

MYCOLOGICAL NOTES.

BY C. G. LLOYD.

CINCINNATI, O.

No. 27.

JULY, 1907.

CONCERNING THE POLYPOROIDS.

We have just begun a critical study of the polyporoids, but it will probably be several years before we shall do much publishing on the subject. The subject is so extensive, some twenty-eight hundred supposed species, that it will take considerable time before we can get any definite ideas as to the value of them. In the meantime we shall content ourselves with a few notes from time to time on the points that come to our attention in our investigations.

FOMES ROBURNEUS.—This is a very rare species I believe in Europe, and Bresadola states (Mycological Notes, p. 22): "There exists no original specimen of this in Fries' herbarium. According to his diagnosis, and certainly according to specimens of several authors, it is a variety of fomentarius. However, Fries' illustration (Ic. T. 184, f. 2) is an exact picture of the stratified form of roseus."

I was glad to find at Kew type specimens of *Fomes roburneus* from Fries. It belongs to the section *Ganoderma* and has no resemblance to *fomentarius*. I think Fries has given a good description of it in his *Hymenomycetes*, and his specimen accords well with the description. Also it is fairly well represented in his "Icones." I have received this rare plant from Rev. A. Breitung, Charlottenlund, Denmark, which agrees exactly with the Friesian type at Kew. When I was in Sweden, Mr. Romell called my attention to a *Fomes* growing on an oak tree at Drottningholm. If I remember correctly, he thought this was *Fomes roburneus* of Fries, though he told me the Friesian type specimen (he had seen the specimen at Kew) did not agree. I think the specimen at Kew is correctly named, and the *Fomes* we found at Drottningholm is something different, as yet I do not know what.

POLYPORUS BERKELEYI.—When Morgan wrote his account of the polyporoids he had *Polyporus Berkeleyi* correct, but what he should have called *Polyporus frondosus* he called *Polyporus Anax*.¹ It

¹ If the labels were removed from the "type specimens" of the "foreign polyporoids" in the museums of Europe, I do not believe that any man could replace ten per cent of them correctly on the strength of the "descriptions" that have been printed of them. To express opinions of the identity of these plants based on these descriptions is only making trouble.

is very difficult for any one in this country to decide as to the identity of *Polyporus Anax* from the "description," or any other *Polyporus* for that matter. From Morgan's work the impression has been gained in this country that *Polyporus Anax* is a synonym for *Polyporus frondosus*, and Mr. Murrill has recently published that "*Polyporus Anax*, Berk., Grev. 12, 1883, is apparently not specifically distinct from *Polyporus frondosus*."²

The type specimen of *Polyporus Anax* at Kew is a large, thick specimen that has no resemblance to *Polyporus frondosus*. Had Mr. Murrill looked at it he would have known at once that it is *Polyporus Berkeleyi*, and he probably did, but forgot it, in the mass of details that he attempted to learn as to ten thousand different specimens, of twenty-eight hundred alleged different species, in a dozen different museums, during a short vacation trip. *Polyporus Anax* is the manuscript name that Berkeley wrote on the specimen when he received it from Lea (No. 547). He sent it to Fries under the same number (547) and Fries described it (1851) and named it *Polyporus Berkeleyi*. It was undoubtedly the same collection, for Fries quotes the same number. Berkeley probably forgot it, for he lists the name, "*Polyporus Anax*, B.," in his *Notices of North American Fungi* (1872), though he had never described it under that name.³ It was one of the species that was dug up from Berkeley's herbarium and published by Cooke after Berkeley had retired from the work.

POLYPORUS FRONDOSUS.—Mr. Murrill, in a recent number of the *Journal of the New York Botanical Garden*, gives an interesting note on *Polyporus frondosus*. He states that the Italian chestnuts are often attacked at the base of the trunk by this polyporoid and that it is thought to do considerable damage. The peasants are so fond of eating the fungus that they will not report its presence lest preventive measures be taken by the Government. Of more interest to me, however, than this item is the fact that he employs the name which everybody else uses, "*Polyporus frondosus*," less than two years since he published elaborate arguments to show that it should be called "*Grifola frondosa* (Dicks) S. F. Gray." Mr. Murrill is a good man and has a good knowledge of polyporoids, and I hope his contact with the mycologists of Europe has convinced him of the utter futility of attempting to force on the mycological world the absurd nomenclature that results from the system, adopted unfortunately by the institution with which he is connected. I meet a great many mycologists in my

² Of course he does not use the name "*Polyporus*" but invents a little, private designation of his own. We are quite willing to discuss the specific identity or differences of species, but we expect to employ a language that can be understood by our readers. For the benefit of the future when we quote from any of the modern authors who amuse themselves by shuffling around the names of the polyporoids, we shall translate their names into the usual mycological language.

³ He had called it "*Polyporus subgiganteus*, n. s." when he received it from another collector.

travels and I have never met, and I think Mr. Murrill has never met, a single man who takes any stock whatever in this system. I think Mr. Murrill has done good work, and a part of the most valuable work he has done, is that of demonstrating in a graphic manner the folly and inutility of this method of changing names, and showing the confusion that would result if any one else paid any attention to it. As he has apparently abandoned "*Grifola frondosa*," let us hope that he has abandoned them all, for he is too good a man to be hampered by such foolishness.

NEW SPECIES.

The more specimens we receive from all portions of the world, the more strongly we become convinced that fungi are plants of wide distribution, and that the *fungus flora of the world is practically the same*. Dr. Kurt Dinter, from German Southwest Africa, has just sent us a fine collection of four species. Three of these, *Geaster fornicatus*, *Geaster asper*, and *Geaster saccatus*, are *absolutely the same* plants that grow in Europe and the United States. The other, *Broomeia congregata*, is well known, but only from Africa. Nine-tenths of the current literature of fungi consists of descriptions of supposed "new species" of fungi. A large part of it originates, I believe, only in the imagination, or inexperience, or lack of knowledge, or lack of opportunities of the authors. Thus, *Geaster asper* was fairly well illustrated by Micheli two hundred years ago. It was beautifully illustrated from England by Purton a hundred years ago, although to-day it will not be found included in any English list of *Geasters*. It grows fairly common around Paris, and has been brought into the museum several times since I have been here. What does it avail to "describe" it as a "new species" (*Geaster campestris* from the United States or *Geaster pseudomammosus* from Europe), when neither of the authors could take collections from the United States, Europe and South Africa and tell one from the other? There have been one hundred and twenty-seven *Geasters* described, and I have seen and studied practically all, and I can find but *forty-six* possible *differences* on which to base names. Seventeen of these are better called forms or varieties.

There is no use of railing about new species-making. There is no one but that has more or less of a touch of the fever. We are all more or less affected with the disease, not excepting the writer. It has been the curse of mycology since the beginning, and is getting worse and worse. It required eight volumes of Saccardo to record the accumulation of this matter during the first ninety years of the work. It required ten to include the additions during the last sixteen years. The appearance of Saccardo has been a great boon to new species-making. While no one can tell anything more about the plants now than he could before, he can at least hunt through the indices and make new names.

Dr. Hollós, who says some very good things (and does some very

bad ones) writes on the subject of new species: "If Nature had spent her millions of years in experimenting, she probably could not have produced as many different species of fungi as have been scribbled together by mankind in one century. In the fourteen volumes of Saccardo's *Sylloge Fungorum*, 47,304 species are described. Thanks to the species manufacturing mania of his predecessors the true investigator is compelled to waste the greater part of his energy and time with the compilation of names of the same meaning, synonyms and superfluous, empty names." Since Dr. Hollós wrote the above, *only four years ago*, four volumes of Saccardo have appeared and 10,711 "new species" added, making the total 58,015, or probably 60,000 at the present writing. Who knows them all? Or who knows even a tenth part of them? Or who could ever be able to learn one-tenth part of them in a life-time? The subject of mycology is too large for any one man to master now in detail. From the very nature it must work into the hands of special students of special families, and I believe only by this means can anything permanent be accomplished. I do not condemn new species simply because they are claimed to be new. I have seen in the *Gastromycetes* a great many that I have condemned because I did not find them new, but I have found many that appear to me to be well founded. Notwithstanding the "sixty thousand" there are a great many new ones yet to be named. Not in Europe I believe, nor to a much greater extent in America, but in that vast region known vaguely as "foreign lands," where all that has been done with mycology is but a small beginning. Any one who secures extensive material from these "foreign lands" and attempts to monograph it after he has learned as far as possible all that is known on the special subject, will be embarrassed with the forms he finds for which he has no names. By far the greater part of foreign material consists of species widely distributed and common in Europe and America, but a large part of the species of these foreign lands that are in any degree local are as yet unknown. If these foreign lands are worked in future as at present, Saccardo's "sixty thousand" names will be swollen to one hundred and sixty thousand before he is through with it. There is no way of even guessing approximately the number of species that exist that are good. If I were to guess on the *Gastromycetes*, basing my guess on what I have learned in the six or seven years I have worked on this one subject I should guess about five hundred. Over a thousand are included in Saccardo now, but I think about one out of three is "good," and that there are enough additional not known to make up the half. On this basis there would be about 30,000 fungi if all were correctly known.

NEW GENERA.—I note in a recent pamphlet that some more "new genera" have been discovered. "*Derminus*" for *Crepidotus*, *Galera* and *Hebeloma*. *Agaricus* for the white-spored species. "*Hyporhodium*" for *Pluteus*, *Claudopus*, etc. I wonder whose pipe dream these are. Smoke up. The number of "new genera" you can discover by this system of juggling is only limited by your ability to invent new names.

NOTES OF TRAVEL. LEIDEN.

A second visit to Leiden was made chiefly to buy some of the rare works of Persoon that were offered at auction in the sale of Oudemans's library. It is probable that Persoon as he tramped over Germany and France hunting fungi never imagined that the day would ever come when one would travel half across Europe for the opportunity to buy a few of his books; or that any one would pay two or three pounds for some of his pamphlets that originally sold for a few francs.

I found much more life and energy in the Botanical Museum at Leiden than on my previous visit. There is a new director now, Mr. J. P. Lotsy, who has succeeded in instilling some new life. On my previous visit, while the specimens on sheets in Persoon's herbarium were in good condition, the specimens in boxes were in bad shape and it was not practicable to work with them. All has now been changed, due to careful work on the part of Dr. W. J. Jongmans who has charge of Persoon's herbarium. The specimens have all been poisoned and each placed in a glass covered box. It is evident that they are beginning to appreciate at Leiden the historic value of Persoon's herbarium. I had not seen these boxes before and they throw some additional light on the puff ball history.

NOTES ON PERSOON'S HERBARIUM.

LYCOPERDON CRUCIATUM.—It has been supposed that Persoon illustrated this plant under the name *Lycoperdon candidum*. I think this is probably true though the figure is not certain and there are no specimens so labeled in his herbarium. That he did not have a comprehensive knowledge of the species is however evident as I found some characteristic though depressed specimens labeled by Persoon, *Lycoperdon depressum*. He never published it under that name.

LYCOPERDON MOLLE.—Additional specimens in boxes confirm our account of this plant as given in footnote, p. 209. A correct idea of *Lycoperdon molle* according to Persoon's views is our figure 4, Plate 42.

CALVATIA SACCATA.—Specimens are labeled by Persoon, "*Lycoperdon excipuliforme*, Schaeff." If modern botanists would use this there would not be the same objection to it there is when they write "*Lycoperdon excipuliforme*, Scop." Schaeffer did not propose the name and Scopoli did not indicate this plant under the name, so I think it is erroneous to use it in the sense of either of these authors.

SCLERODERMA AURANTIUM.—There are several collections of this common species. Some are labeled "*Lycoperdon aurantiacum*, Bull., *Scleroderma citrinum*, Pers. Syn." thus proving that Persoon considered his species *citrinum* a synonym for Bulliard's figure. He kept them distinct in his Synopsis but the specimens were probably labeled afterwards.

A NEW GALERA.—*Galera kellermani* is the latest from America. It has the advantage over most in being well illustrated. It was probably named for doctor w. a. kellerman.

A LEARNED INDIVIDUAL.

If you read French you will probably be amused as I was when I ran across the following title page in purchasing books in Paris. I had not the pleasure of an acquaintance with Dr. Hussenot, but judging from the number of "learned" Societies of which he was *not* a member, he seems to have been a pretty smart fellow.

Chardons Nauceiens,
ou
Prodrome
d'un
Catalogue des Plantes
de la Lorraine.
1er fascicule
Par le Docteur Hussenot.
Qui n'est rien ; pas même médecin ; membre d'aucune acad. ;
corresp. d'aucune soc. savante ; qui n'est ni de la soc.
royale des sciences, lettres et art de Nancy ; ni de
la soc. cent. d'agricult. de la même ville ; pas
plus de la soc. d'émulation des Vosges que de
celle philomathique de Verdun, ou d'aucune
de celles de Metz : directeur d'aucun jar-
din public ou particulier ; conservateur
d'aucune collection, autre que la
sienne, qui se mange des bêtes ;
redacteur de rien du tout ; en-
fin, simple citoyen comme
tout le monde hors qu'il
n'est pas décoré.

NOMENCLATURE.

The following letter is from one of the leading mycologists of the United States, but I do not give his name as I do not wish to draw him into a discussion of the subject :

"Please accept my thanks for yours of the 15th instant naming the *Calvatia* sent you, and also for another of your printed letters, this time No. 10. I am not sure that you can introduce a system of nomenclature that will gain general adoption, but I do believe there is a great deal of sense in what you say concerning this subject. The attempt to make priority the decisive thing in regard to the selection of names can never work well in regard to the names of fungi, whatever we may say of the method as applied to the nomenclature of flowering plants. I am sure, too, you pursue the correct method in trying to determine what the names of European origin mean.

"I hope you will find sufficient encouragement to warrant you in devoting your time and opportunities to the matter. We are all interested in your success."

I am not trying to "introduce a system of nomenclature that will gain general adoption." I quit indulging in day dreams years ago. I am only trying to show the advantage of using the names that are of *value from historical truth and from general use*. And I believe, if mycological writers in general would rely on these principles alone in the selection of names, it would only be a short time until we should be in practical accord. There is an "if" in that sentence, however, that has a great deal of bearing on it. Before we can hope to have authors adopt names solely on their merits, the personal advertisements must be eliminated. That will never be done. There are too many men whose interest in mycology is chiefly that of getting up "new combinations" or "new names," with this main object in view. They will never consent to have the "reward of their labor" taken away. And as long as it is so easy to shuffle names about and obtain this "reward" it will be done.

CALVATIA RUBROFLAVA IN BRAZIL.

Rev. J. Rick writes me that the species is "here common and grows in sandy places *everywhere*." Is it not strange that this plant known heretofore only from the United States and rare there so far as known (excepting in one locality, Lafayette, Ind.), should prove a common species in Brazil? When the science of mycology gets past its babyhood, and mycological observers turn their attention from the hunt for "new species" to the study and distribution of the old, then we can expect some interesting developments. We are well convinced that the "puff balls" of the world are largely the same species and that the number of species is relatively few. But their distribution presents some curious surprises. Witness the case of *Arachnion album* fairly common in the United States and known in Europe from only one collection (Italy). Or *Bovistella Ohiensis*, a most abundant plant in our Southern States and known in Europe from one collection each from Germany and Spain. Or *Mitremyces Ravenelii* of our Appalachian regions which proves to be a *common species* in Japan. Or, *Lycoperdon Wrightii* which occurs in North and South America, Java and Africa but has never been found in Europe. Truly we are just beginning the real study of mycology.

LASIOSPHAERA FENZLII IN SUMATRA.—In the museum at Leiden I saw a large specimen of this plant, collected in Sumatra. It was over a foot in diameter and all trace of peridium had fallen away. We think that our account of this plant (Myc. Notes, p. 191) and its habits is entirely correct. It is the "giant puff ball" of India and the East Indies and seems there to replace *Calvatia gigantea* of the remainder of the world.

MYCOLOGICAL "LITERATURE."—Much of the mycological "literature" nowadays reminds me of one of the patent carpet sweepers that sweeps up the trash and carries it along with it. Thus, sixty years ago, Tulasne wrote a monograph of the Nidulariaceae. He hunted up all the old references and pictures, reduced them to synonymy and listed them in detail. For the three common species he gives sixty-one references, which was information at that time, as it was original work. In 1902 Miss White, New York, writes again on the Nidulariaceae, and gives with the same detail forty-one references, thirty-six of them being copied with a few changes from Tulasne. In 1904 Dr. Hol-lós writes on the Nidulariaceae, and we find the same old list served up with a little rearrangement, and a few additions, but practically the same thing. The whole list is rubbish, and should have been dropped (in detail) after Tulasne had shown it up.

CAPITALIZING SPECIFIC NAMES.—As we note that the Journal of Mycology is printing personal specific names in lower case type, we suppose there is some new "rule" on the subject. The editor is a great stickler for "rules." We think it is really a good rule, for personal names are without doubt used too much for plant names, and seeing their names in lower case type ought to take some of the conceit out of the system. In our own case if we ever experienced any secret pleasure in seeing "*Hypocrea Lloydii*" in type, it was more than counterbalanced by the disgust we felt when we saw it printed as "*Hypocrea lloydii*"

REPUBLICATION OF NOS. 1, 2, 3 AND 4 MYCOLOGICAL NOTES.—In order to supply the frequent demand we have republished the first four numbers. They will be mailed to any one on application to the Lloyd Library, Cincinnati, Ohio.

We are now in position to complete most of the sets of our publication, with the exception of The Volvae and Mycological Notes Nos. 12, 13 and 14 and 19, the latter having recently become exhausted.

BOUDIER'S PLATES.

The following extract is from a letter from Prof. Geo. F. Atkinson. It is in keeping with our feeling that Boudier's are the most perfect plates that have been ever issued.

"I presume you know that the Library at Cornell at my instigation has been from the first a subscriber to Boudier's Plates for a complete set. When I was in Paris in 1903 I spent half a day looking through Boudier's original illustrations with him. I recognized in them at that time the finest illustrations of this character which I had ever seen. Added to Mr. Boudier's talent as an artist, we have the work of a very careful scientific man in connection with accurate mechanical work in measuring and obtaining the exact proportions of the different parts of the plant. At that time he told me his method was to obtain absolute accuracy of form and proportions. I regard them as the finest set of Mycological plates which have ever been published."

I also have a letter from Professor Peck on the same subject.

"Boudier's plates seem to me to be about as near perfection as we can hope to get at present. Only a single weak point has suggested itself to me and that is in the failure to show the color of the young gills in the few species of *Cortinarius* figured. I suspect that you yourself, who have so valiantly championed photographic illustrations of fungi, will acknowledge that these figures are better than photographs."

I have no hesitation whatever in stating that such plates as Boudier has issued are vastly superior to any photographs that could be produced. If the quality of mycological plates was up to the standard of Boudier no criticism could be offered as to this method of illustration. Unfortunately, however, the great majority of plates of agarics that have been issued are so poor that they do not at all represent the plants. And all that I maintain about photographic illustrations is that a good photograph is vastly superior to a poor drawing, and that a large part of the colored plates are very poor.

Professor Morgan writes:

"These plates are the ideal of perfection. They are models for work in illustration both artistic and scientific."

Professor H. C. Beardslee writes:

"Boudier's plates are certainly fine, and it makes one feel that good work is really worth while. I felt more like careful work after I had looked over them."

Professor W. A. Kellerman writes:

"I had thought you praised Boudier's plates too highly, but I see now you did not commit any extravagance."

The library or individual who is interested in this line of work and who can afford it, and does not subscribe for Boudier's plates as they are issued is making a mistake. But a few years will pass I think until these plates will become as rare and as high priced in the book market as Sibthorp's "Flora of Greece."



Lloyd, C. G. 1907. "Mycological Notes, No. 27." *Mycological writings of C. G. Lloyd* 2, 341–348.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/59611>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/328823>

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>.