, *Polystictus*. N. A. F. 1694, 1695—Rav. Fasc. 1, No. 15, Or *Polystictus rigens*, as found in Saccardo.

*roburneus*, *Fomes*. Compare *fulvus*.

*robustus*, *Fomes*. Compare *Hartigii*.

*roseus*, *Fomes*. de Thüm. 1904 (excepting as to the juggle).

Misnamed.

Griffiths, 351 = *Trametes carneus* (an alleged synonym, but a mistake.)

Compare *rufo-pallidus*.

Misnamed.

*rubellus*, *Merulius*.

N. A. F. 3004 = *Merulius incarnatus* (synonym).

*rubescens*, *Ptychogaster*. Rab. 3946.

Compare *terrestris*.

Misnamed.

*rubescens*, *Trametes*.

Rab. 118 = *Daedalea confragosa* (synonym).

Sacc. 1411 = Specimen too poor to determine.

Spegazzini, 31 = Specimen too poor to determine.

de Thüm. 314, 710 = *Daedalea confragosa* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*rubriporus*, *Fomes*.

Sacc. Ital. 1416 = *Fomes torulosus* (synonym).

*rufescens*, *Polyporus*. \*Erb. Ital. 2nd, 140.

Victoria, Australia, Campbell.



\* dimidiata form = Polyporus heteroporus cfr. Stip. Polyporoids, p. 158.

Compare biennis, occultus, sericellus.

Misnamed.

rufo-pallidus, Polyporus.

Karsten, 120 = Fomes roseus (synonym).

rutilans, Polyporus. Brinkman, 159—Sydow, 451.

Misnamed.

"Fries in litt."

This specimen is not rutilans in sense of Persoon, but I do not know what it is. It is a plant that turns dark-reddish in drying, on the order of Poria aurantiaca.

Compare croceus, nidulans.

salicinus, Fomes. Brinkman, 148\*—Desm. 315—Karsten, 241—Krieger, 819—Oud. 230—Rab. 609—Romell, 12—Wartman & Schenk, 325.

\* The pileate form is called also Fomes conchatus, but is same species.

Misnamed.

salicinus, Polyporus.

de Thüm. 1606 = Fomes igniarius (misdetermination).

Misnamed.

salignus Polyporus.

Rab. 1702 = Daedalea gibbosa (misdetermination).

Compare epileucus, Holmiensis.

sanguineus, Polystictus. Balansa, 114, Tonkin-Balansa, 3385, Paraguay—Fung. Col. 912—Harper, 1623a—N. A. F. 501—Rab. 3032, South Africa—Rav. 16, 418—de Thüm. 905, discolored, 805, South Africa.

(Correct?)

Schulzeri, Polyporus.

Linhart, 449. I do not know as to this, but it is not the same as listed in Fungus Kmet. under this name. The Fungus Kmet. specimen is possibly the same as Polyporus obtusus of the United States. This certainly is not.

Schweinitzii, Polyporus. Fung. Col. 1203—Oud. 220—Rab. 1002, 1602—Sacc. Ital. 406—Syd. 808—de Thüm. 1108, 2107—Waghorn, 459.

"Fries misit" British Museum.

Compare hispidus, sistrotremoides.

Misnamed.

scrobinaceus, Polyporus.

Rab. 407 = Polyporus Pes caprae (juggle).

scutellatus, Fomes. Fung. Col. 1010—N. A. F. 1597—Waghorn, 494.

"ex herb. Schw.," British Museum.



Misnamed.

sector, Polystictus.

Ule, 1551, Brazil = Polystictus Friesii (synonym).

Wright, 279, Cuba = Polystictus Friesi (synonym).

These two collections are, however, the small depauperate form which was originally named Polyporus sector, the most "prior" name.

semipileatus, Polyporus. N. A. F. 3407.

Compare chioneus.

Sepium, Trametes. N. A. F. 11—Rav., Fasc. No. 21, 216—de Thüm. 1306—Waghorn, 685 (doubtful, possibly Trametes variiformis).

serialis Trametes, Rab. 3455—Romell, 117, 118.

"Fries in litt."

Compare squalens.

Misnamed.

sericellus, Polyporus.

Sacc. 818 = Polyporus rufescens (synonym).

Misnamed.

serpens, Trametes.

N. A. F. 112, 1707 = (See note).

Sydow, 3426 = Daedalea cervina (?) specimen poor (misdetermination).

The abundant tropical plant so common in Florida, which has mostly been referred to Trametes serpens, I am convinced is wrong, and not same as the Northern European species, but I have no name for it.

Compare Stephensii.

Misnamed.

sistotremoides, Polyporus.

Aust. Hung. 3145 = Polyporus Schweinitzii (juggle).

Brinkman, 145 = Polyporus Schweinitzii (juggle).

spathulatus, Favolus. Compare vibelinoides.

Misnamed.

spongiosus as var. of Polyporus nidulans.

"Fries in litt."

The specimen is Poria aurantiaca, as illustrated Rostk. 4, t. 58. It has no relation to Polyporus nidulans in sense of Fries, which is a synonym for Polyporus rutilans.

spumeus, Polyporus. Erb. Ital. 877 (Correct)—de Thüm. 815 (doubtful, probably incorrect).

Misnamed.

Fuckel, 1384 = Fomes fraxineus (misdetermination).

N. A. F. 1103 = Fomes geotropus (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 1103 = Polyporus croceus (misdetermination).

Compare borealis.

Misnamed?

squalens, Trametes.

Rab. 3528. This is a co-type specimen. I do not know it as a species, and it may be a good species. The specimen is partly resupinate and partly pileate. Surface brown. Is it not Trametes serialis?



squalidus, *Merulius*. Brinkman, 121.

Fries in litt.

Very close to *Merulius lacrymans*.

squamosus, *Polyporus*. Cavara, 66—Fuckel, 1398—Krieger, 172, 860—Sacc. Ital. 211—Sacc. Ven. 8—Sydow, 212—de Thüm. 310 (emendated).

Compare *giganteus*.

Misnamed.

*Stephensii*, *Trametes*.

Rab. 117 = *Trametes serpens* (synonym).

Rav. No. 7 = unnamed probably. See note under *Trametes serpens*.

Misnamed.

*stereoides*, *Polyporus*.

Fuckel, 2399 = *Polystictus versicolor* (misdetermination).

suaveolens, *Trametes*. Aust. Hung. 758—Cavara, 16—Erb. Ital. 231—Fuckel, 1365—Fung. Col. 1206—Krieger, 524—N. A. F. 10—Sacc. Ital. 6—Sacc. Ven. 22—Sydow, 405.

"Fries in litt."

All are surely correct excepting the "Fries in litt.," which is probably *Trametes hispida*.

Misnamed.

*sublingueformis*, *Polyporus*.

Linhart, 54 "type" = *Fomes fraxineus* (synonym).

*subsquamosus*, *Polyporus*. Rab. 1209.

This is correct as known to Fries, but as to Linnaeus? It is *Polyporus griseus* of Peck.

Misnamed.

*subtropicalis*, *Polyporus*.

Balansa, 3400, Paraguay (co-type) = *Polyporus licnoides* (synonym).

sulphureus, *Polyporus*. Aust. Hung. 1154—Cavara, 214—Erb. Ital. 340—Fuckel, 1392—Fung. Col. 1107—Jack. L. & S. 935—Karsten, 310—Krieger, Sax. 365—Krieger, Schäd, 76—Linhart, 149—N. A. F. 707—Sacc. Ital. 1414 (specimen very poor)—Sacc. Venet. 1108—Sydow, 626, 2003—de Thüm. 1008, 1603—(Wien) 945.

Australia, Bailey.

China, Henry.

West Indies, Elliott.

Compare *imbricatus*.

*tabacinus*, *Polystictus*. N. A. F. 1705.

Compare *Ravenelii*.



Misnamed.

tephroleucus, Polyporus.

Oudemans, 223 = *Fomes connatus*, and surely a bad error to mistake such a common species as *Fomes connatus*.

Compare *pallescens*.

Misnamed.

terrestris, *Ceriumyces*.

Sacc. Ven. 836 = *Ptychogaster* form of *Polyporus rufescens*.

tinctorius, *Hydrofomes*. Compare *lateritius*.

trabea, *Lenzites*. Compare *pallido-fulva*.

tomentosus, *Polyporus*. Compare *biennis*.

torulosus, *Fomes*. Compare *rubriporus*.

tremellosus, *Merulius*. Brinkman, 118—Cavara, 159—Desm.

553—Erb. Ital. 970—Fuckel, 1358—Fung. Col. 213—Karsten, 243—Krieger, 1013—Libert, 222—N. A. F. 507—Rab. 7, 2307—Rav. No. 15, 715—Sacc. 401—Sacc. Ital. 412—Sydow, 926, 3701—de Thüm. 1111, 2205.

“Fries in litt.”

Misnamed.

*Tricholoma*, *Polyporus*.

Ule, 15, Brazil = *Polyporus ciliaris* (cfr. *Stipitate Polyporoids*, p. 176).

Misnamed.

*Trogii*, *Trametes*.

Rab. 4049, 4349 = *Trametes hispida* (synonym).

Type ex Berlin = *Trametes hispida* (synonym).

Misnamed.

*Tsugae*, *Fomes*.

(Wien) 1304 = *Polyporus lucidus* (synonym).

ulmarius, *Fomes*. Briosi & Cavara, 167—Rab. 616—de Thüm. 206.

umbellatus, *Polyporus*. Sacc. Ital. 1413.

Compare *ramosissimus*.

Misnamed.

umbonatus, *Polyporus*.

Balansa, 3909, Paraguay = *Polystictus pinsitus* (synonym).

undatus, *Polyporus*. Brinkman, 136.

(as *Poria*. It is usually resupinate.)

Compare *Broomei*.

Misnamed.

ungulatus, *Fomes*.

Sacc. 214 = *Fomes pinicola* (juggle).

Sydow, 54 = *Fomes pinicola* (juggle).

(Wien), 939 = *Fomes pinicola* (juggle).



unicolor, *Daedalea*. Many exsiccatae I do not list in detail, but I note none misnamed.

Compare *aurea*, *cinerea*, *Magnusii*.

*variegata*, *Hexagona*. Ule, 1553, Brazil.

Compare *papyracea*.

*varius*, *Polyporus*.

Fuckel, (number ?).

"Fries misit," British Museum.

*velutinus*, *Polystictus*. Erb. Ital. 804, 1051—Rab. 701 (best), 2301—Sydow, 308? specimen poor—de Thüm. 614 (?), 1206 (?) (nearer *hirsutus*).

"Fries in litt."

*Polystictus velutinus* and *Polyporus pubescens* are thin and thick forms of the same thing.

Misnamed.

Fuckel, 1377 = *Polystictus versicolor* (misdetermination).

Rav. fasc. 4, No. 6—*Polystictus abietinus* (misdetermination).

Sacc. Venet. 17 = *Polystictus versicolor* (misdetermination).

de Thüm. 1305 = *Polystictus hirsutus* (misdetermination).

Compare *albus*.

*versatilis*, *Polystictus*. Cuming, 2026 (as *Trametes*) (type)—N. A. F. 2307 (as *Trametes*).

Compare *Drummondii*.

*versicolor*, *Polystictus*.

There are over forty exsiccatae of this common and variable plant at the British Museum, and I hardly feel that they are worth itemizing, excepting as to a few marked forms.

Jack. L. & S. 656.

This is a dark, thick, subtrametoid form, probably worthy of a distinct name *Polystictus nigricans*.

Sydow, 4203.

A pale, flaccid form called *Polyporus hirsutulus* and possibly *Polyporus fibula*, though opinions vary as to the identity of the latter.

Waghorne,

The forms of *Polystictus versicolor* with a preponderance of bluish zones are *Polystictus azureus*, as named by Fries from Mexico.

Compare *stereoides*, *velutinus*, *zonatus*.



Misnamed.

versicolor, Polyporus.

Migula, 154 = Polystictus abietinus (misdetermination).

Migula, 155 = doubtful, too poor to consider.

Rav. No. 14 = Polystictus pinsitus (misdetermination).

Sydow, 3215 = doubtful, too poor to consider.

Misnamed.

vibelinoides, Polyporus.

Zenker, 1359 = error for vibecinoides. It is a Favolus, probably Favolus spathulatus.

Misnamed.

violaceum, Sistotrema.

Mougeot, 678 = Polystictus abietinus (synonym).

Misnamed.

virellus, Polyporus.

Sydow, 3512. Probably Polyporus cristatus, but specimen poor and discolored. Polyporus virellus in sense of Fries was based on a regular mesopodial form of Polyporus cristatus.

Misnamed.

virgineus, Polystictus.

Rav. 11 = Polystictus conchifer (synonym).

volvatus, Polyporus, N. A. F. 307.

Misnamed.

Warmingii, Polyporus.

Ule, 1., Brazil = Stereum aurantiacum.

Cfr. Stipitate Stereum, page 22. I would think the British Museum example was a misenclosure, but I note that the corresponding exsiccatae at Berlin is the same misdetermination.

zonatus, Polystictus. Romell, 15—de Thüm. 2105.

“Fries in litt.”

“Fries misit.”

Polystictus zonatus is only a form of Polystictus versicolor and often not “zonate.” Around Upsala it is more common than the usual form. The value of the species, if it has any, rests on the color as shown in Rostk, t. 44, which Fries cites.

Compare angulatus, Cerasi.

Misnamed.

Fuckel, 1376 = Polystictus versicolor (nearer than to zonatus).

Migula, 156 = doubtful, specimen too poor to refer.

Sydow, 920, 4610 = Polystictus hirsutus (nearer than to zonatus).

de Thüm. 613 = Polystictus versicolor (nearer than to zonatus).



## ADDENDA.

Having three pages to fill out in this Letter, we print some matter that has been standing in type, some of it, for several years. Some of the items are a little out of date. All of it has been left over from various Letters and Mycological notes.

### ADVERTISEMENTS.

(Crowded out of Letter No. 48.)

adustus, Willd.; affine, L  veill  ; affinis, Nees; anebus, Berk.; antilopus, Kalchbrenner; applanatus, Persoon; aratoides, Patouillard; arcularius, Batsch; australe, Bathie; australis, Fries; bicolor, Junghuhn; Blanchetianus, Montagne; candidus, Spegazzini; caperatus, Berkeley; carneo-nigra, Cooke; cinnamomeo-squamulosus, Hennings; coliformis, Dickson; concentrica, Bolton; conicus, Bathie; dendroidea, Berkeley; dichrous, Fries; dictyopus, Montagne; durus, Junghuhn; elegans, Junghuhn; fasciatus L  veill  ; favoloides, Hennings; flabeliformis, Klotzsch; flavus, Junghuhn; gallo-pavonis, Berkeley; gibbosa, Persoon; gilvus, Schweinitz; hispidus, Bulliard; hornodermus, Montagne; hystrix, Cooke; immaculatus, Berkeley; leoninus, Klotzsch; lignosus, Klotzsch; lobatum, Swartz; lucidus, Leys; luteo-olivaceus, Berkeley; luteus, Nees; Madagascarensis, Bathie; mangiferae, L  veill  ; mastopodus, L  veill  ; megaloporus, Montagne; melanoporus, Montagne; Mellisii, Berkeley; minuto-fruticum, Bathie; multiformis, Montagne; occidentalis, Klotzsch; pachyphloeus, Patouillard; pectinatus, Klotzsch; perlevis, Bathie; Persoonii, Montagne; petaloides, Bathie; pruinatus, Klotzsch; pseudosenex, Murrill; pulcherrimum, Berkeley; pullus, Montagne; quercina, Linnaeus; radicans, Berkeley; rawakense, Persoon; repanda, Persoon; rigida, Berkeley; roseola, Patouillard; rugosissimus, Bathie; rugosus, Nees; Sajor Caju, Fries; sculpturatus, Bathie; senex, Montagne; stuppeus, Klotzsch; substigiis, Berkeley; subtornatus, Murrill; sulphureus, Fries; surinamense, L  veill  ; tabacinus, Montagne; tenuis, Hooker; umbrinella, Fries; unguliformis, Bathie; velutinosus, Bathie; velutinus, Fries; versatilis, Berkeley; vinosus, Berkeley; xanthopus, Fries.

### MINNESOTA MUSHROOMS.

"Minnesota Mushrooms" is the title of a publication (Part 4) of Minnesota Plant Studies. Although the work was issued in 1910, it has just come to our notice. We were in Europe when the work appeared. The author is F. E. Clements, State Botanist of Minnesota.

While, of course, the work is not exhaustive, we think it will prove one of the most useful publications on American mycology, particularly to those who are not familiar with the common species. It is well illustrated with photographic cuts that are characteristic enough, so that the common fungi of the woods can mostly be easily identified. The author should be strongly commended for two things:

First, he used binomials as the names for the plants, and made no reference to the biographical citations to those who are alleged to have named them. The general adoption of this plan would cause very rapid advancement in mycology, for the mycological worker would then be more interested in finding out the truth than he would be in proposing as a new species everything he can not identify for the purpose of adding his name. We are glad to note that several recent writers, such as Romell, Massee, Swanton, and now Mr. Clements, have adopted this plan. It will lead to a very superior line of work in the future.

Second, Mr. Clements has used the established names in mycology, and



has paid no attention and made no effort to take part in the cheap name-juggling that is now going on. When the host of busybodies who spend their time hunting up excuses to form "new genera" begin to realize that nobody takes them seriously, there will be less of that work done, much to the simplification of the subject.

A few errors have crept into the work which we mention as an aid in case future editions are printed. Fig. 75, *Clavaria Ligula*, should probably be *Clavaria pistillaria*. It is much too obese for *Ligula*. Fig. 85, *Tremella fuciformis*, is *Tremella vesicaria*. It has no resemblance at all to *Tremella fuciformis*, which is a white species of the tropics, and does not occur in the United States. This mistake has been copied from Atkinson. Fig. 90, *Tylostoma mammosus*, is evidently *Tylostoma campestris*. *Tylostoma mammosus*, which is the common European species, is strangely rare in America. It is a much smaller plant than *Tylostoma campestris*, with a well-defined tubular mouth. Fig. 97, *Dictyophallus impudicus*, is *Phallus Ravenelii*, the same exactly as Fig. 96. The well-developed veil shown on one of the sections, as well as the even pileus, are characteristics of *Ravenelii* and contrary to the characters of *impudicus*.

To the best of our belief, all the remaining figures, some 125 in number, are correctly named.

Any one beginning the study of mycology will find Professor Clements' book a most useful help. It can be obtained by sending 30 cents in postage stamps to F. E. Clements, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

### A NEW EDITION OF McILVAINE'S BOOK.

There has recently been issued a new edition of the book that was previously issued under the title "One Thousand American Fungi," by Charles McIlvaine, revised by Chas. F. Millspaugh. Mr. McIlvaine was for years an enthusiastic observer of fungi, but he should be classed as a mycophagist rather than a mycologist, as his studies were mostly confined to the edible side of the fungus question. He published some years ago a very bulky work on American fungi, which was largely a compilation. It was very useful, for he compiled in systematic form many of Professor Peck's descriptions, otherwise only found scattered through periodical literature and not accessible to the ordinary students. The present edition appears to me to be an improvement on the original edition, both in the superior quality of the plates and the correctness of the text. There are still a great many errors in the book which should be corrected in a text-book on American fungi. Much of our literature is a compilation of traditions and mistakes, and until some one who has a familiar field knowledge of the subject writes a text-book, these errors will always be handed down.

The price of the book is \$5. Publishers, Bobbs, Merrill & Co., Indianapolis, Indiana.

### ASEROE ZEYLANDICA IN AFRICA.

The genus *Aseroe* has never been definitely recorded from Africa. At Berlin there is an unrecognizable specimen which was not published (cfr. Note 12, p. 44, Synopsis of the Known Phalloids). I was much interested in a specimen received (in formalin) from Mr. Chas. A. O'Connor, Mauritius, which from the disposition of the segments I would refer to *Aseroe Zeylandica*. This species occurs in Ceylon and Java, and it is worthy of note that the African species accords with the East Indian species, but does not agree with any form known from Australia.

**POLYSTICTUS PINSITUS.**—"Polystictus pinsitus with dark pores is quite a rare plant. When growing in the shade the pores are white, when exposed to the sun and older the pores are often dark. The variation of this species is infinite. The surface is sometimes quite white. If growing covered in the woods sometimes yellow, but rare, mostly cinereous. I think the whole section of Saccardo is the same thing. It has often habits of *Irpeex*."—Extract from letter from Rev. J. Rick, Brazil.



CORRECTION.—“There are no regular, stellate lobes (to the exoperidia of *Sphaerobolus stellatus*) as usually shown in illustrations.”—Myc. Notes, p. 432.

This statement, which was made from observation and photograph of (see Fig. 246) the first fresh specimens I noted of the plant, I have found from subsequent observations to not always be true. I have since seen *Sphaerobolus stellatus* with the lobes as regular and as sharp as shown in Sowerby's plate, which is the one usually copied.

The genus *Lysurus* in the West Indies.—There is no record of the genus *Lysurus* growing in the West Indies, but we have just received from Mr. William H. Patterson, from St. Vincent, a drawing which is undoubtedly a *Lysurus*. We judge it is the species included in our recent pamphlet as *Lysurus australiensis* or *Lysurus borealis*, if there is any difference between these species. The drawing was not accompanied with color notes, but unless it differs in its color it seems to be very much the same as the Australian and American plants. The occurrence of the genus *Lysurus* in the West Indies is an interesting addition to our knowledge of the Phalloid subject.

“I greatly enjoy your breezy, independent way of writing, and pray convey to the redoubtable Professor McGinty my appreciation of his researches. I wish he might turn his mind to the Spermatophytes for a great field is open to a man of his talents.”—Extract from a letter from P.—Cal.

### THE GENUS GEASTEROPSIS.

I have had a great deal of trouble in finding the original publication of this “new genus,” but have finally received it through the kindness of Mrs. Flora W. Patterson, who has sent me photographs of the original article.

The genus *Geasteropsis* is, in my opinion, exactly the same as the genus *Trichaster*, described some sixty years ago from Russia, and considered in *Mycological Notes*, page 189, plate 17. At the time I wrote the article on the genus *Trichaster*, I considered the genus valid, although I stated the reasons why it was possibly something abnormal. Since writing this article I have been thoroughly convinced that the genus *Trichaster* has no value, but was based on an abnormal *Geaster* with deciduous peridia. I have since received undoubted specimens of *Geaster hygrometricus*, showing exactly this same character.

### THE COLOR OF POLYPORUS OBTUSUS.

Mr. Perley Spaulding, Forest Pathologist, Department of Agriculture, has written me a few notes regarding this species, which may explain the discrepancy in our accounts of its color.

“If the fungus is wet with rain which has recently fallen, it is almost a pure white; but if there has been a long, dry period, so that the fungus is dry and rigid, the color is apt to be yellow. I believe the difference in statements as to color depend almost entirely upon whether the fungus is wet or not. I know that all the specimens which we have dried in our collections have a yellowish tint, and as I recollect, all specimens which I have ever found in the field which were dry have had the same yellow tint. I do not remember seeing a wet specimen which had the yellow color.”

POLYSTICTUS PERROTTETII.—On my return to Paris, February, 1911, I found in the cover what is taken for the “type,” labeled “*Trametes Perrottetii*, Lev. Java, M. Perrottet, 1821.” This specimen was not in evidence on my previous visit, and does not bear out my note on page 67 of the *Polystictus Synopsis*. It was no doubt at that time loaned to Bresadola. However, I still believe that my note is in substance correct, and that this specimen is labeled as coming from “Perrottet, Java” by mistake. It is exactly the same as *Polystictus trichomallus*, and the same as the abundant specimens labeled by Leveille on a printed label, “Guyane francaise, M. Poiteau.” *Polystictus trichomallus* is an abundant plant in the American tropics, and many specimens are in the museums, all from the American tropics, except this one, which I am sure was labeled through error as coming from Java. I do not believe the species grows in Java, or any portion of the East.





Lloyd, C. G. 1914. "Letter No. 52." *Mycological writings of C. G. Lloyd* 4, 1–32.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/59614>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/329399>

**Holding Institution**

University of California Libraries (archive.org)

**Sponsored by**

MSN

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: NOT\_IN\_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.