

THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR POLYPORACEAE
Additions and corrections

M. A. DONK
Rijksherbarium, Leiden

This paper contains some additional information and discussions as well as corrections of statements and of facts recorded in a previously published paper entitled "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae".

INTRODUCTION.—This paper forms part of a series entitled "The generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes" and contains additions and corrections related to "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" (Donk *in Persoonia* 1: 173-302. 1960) which represents the tenth part of the series.¹

Shortly after the publication of "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" another paper appeared that to a large extent covered the same field: W. B. Cooke, "The genera of pore fungi" (*in Lloydia* 22: 163-207. "1959" [June 30, 1960]). The reader who compares the two publications as to details will find many discrepancies, but he also will soon find that most of them were repetitions from Cooke's previous publications and that I already dealt with them in my above mentioned paper, so that there is no need to return to these. Other discrepancies will be indicated below. I have also added cross-references to those generic names that Cooke mentioned but that I left out altogether because the names are actually based on species not referable to the 'Polyporaceae'.

Ad *Agarico-carnis* Paul. — When I discussed Paulet's mycological publications in connection with this and several other names he coined, I forgot to take into account a publication by that author which appeared at an earlier date than his "Traité des Champignons" (1793) and which is entitled, "Tabula plantarum fungosarum", Parisii, 31 pp. with 1 table. 1791. In this paper Paulet established the genera he was to use in the "Index" of the "Traité des Champignons" and which

¹ This is Part XIV of the series. The parts already published or in press are as follows: Part I ("Cyphellaceae") *in Reinwardtia* 1: 199-220. 1951; Part II (Hymenolichenes) *in Reinwardtia* 2: 435-440. 1954; Part III ("Clavariaceae") *in Reinwardtia* 2: 441-493. 1954; Part IV (Boletaceae) *in Reinwardtia* 3: 275-313. 1955; Part V ("Hydnaceae") *in Taxon* 5: 69-80, 95-115. 1956; Part VI (Brachybasidiaceae, Cryptobasidiaceae, Exobasidiaceae) *in Reinwardtia* 4: 113-118. 1956; Part VII ("Thelephoraceae") *in Taxon* 6: 17-28, 68-85, 106-123. 1957; Part VIII (Auriculariaceae, Septobasidiaceae, Tremellaceae, Dacrymycetaceae) *in Taxon* 7: 164-178, 193-207, 236-250. 1958; Part IX ("Meruliaceae" and *Gantherellus* s. str.) *in Fungus* 28: 7-15. 1958; [Part X] "The generic names proposed for Polyporaceae" *in Persoonia* 1: 173-302. 1960; [Part XI] "The generic names proposed for Agaricaceae", in press; Part XII (Deuteromycetes), in press; Part XIII (Additions and corrections to Parts I-IX), in press.

registered the scientific names of the genera and species he described under French names in the preceding text. All generic names were accompanied by descriptions (in Latin).

The following corrections in the places of publications are to be made.

Agarico-carnis Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 11. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-igniarium Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 10. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-pulpa Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 12. 1791 (devalidated name).

Agarico-suber Paul., Tab. Pl. Fung. 9. 1791 (devalidated name).

Apus (C. Nees) ex S. F. Gray.—‘Agaricaceae’ (see Part XI, in press).

Ad *Agaricon* [Tourn.] Adans. — The remark (p. 181), “I have not come across a valid publication of *Agaricus* Tourn. after the starting-point date (1821) of these fungi”, is to be crossed out and the following changes to be made.

Agaricus [Tourn.] Rafin., Medic. Fl. N. Amer. 2: 186. 1830. — VALID PUBLICATION. This is Rafinesque’s account in which he took up this early name in its original (Tournefortian) sense:

“AGARICUS. *Punk*. Many species, growing on decayed trees. All more or less styptic and bitter, useful to make the Agaric, a soft powder . . . Punk is the Indian name for all perennial fungi growing on trees and of a spongy nature: useful to make spunk or touch wood . . .”—Rafinesque (op. cit. pp. 186–187).

Although there is no reference to De Tournefort’s work, it is clear that Rafinesque had *Agaricus* Tourn. in mind and not *Agaricus* L., which he called “*Amanita* Lam.” The above quoted account contains just sufficient descriptive matter to ensure valid publication of the name.

It should be pointed out that Rafinesque in the same work also accepted a restricted genus *Boletus* L. the differences of which with *Agaricus* Rafin. are not well stated:

“BOLETUS, L. *Touchwood*. Fungi with pores beneath; we have nearly 200 species: those with cells beneath are my *G. Phorima* [cf. Donk in *Persoonia* 1: 254. 1960]; *Polyporus* has a central stem, *Dedalea* [!] a labyrinth beneath, *Fistulina* hollow tubes beneath. The true *Boletus* are sessile, equivalent to *Agaricus* to make tinder and styptic lint. *A. cinnabarinus* dies red. *B. suberosus* . . . *B. igniarius* and *B. fomentarius* . . . *B. marginatus*. *B. odoratus* and *B. suaveolens* . . . The *B. laricis* . . .”—Rafinesque (op. cit. p. 201).

STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym *Agaricus* L. per Fr. (1821).

Asterostromella Höhn. & L.—‘Thelephoraceae’ (see Donk in *Taxon* 6: 20. 1957 & Part XIII, in press).

Ad *Boletus* S. F. Gray. — The name *Boletus* L. was also used in a strongly emended and reduced sense by Rafinesque (Medic. Fl. N. Amer. 201. 1830). His use of the name may be considered a mere monadelphous homonym of *Boletus* S. F. Gray with which it would seem roughly to agree. For an excerpt from Rafinesque’s account on his genus, see above under *Agaricus* [Tourn.] Rafin.

Ad *Boudiera* Lázaro. — W. B. Cooke (in *Lloydia* 22: 174. 1960) and Donk (in *Persoonia* 1: 191. 1960) list the same type, which Cooke cites as “*B. connata* (Batr.)” and Donk as “*Polyporus connatus* Weinm., not *Polyporus connatus* Schw.” The latter author remarked further, “If Lázaro correctly interpreted *Polyporus connatus* = *P. populinus* Fr. (of which I am not yet sure), then *Oxyporus* (Bourd. & G.) Donk . . . is a typonym”. Cooke’s conclusion in this regard is widely at variance since he states that *Boudiera* Lázaro is, “Possibly a synonym of *Coltricia* S. F. Gray.” I would conclude that he confused Lázaro’s type species with the completely unrelated *Coltricia connata* S. F. Gray ≡ *Boletus perennis* L. ≡ *Polyporus perennis* L. per Fr.

Byssocorticium Bond. & Sing. ex Sing.—‘Thelephoraceae’ (see Donk in *Taxon* 6: 23. 1957).

Caloporia P. Karst. and

Caloporus P. Karst.—See “Additions and corrections to Parts I–IX” (‘Meruliaceae’).

Cristella Pat.—‘Thelephoraceae’ (see Donk in *Taxon* 6: 68. 1957).

Ad *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. — As stated, Quélet (1876) remarked that he considered *Daedalea quercina* (L.) per Fr. a species of *Lenzites* Fr., but he was not the first actually to make the combination *L. quercina*: this was done before 1886 by Karsten [in *Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk* 37: 54. 1882 (“Quél.”)].

Ad *Daedaloides* Lázaro. — VARIANT SPELLING: “*Daedaleoides*”; W. B. Cooke in *Lloydia* 22: 179. 1959.

Ad *Echinodontium* Ell. & Ev. in *Bull. Torrey bot. Cl.* 27: 49. Feb. 1900 (corrected reference). — Add under ‘TYPONIMS’: See also under *Hydnophysa* P. Henn., additional remark inserted below. — The genus was recently excluded from the Polyporaceae and made the typegenus of a new family, Echinodontiaceae Donk (in *Persoonia* 1: 405. 1961).

Ad *Elmeria* Bres. & *Elmerina* Bres. — Originally W. B. Cooke listed *Poria setulosa* P. Henn. as type species of both *Elmeria* and *Elmerina*. More recently (W. B. Cooke in *Lloydia* 22: 180. 1960) he partly returned on this and gave *Polyporus vespaceus* Pers. as type species of *Elmeria*, but retained *Poria setulosa* for *Elmerina*. By his remark under *Elmerina*, “Neither species cited with *Elmeria* is mentioned except by implication”, one is forced to conclude that he considered *Poria setulosa* the only original species of the generic name, because it was the only species Bresadola dealt with separately when introducing *Elmerina*. In fact, he makes it quite clear that he regards *Elmeria* Bres. (1912, not 1911 as Cooke states) and *Elmerina* Bres. as two distinct genera, the first “being a segregate of *Hexagona*, the other of *Poria*”. In addition, he does not consider *Elmeria* Bres. a homonym (orthographic variant) of *Elmera* Rydb. (1905; Saxifragaceae) and hence emphasizes that *Elmeria* Bres. is “valid and usable”.

As to the typification of *Elmeria* Bres., *Polyporus vespaceus* ("the better known" of the two original species) should not be accepted as long as the inadequacy of the earlier choice, *Hexagona cladophora* Berk., has not been demonstrated.

Cooke's surprising conclusion that we are dealing in this case with two different genera can be easily unnerved: *Elmerina* owes its valid publication to a reference to the earlier published *Elmeria* Bres. (there is no accompanying generic description) and hence is a pure isonym of that name, and its original species as well as its type completely coincide with those of the basionym. If one would interpret *Elmerina* as a new monotypic genus it would not be validly published because there were no accompanying descriptions, not even a descriptio generico-specifica, and because its only species (*Poria setulosa*) was not a new one.

If one wants to go so far as to accept *Elmera* Rydb. and *Elmeria* Bres. as non-homonymous names, then it should be remembered that Bresadola's name is impriorable (illegitimate) on account of *Elmeria* Ridl. (1909; Zingiberaceae).

Ad *Favolaschia* (Pat.) Pat. apud Pat. & Lagerh. — W. B. Cooke (*in* *Lloydia* 22: 181. 1960) admits two genera *Favolaschia*, one of which is "*Favolaschia* Pat. in Morat [!] Journ. Bot. 1887: 231. 1887". The correct citation of this name is '*Laschia* sect. *Favolaschia* Pat. in J. Bot. (ed. Morot), Paris 1: 231. 1887'. Why it should be typified by *Laschia auriscalpium* Mont. is not clear to me.

Ad *Fomes* (Fr.) Fr. — I have been unable to verify W. B. Cooke's statement that "Cunningham has chosen *Fomes salicinus* (Fr.) Kickx as the type of the genus *Fomes* Kickx". As previously indicated, I am aware that Cunningham chose *Polyporus igniarius*, and in addition I may point out that he (Cunningham *in* Trans. roy. Soc. New Zeal. 82: 895. 1955) even remarked: "*F. salicinus* and *F. igniarius* . . . as the former has not been proposed as a type it may be disregarded further".

Cooke also stated that he had previously chosen *Fomes igniarius* as type of *Fomes* Kickx. I have been unable to verify this; in any case he wrote on previous occasions that "*Fomes* Kickx" was "Based on *Boletus fomentarius* L."

Ad *Fomitiporia* Murrill. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Formitiporia*"; W. B. Cooke *in* *Lloydia* 22: 182. 1960.—Evidently a misprint.

Ad *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. — The authors' citation of the generic name should read '(P. Karst.) P. Karst.'

Add: BASIONYM: *Lenzites* subgen. *Gloeophyllum* P. Karst. *in* Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. 2 (1): 15. 1881.—Introduced in a paper entitled "Hymenomycetes fennici" with three species in this order: *Lenzites sepiaria* (Wulf. per Fr.) Fr., *L. abietinus* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr., and *L. septentrionalis* P. Karst. — HOMONYM: *Gloeophyllum* Korsikov (1953; Protococcineae, Chlorophyta; lacking Latin description).

Gyrophana Pat.—'Meruliaceae' (see Donk *in* Fungus 28: 9. 1958).

Gyrophora Pat.—‘Meruliaceae’ (see Donk in Fungus 28: 10. 1958).

Ad *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. — Replace the given account by the two following.

Haploporus Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. in Mycologia 36: 66, 68. 1944. — ETYMOLOGY: ἀπλός simple; πόρος pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes odora* (Sommerf.: Fr.) Fr. sensu Nikol. and Bond. & Sing.—According to Bondartsev (Trutov. Griby 300. 1953) this is *Fomitopsis odoratissima* Bond. — PROTONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. in Ann. mycol., Berl. 39: 60. 1941.—Not validly published: no Latin description. Two species were mentioned thus: “Typ: *H. odorus* (Fr.) B.-S. Ferner: *H. Ljubarskyi* (Pil.) B.-S.” — REMARK. When Singer (l.c.) validly published the generic name he indicated as its type: “*H. odorus* (Fr.) B.-S.”, the same species given as type when the protonym was published. When Bondartsev (see below) validly published the name at a later date (without reference to Singer’s publication) he appointed the other one of the two original species, viz. *Trametes ljubarskyi* Pilát, in this way creating a later homonym. — HOMONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. 1953 (‘Polyporaceae’).

Haploporus Bond., Trutov. Griby 47, 523. 1953. — ETYMOLOGY: ἀπλός, simple; πόρος, pore. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (by original designation): *Trametes ljubarskyi* Pilát. — REMARKS. See also under preceding name. — When Bondartsev, independently of Singer’s valid publication of *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing., took up the latter name (“g.n.”), he excluded the type (indicated when the latter was published and which had also been indicated by Singer) under the name *Fomitopsis odoratissima* Bond. and proceeded to appoint as type the other one of the two originally included species (*Trametes ljubarskyi*) thus creating a later homonym. This generic name should be known as *Haploporus* ‘Bond.’ rather than as ‘Bond. & Sing. ex Bond.’ The supposition that Bondartsev had identified the two original species appeared quite erroneously (Donk in Persoonia 1: 222. 1960). — HOMONYM: *Haploporus* Bond. & Sing. ex Sing. (1944), q.v. — STATUS. Impriorable on account of the earlier homonym.

Ad *Henningsia* A. Möll. — The name was first validly published in Bot. Mitth. Tropen 8: 44. 1895. I qualified this use as a nomen nudum but now have to reconsider this view. Möller wrote: “In *Henningsia geminella* nov. gen. et nov. spec., einem Typus der Polyporeen, werden wir eine Form antreffen, welche regelmässig einen verhältnismässig hochorganisirten Thelephoreenzustand durchläuft, ehe die Röhren des höher entwickelten Fruchtkörpers in die Erscheinung treten.” Technically this represents sufficient description to assure valid publication of both the generic and the specific name.

Hydnochaete Peck.—‘Hydnaceae’ (see Donk in Taxon 5: 96. 1956).

Hydnochaetella Sacc.—‘Hydnaceae’ (see Donk in Taxon 5: 96. 1956).

Ad *Hydnophysa* P. Henn. — Add under 'TYPE SPECIES': Imazeki (in J. Japan. Bot **11**: 519. 1935) concluded that *Echinodontium tinctorium* and *Hydnofomes tsugicola* were different, although congeneric species.

Ad *Hydnoporia* Murrill. — W. B. Cooke (in *Lloydia* **22**: 186. 1960) listed as type: "*Hydnum squalidum* Fr. (Synonym: *Sistotrema fuscescens* Schw., *Irpex cinnamomeus* Fr.)". This is an error: *Hydnum squalidum* Fr. (Syst. mycol. **1**: 420. 1821) is certainly different from *Sistotrema fuscescens* Schw. Presumably Cooke relied on Fries (Elench. **1**: 139. 1828) who included Schweinitz's species as variety β . under *Hydnum squalidum*.

Ad *Inodermus* Qué. — Add the following at the end of the discussion on "TYPIFICATION": It should be pointed out that the year following the introduction of this genus Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 143. 1887) accepted it and listed as "Espèces principales: *I. hispidus*, *I. cuticularis*, *I. rheades*, etc.", without mention of *Polyporus radiatus* (Sow.) per Fr. in this connection or under any other generic name, however.

Ad *Inonotus* P. Karst. — Add the following REMARK. Patouillard's emendation (Hym. Eur. 140. 1887) of the genus to a group of which he merely cited as "Espèces principales: *I. nidulans*, etc." must be qualified a downright misapplication since the species mentioned was not an original one. Karsten never considered it typical of *Inonotus* and already in 1881 he based *Hapalopilus* P. Karst. on it.

Ad *Irpicochaete* J. Rick. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Irpiciochaete*"; W. B. Cooke in *Lloydia* **22**: 187. 1960.—Presumably an unintentional error.

Ad *Melanopus* Pat. — Add under 'TYPIFICATION' at the end: When Patouillard (in Ann. Crypt. exot **1**: 8. 1928), decided to incorporate *Polyporus scopulosus* Berk. into the genus *Melanopus*, he remarked: "On est donc amené à diviser ce dernier genre ainsi qu'il suit: / 1^o *Carnosi*: *M. squamosus*, *M. radicans*. / 2^o *Lenti*: *M. varius* et analogues (série typique, à chapeau mince). / 3^o *Lignosi*: *M. scopulosus* (. . .)." This shows that Patouillard himself did not regard *Polyporus squamosus* (Huds.) per Fr. as typical of the genus. His "série typique" contained *Polyporus varius* (Pers.) per Fr., "et analogues", which presumably also covers *Polyporus melanopus* (Pers.) per Fr.; Patouillard perhaps considered the latter species synonymous with *P. varius*.

Merulius Haller (non *Merulius* Fr.), *Merulius* Fr., *Merulius* S. F. Gray.—See Donk in *Fungus* **28**: 10, 11. 1958 under *Merulius* Fr. and *Merulius* [Haller] St.-Am. See also Part XIII of the present series (in press).

Ad *Microporus* P. Beauv. per O.K. — Add under 'VALID PUBLICATION', after the remark concerning Hariot, the following paragraph.

Perhaps the first author to accept the generic name definitely was Patouillard [in Ann. Jard. bot., Buitenzorg (Suppl. **1**): 111. 1897]. He did not mention it

separately but used it exclusively as the generic appellation in three specific combinations; it was not validly published by him on that occasion by the lack of a generic description or a valid reference.

Ad *Mucronoporus* Ell. & Ev. — Add to TYPIFICATION the following note: If no previous indications of type species had occurred, one would not hesitate to select *Polyporus tomentosus*: it was the only species fully described and illustrated (*pl. 8*). Of all other species listed (eleven in number) no descriptions were added except some details of the setae. First species, *Polyporus circinatus*, last species, *Polyporus balansae*. Of these two, Murrill (1903) selected the former and W. B. Cooke (1940) the latter. This later indication may perhaps be explained by a remark the authors of the generic name made in the introductory paragraph: "The only described species having this character [viz. having the inner surface of the pores studded with reddish-brown spines exactly as in the hymenium of *Hymenochaete*], so far as we know, is *Polystictus balansae*, Speg., of which Saccardo (in Syll.) remarks that it might well be the type of a new genus ('facile novum genus')." However, this does not imply that it must also be considered type of the generic name *Mucronoporus*.

Myxomyces Mont. in Ann. Sci. nat. (Bot.) IV 1: 137. 1854 (incidental mention). — When publishing *Laschia auriscalpium* Mont., its author mentioned a generic name for it as follows: "La structure est d'ailleurs si différente, que j'avais d'abord été tenté d'en faire un nouveau genre sous le nom de *Myxomyces*..." However, he did not definitely accept this name and, hence, it was not validly published even as an alternative name. *Laschia auriscalpium* will be found mentioned in connection with *Favolaschia*, q.v.

Ad *Ochroporus* J. Schroet. — TYPIFICATION. On the previous occasion I left the choice of the type species undecided between *Polyporus contiguus* (Pers.) per Fr. and *P. igniarius* (L.) per Fr. If the genus *Phellinus* Quél. is taken in the broad sense of Bourdot & Galzin (Hym. France 613. 1928), inclusive of resupinate species, then *Ochroporus* with either species as type becomes a synonym of *Phellinus*. If the resupinate species are excluded then, with *Polyporus contiguus* as type, *Ochroporus* becomes the correct name for the genus which Cunningham (*in* Bull. Dept. sci. ind. Res., Pl. Dis. Div. No. 73: 1. 1948) and other authors have called *Fuscoporia* Murrill (1907); if *P. igniarius* is to be preferred, *Ochroporus* remains a synonym of *Phellinus*.

Moreover, if in the future it appears necessary to split up *Phellinus* sensu Bourd. & G. into smaller genera and at the same time one wants to retain *Polyporus rubriporus* Quél. as its type species, then presumably *Ochroporus* might be a convenient name for a genus typified by *Polyporus igniarius*. The next name to be considered for the *P. igniarius* group would be *Scindalma* [Hill] O.K. (1898) based on a somewhat dubious cushion-shaped (resupinate) species or form of that group. Next in succession would perhaps be *Pseudofomes* Lázaro (1916), but in this case, too, some degree of diversity in opinion on the correct taxonomic interpretation of the type species might be expected.

After a renewed careful examination of the question, I now believe that *P. igniarius* may be retained as type species of *Ochroporus*, and *P. contiguus*, rejected, for the following reasons. The original description reads, "Substanz der Fruchtkörper braun. Sporenpulver weiss; Membran der Sporen farblos. Die übrigen Charactere dieselbe wie bei *Polyporus*." Schroeter mentioned neither the colour of the spore print nor of the spores for *Polyporus contiguus*; in fact nothing is said of either in the description of that species. Also, it is not explicitly mentioned that the context was brown. In contrast, the description of *Polyporus igniarius* states: "Substanz, innen rostbraun" and of the spores, "... Membran farblos...". It thus may be assumed that *P. contiguus* was placed in *Ochroporus* by implication rather than by exact knowledge of certain essential generic characters, and that for this reason, it is not a suitable lectotype. These considerations leave *P. igniarius* as the preferable type species.

Ad *Pelloporus* Quél. — Add following the first paragraph under "TYPIFICATION": Patouillard (Hym. Eur. 143. 1887) took up Quélet's genus immediately after Quélet had introduced it, listing as "Espèces principales: *P. perennis*, *P. Montagnei*, *P. fimbriatus*, etc."

Ad *Phaeoporus* J. Schroet. — I left the choice of the type species undecided between *Polyporus obliquus* (Pers.) per Fr. and *P. cuticularius* (Bull.) per Fr. Recently it became necessary to make a decision, and I now prefer *P. cuticularis* because it is the species which agrees best with the generic description. The latter contains, *inter alia*, "Conidien auf der Oberfläche der Fruchtkörper an kurzen Hyphen abgeschnürt; Membran braun." The only species for which Schroeter described conidia is *P. cuticularis*: "Auf der Oberfläche werden an den jungen Fruchtkörpern oft elliptische Conidien mit glatter brauner Membran abgeschnürt."

Phlebiella P. Karst.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk in *Taxon* 6: 108. 1957 & Part XIII, in press).

Ad *Phyllo dontia* P. Karst. — W. B. Cooke (in *Lloydia* 22: 194. 1960) called the type "*P. magnus* Karst." This is an error for '*Phyllo dontia magnusii* P. Karst.'

Phylloporus Quél.—Boletaceae (see Donk in *Reinwartia* 3: 297. 1955).

Ad *Polystictus* Fr. — Insert the following paragraphs immediately after the word "TYPIFICATION".

Fries (in *K. svenska Vet.-Akad. Handl.* 1848: 127) had conceived the taxon already before he decided to treat it as a distinct genus: originally he fused it with *Trametes* Fr.:

"*Trametes* . . . Post editam Synopsis Hymenomycetum hoc genus valde dilatavimus, huc referentes omnes species suberosas l. lignosas, nec instar *Polypori* genuini e carnosolentas fibrosas, poris haud stratosis in quibus omnibus re ipsa trama a pileo formata adest, licet in diversis speciebus plus minus distincta appareat. — Ad hoc genus, quod majorem partem *Polypororum* exoticorum sibi vindicat . . ."

"Ad stirpem *Tr. perennis* pertinent sequentes species sub *Polyporo* descriptae: a) *poris amplis trama crassa: P. maximus, Schweinizii, rufescens, radicans* (Schwein.!) *connatus* (Schw.); b) *poris minutis, trama tenui: Tr. circinatus, tomentosus, bulbipes* (= *P. oblectans* Be[r]k.?...) *Cladonia* Berk. etc. . . .

"Alteram *Trametes mesopodium* stirpem representat *Polyporus sacer* . . ., cujus plurimas quoque habemus species. — Utraque haec series a *Polyporis* mesopodibus genuinis clare differt; et sub singula *Trametes* tribu redeunt cum his analogae species. Tantum proba distinctione *Trametes* et *Polyporum* facilem proponere licit specierum conspectum."

These remarks tend to show that the later genus *Polystictus* started with the conception of a stirps typified by *Polyporus perennis* (L.) per Fr., in the first place, and a stirps typified by *P. sacer* Afz. ex Fr.

Porodon Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 459. 1821 (nomen nudum); in Nova Acta Soc. Sci. upsal. III 1: 92. 1851 (nomen nudum). — When looking back on the Hymenomyces in a brief survey of the genera, Fries introduced this generic name as a nomen nudum: "POLYPORUS abiens in Hydnum = *Porodon*. (Sistotremat. sp. Pers. *Daedalea* sp. Mihi.)". It is not clear which species he had in mind, but it might have been, for instance, *Daedalea biennis* (Bull.) per Fr., which he accepted on the basis of its original account (Bulliard, Champ. France pl. 449 f. 1. 1789; "v.i."). — I know of only one other mention of the name (cited above): when discussing *Polystictus versatilis* (Berk.) Fr., Fries remarked about it: "Forsan P. venusto proprior vel ad novum genus *Porodon* (typo *P. Acanthoide*) referendus." No generic description was given and the name only provisionally accepted. *Polyporus acanthoides* (Bull. per Mérat) Fr. sensu Fr. (Epicr. 448. 1838) is a form of *Polyporus biennis* (Bull. per Fr.) Fr. as was pointed out by O. Fidalgo (in Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 86: 134. 1959), and closely related to (if not conspecific with) *Polyporus distortus* (Schw.) Steud.: Fr., the type species of the name *Abortiporus* Murrill.

Ptychogaster Corda.—Deuteromycetes (see Part XII of the present series, in press).

Ad *Rigidoporus* Murrill. — VARIANT SPELLING: "*Rigidiiporus*"; W. B. Cooke in *Lloydia* 22: 199. 1960.—Presumably an unintentional error.

Rodwaya H. & P. Syd.—Boletaceae (see Donk in *Reinwardtia* 3: 299. 1955).

Ad *Trametes* Fr. — The type species should be cited as '*Polyporus suaveolens* (L.) per Fr. sensu Fr.' Eriksson [in *Symb. bot. upsal.* 16 (1): 140-146 fs. 44, 45. 1958] has shown that the original *Boletus suaveolens* L. must be equated with *Polyporus odoratus* Sommerf.: Fr. ≡ *Trametes odorata* (Sommerf.) Fr. while Fries's interpretation of it agrees with what is now currently called *Trametes suaveolens*.

Vararia P. Karst.—'Thelephoraceae' (see Donk in *Taxon* 6: 121. 1957).

Ad *Xanthochrous* Pat. — Add under "TYPIIFICATION": Gosselin (in *Farlowia* 1: 526. 1944) remarked that, "In 1900, Patouillard made a new genus *Xanthochrous* based on *P. circinatus*. He described the setae as being straight. Apparently his

X. circinnatus is *P[olyporus] tomentosus* Fr.” This statement is misleading in several respects: there is no indication that Patouillard ‘based’ the name on that species. In both the original account (1897) and that of 1900 (*Essai taxon. Hym.* 100) he listed as examples, *inter alia*, *Polyporus tomentosus* Fr. as well as *P. circinatus* (Fr.) Fr., without adding descriptions. However, in 1900 (f. 56: 4) he depicted a straight seta for *P. circinatus*, but this may be an error and a seta of this species is perhaps depicted in figure 56: 3 as “Cystide de *X. vulpinus* (Fr.)”.