Each perithecium contains many 8-spored, cylindric, thin-walled asci 7—9 µ wide and 90—120 µ long, with thin, rounded top. The spores are uniseriate, colourless, 3-septate, fusiform, tapering towards the tips, 3—4 µ wide, 16—20 µ long, with cubic cells. Pycnidia are not present.

The species under consideration differs from *Thelidium* in its gonidia and the fusiform spores; from *Porina* in its gonidia and the diffusent paraphyses. It represents, it would seem, a new genus. Although Pyrenotrichaceae have Scytonema-gonidia the genus may be provisionally assigned to this family.

Cyanoporia Groenh., *gen. nov.*

Thallus crustaceus, homoiomericus, gonidiis Stygonemataceis. Apothecia pyrenocarpica, globosa; nucleus gonidiis hymenialibus destitutus; asci 8-spori, leptodermatici; sporiae decolores, horizontaliter septatae, cellulis cubicis. Pycnidia ignota.

Cyanoporia granulosa Groenh., *sp. nov.* —Fig. 1

Thallus pulvinato-crustaceus, homoio-mericus, dispersus granulosus Groenh. with three perithecia; *b*, vel continuus granulosus, opa-
types of gonidia; *c*, gonidia with gomodial cus substrato arete adnatus, hyphae; *d*, ascus; *e*, spore.

* Strobilomancha Donk, *gen. nov.*

Stygomyotrichaceae. Perithecium numerosa, solitaria, minitissima, globosa, implausa, fulvescentia, 110—130 µ. diametro, poro ignoto; nucleus albidus, iodo non reagens; asci cylindrici, longitudine 90—120 µ, crassitudine 1—9 µ, membrana tenui; sporiae 8-nae, decolores, fusiformes, rectae, 3-septatae, loculis cubicis, aequalibus 3—4 X 16—20 µ, membrana tenui. Pycnidia ignota.

TYPE. —JAVA. West Java. Mt. Gegerbentang, on bark of *Phoebe declinata*, over mosses, lichens, and detritus, alt. 1310 m, April 19, 1950, comm. C. C. Schrotter 5031 (Eg. 5758).

**THE GENERIC NAMES PROPOSED FOR HYMENOMYCETES—I

"Cyphellaceae"

M. A. DONK *

SUMMARY

1. The present paper is the first of a series intended to deal from a nomenclatural point of view with all the generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes. For each name the following items are considered: (i) its etymology and gender, (ii) the original scope of the corresponding genus, and, in case of the name being an isonym, also of the group covered by its basinym; (iii) the type species, which when not originally designated, is selected; (iv) its basinym, synonyms, homonyms, tylonyms, and variant spellings, if any, are indicated; (v) its status under the Rules is determined; and (vi) supplementary remarks are given when these are deemed useful.

2. This first instalment deals with "Cyphellaceae," a group defined in a conventional, rather descriptive, manner, not as a taxonomic unit.

3. A new generic name, *Stromatoscypha* Donk, is introduced for *Porothelium* (Pr. ex Fr.) Fr.

4. The following new combinations are made: *Aleurodiscus digitalis* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Donk [basinym: *Cyphella digitalis* (A. & S.) ex Fr.], and *Stromatoscypha fimбриata* (Pers. ex Fr.) Donk [basinym: *Polyporus fimбриatus* (Pers.) ex Fr.].

INTRODUCTION TO THE SERIES.—A few words may be said about the origin of the present series. For about twelve years before World War II hit Java, I was engaged in the preparation of a "Genera of Hymeno-
mycetes." It soon appeared that the application of many generic names was uncertain and rather than using them in a haphazard manner I tried to find out more about them in order to apply them as correctly as possible. This proved an arduous task. When it was completed, the "Genera" were sent to the printer’s. As a consequence of the war, the text that went to the printer’s, the already printed sheets, as well as the trunk containing the carbon-copy, nearly all of the notes on which the manuscript was based, and about 500 especially prepared illustrations were destroyed. However, a carbon-copy of the nomenclatural part, abandoned several years before the book was finished, was retrieved. It lacked, of course, all the corrections and additions made between its storing-away and the finishing of the final manuscript. I have not seriously tried to cover once more the entire
A second flood was published in anticipation of the international regulations promised several years ago but not yet agreed upon when those lists were published: Clements & Shear (all groups of fungi), Singer & A. H. Smith (Agaricaeae), W. B. Cooke (Polyporaceae), Imazeki (Polyporaceae), Doty (Clavarioid and Chondrelloideae fungi), and Donk (Agaricaeae).

Strictly speaking this second flood was premature. Each author trusted that his personal code was sound and would appear to be pretty well identical with the regulations to come. The idea that long lists of type species would be sanctioned as a whole was an opinion tacitly adopted before hand by some authors and perhaps induced by certain lists of proposals for planerograms, such as "Species leototiquea generum Linnaei."

I have committed myself in some papers in which numerous type species for generic names of Hymenomycetes were selected, but want to emphasize that, after the war, the reasons for their publication before the Stockholm Congress was held, were rather of a special nature. In the first place the selecting of type species was done strictly in relation to proposals for conservation and rejection of generic names, in the second place as a reaction to a published list of proposed lectotypes. One never could tell on what actions a Congress might decide and it was playing safe to place the pros and, more in particular, the cons before the public in time.

The present paper forms the first part of a series planned to give a nomenclatural and annotated enumeration of all generic names proposed for Hymenomycetes. The manuscripts of this series now reaches completion, but I hesitate to send it to the printer's as a whole because of the changes recently made in the "International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature" at the Stockholm Congress, some of which are drastic and have still to be studied as to their consequences. Viewpoints adopted until recently will have to be revised and this may give rise to several alterations, and renewed consultation of an extensive amount of literature will be necessary. Therefore, it was decided to postpone the publication of the bulk of the work and to publish it in sections, the smaller ones first.

An attempt has been made to include all generic names effectively published as or after the introduction of the Linnean system of nomenclature, whether of not they were validly published. A distinction is made between, (i) names that are pre-Frilian, that is, published before the starting-point date of Hymenomycetes (lichenes excepted), 1821, and have never been taken up after that date, (ii) names published after the
starting-point date but not validly published, and (iii) names validly published after the starting-point date. The former two categories are more casually dealt with (names spaced) than the third (names in bold-faced type). Names treated between square brackets are considered to belong to other than Hymenomycetous fungi, although they are or were included in that group. An alphabetical sequence will be followed in each paper.

The registration of names in this series, even when they are considered validly published or priorable, does not denote the author's intention to assign to them any other status under the Rules than the one they actually possess. New names or new recombinations will be unambiguously indicated.

A few terms require an explanation.

Devalidated names. These were published between the starting-point date and 1753 and would have been validly published if the starting-point date of the groups to which they belong had not been changed from 1753 to a later one. I am well aware that even these names are sometimes considered validly published though 'illegitimate.' This view may be interpreted as indicating that they count in matters of homonymy as exactly as names validly published after their starting-point date. This view is not generally accepted and as a rule devalidated names are left out of consideration in homonymy questions. One point is certain: devalidated names are at least 'illegitimate' (= imprerable).

Priorable and improvable names. A priorable name is a name validly published after the starting-point date and counting in priority considerations; it may become a correct name if it be the earliest given to a group in a certain circumscription and rank and including its type. Validly published names may be imprerable for various reasons; they may be later homonyms, nomina confusa, and so on. It would seem that the equivalents in the Rules as altered at the Stockholm Congress might be 'legitimate' and 'illegitimate' names, but it is certain that 'legitimate' is still too loosely applied, even misunderstood, and is confusingly defined; and that its antonym 'illegitimate' has as yet no strict meaning at all. Therefore, Furtado's terms 'priorable' and 'improvable' are to be preferred in anticipation of improvements in the definitions of the other set of terms. A name may be of a restricted priorability: a nomen anamorphosis is imprerable in regard to the corresponding perfect state, but if applied only to imperfect fungi it may well be priorable.

Nomen anamorphosis. The name is based on an imperfect state,

Protonym. Neither a devalidated nor a validly published though effectively published name, but taken up and validly published afterwards.

Typonym. A name having the same type as another name which is neither its basynim nor a synonym. As long as the Rules say that a generic name has a species as its type, names having the same type species might be called typonyms. However, the ultimate type, the material basis of a generic name, comparable to the type of a species, may well be different in such a set of typonyms and I would prefer to define a 'typonym' as a name having the same ultimate type as another name not having the basynim-isnonym relation. This narrow and preferable meaning is not adopted in the present series.

Synonym. Names having the same basynim.

Monadelphia homonym. A devalidated generic name may have been validly re-published (after the starting-point date) independently by two or more authors, often in such a manner that different groups with different type species (by selection or 'original designation') are involved. These species may be original ones of the devalidated name, or species included afterwards, but prior to the starting-point date. Of such a resulting set of monadelphia homonyms, severed from their common source by Art. 20, the later members are here treated as mere applications (often 'misapplications') of the earliest one.

Typonym homonym. Typonyms that are at the same time homonyms. In these cases, too, the later name is here treated as an application of the earlier one.

Definition of "Cyphellaceae." — The "Cyphellaceae" are now often accepted as a special family of Hymenomycetes. However, the circumscription has not yet become stabilized and the contents are still steadily increasing. The family name is here placed between inverted commas for several reasons to be stated in detail in a forthcoming taxonomical paper; one of the reasons is the fact that the group is extremely heterogeneous and unnatural.

The limits set to the "family" are the more generally adopted ones of to-day, i.e. included are such Hymenomycetes-Homobasidiaceae as have their smooth (or somewhat wrinkled) hynemium lining the hollowed-out (or flat), downward looking side of the fruit-body, the attachment of the latter to the substratum being at the opposite, sterile side (and never exactly marginal). The "disc" is never compounded by partitions sterile on edge, although more or less pronounced gill-like folds may occur.
Numerous fruit-bodies may be crowded on a resupinate stroma; in such cases the whole may form a fruit-body of higher order.

Excluded are the following genera which have been entered, or suggested for entrance, into the "family":

Arrhenia Fr. ("Thelephoraceae"),
Campanella P. Henn. ("Agaricaceae"),
Carstia O.K. (Podostrombiaceae Kame, Hypolyssus "Berk., etc." ("Clavariaceae"),
Daercyobulus Fr. ("Hydnaceae"),
Discocephyla P. Henn. ("Thelephoraceae"),
Elytobolus Pat. ("Thelephoraceae"),
Poroloma (Pat.) Pat. (including Poroclothea Pat.) ("Polycomaraceae"),
Platybulla Bul, ex Fr. ("Polycomaraceae"),
Podostroma Quél. ("Clavariaceae"),
Punctularia Pat. ("Thelephoraceae"),
Stevenskyllum P. Karst. ("Thelephoraceae"),
and Trogia Fr. ("Agaricaceae").

On the other hand one will encounter below some names not definitely associated with this "family" before, viz. Merisnidae (the type of which is an avowed species of "Cyphellus"), Pleurotopeae, and Pileatraceae. Their 'gills,' if any, are not at all comparable to those of the true agarics and represent mere folds of the hymenial layer like the folds in Matalus. Their fruit-bodies are 'Cypheloid' at least in origin. Penicillioidea and Wiesenriina, with pinhead-shaped fruit-bodies, agree more closely with the definition of the present group than with the "Thelephoraceae" and are, therefore, listed in this paper.

The number of genera could have been increased easily if the definition above were strictly adhered to, for instance with Stevenson & Cash in Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 35: 42. 1936. — A 'McInty' name, not accepted by the author who published it, and to be valued as a provisional name. It was introduced under Aleurocyrtus maydensis Lloyd as follows:—

"It is the only Aleurocyrtus known with subbasitunicate texture and cystidia except Aleurocyrtus nemorus which is probably the same. A 'new genus' (Aleurocyrtus McInty) could be based on its texture and presence of cystidia."—Lloyd (2).

G. W. Martin (in Lloydia 5: 161. 1942) considered the two species mentioned by Lloyd, as well as Corticium hakagallae ("hakagallae") Berk. & Br., as conspecific; the chlamydosporic state of C. hakagallae is Matula parasponiformis (Berk. & Br.) Mass., the type species of Matula Mass. (1888; nomon anamorphosis). Martin also identified Matula montisellii (J. K. & C. Lloyd with M. parasponiformis. I can not yet follow Martin in all these conclusions (which were not all of them reached by an actual study of specimens). W. H. Cooke (in Mycologia 13: 208. 1961) follows Martin.

GENERAL REMARK ON THE MCGINTY NAMES.—C. G. Lloyd coined and published several names in a jocular spirit. Thus, in his "Mycological Writings," a facilest Prof. McInty acted as the author of a number of new names, of which, in the present paper, Aleurocyrtus is a good example. Lloyd's intention was to ridicule and ridicule certain mycologists he labeled as 'name jugglers,' 'splitters' and 'new species hunters.' One point emerges incontestably: the McInty names were not acceptable to Lloyd himself, the publishing author. However, he repeatedly admonished future authors not to forget the existence of the McInty names, which he apparently considered validly published. This is clear: these names belong to the class of nonnamnon-accepted. Not being accepted by the publishing author, they were "merely proposed in anticipation of the future acceptance of the group concerned, or of a particular circumscription, position, or rank of the group," and hence were not validly published.

Many of the McInty names were often purposely and somewhat maliciously coined after bad examples, and served as punishment in store for those who dared to deviate from the usually rather crude taxonomical views to which Lloyd adhered. A number of the names in question were published as nonnamnon-accepted. Some were taken up by subsequent authors and validly published on such an occasion.

Stevenson & Cash, in their valuable "The New Fungi Names Proposed by C. G. Lloyd" (in Bull. Lloyd Libr. No. 36: 1980) brought together all of that author's new names, inclusive of McInty's. Several of these names were originally accompanied by insufficient descriptions or were perfect examples of nomen nudum. To such names the two compilers added Lloyd's own herbarium-notes when available and when not previously published; these notes often amount to descriptions. They were offered purely as a matter of record and Stevenson & Cash (p. 5) were careful in pointing out that in their book, "No attempt has been made to evaluate or to discuss critically the species [and genera] here listed. For instance, we have included most of the names published by Lloyd under the "non namnon-accepted" N. J. McInty as a matter of record since upon critical study a few of these at least may be found [taxonomically] valid." Therefore, in their compilation we will find the McInty names effectively re-published and some of them with an accompanying description, but it is evident: that in the light of Art. 37 Inc. the "publishing author," in this case Stevenson &
Cash, did not ensure their valid publication. They had no intention to do so ("incidental mention").

**Aleurodiscus** Rab. ex J. Schröter. *in Cohn, Krypt.-Fl. Schles. 3 (1): 429. 1888. — ETYMOLOGY: *aleuros*, flour; *discus*, round plate. Gender: m. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): *Peziza anamorpha* Pers. = *Thelephora anamorpha* Pers. ex Fr. = *Aleurodiscus anamorphus* (Pers. ex Fr.) J. Schröter. 1 — PROTONYM: *Aleurodiscus* Rab, Fung, europ. exs. No. 1824. 1874; in Hedwigia 13: 184. 1874.—This name was published as a nomen nudum: no description. It should be noted that the distributed specimens are accompanied by a printed label showing drawings of microscopic hymenial elements of the only species attributed to the genus by Rabenhorst, *Peziza anamorpha*. However, as the species was not a new one, the name *Aleurodiscus* was not validly published even by the provision of a "plate with analyses showing essential characters." — VALID PUBLICATION. The following is quoted from Cooke:

"On *Corticium anamorphum*. Price. . . . In 1872, Mr. C. H. Peck described in the 24th Report of the State Museum of New York (p. 96), a new genus under the name of *Nodularia*, for the reception of a fungus found by him on the bark of *Abies balsamea*. . . . [Having] been favoured by Mr. Peck with specimens, it became at once evident that he had met with the *Peziza anamorpha* of Persoon, of which his *Nodularia balsamica* is a synonym. . . . [This fungus] cannot well be referred to any constituted genus, except such as have been constructed to receive it as the type. These, apparently, are two—the *Nodularia*, of Peck (1872), and *Aleurodiscus*, of Rabenhorst (1874). The claim of priority on the part of Peck is, however, not sustained by the fact of *Nodularia* being appropriately by Karsten, in his *Monographia Pediarmum Fennica*um*, p. 194 (in 1869), for a Pezizoid fungus . . . Although he only uses it with the value of a subgenus, it is a prior name. . . . *Aleurodiscus* appears to have the best claim for acceptance. . . ."—Cooke in *Grevillea* 3: 136-137. 1875.

Donk (in Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 17: 156, 159-160. 1941) at first thought that Cooke, who definitely accepted the name *Aleurodiscus* and definitely identified it with *Nodularia* Peck, validly published the name *Aleurodiscus* by a reference to Peck's generic name, and that consequently *Aleurodiscus* Rab. ex Cooke had to be considered an isonym of *Nodularia* Peck, and accordingly based on *N. balsamica* rather than on the distributed specimens of Rabenhorst. This opinion was subscribed to by D. P. Rogers & Jackson (in *Farlowia* 1: 269. 1943). I can no longer maintain this view (see Donk in Bull. bot. Gdns Buitenzorg III 18: 88. 1949). The only reference that could have ensured valid publication for *Aleurodiscus* as used by Cooke, is the one to *Aleurodiscus* Rab., the avowed and

1 This recombination is ascribed to J. Schroeter rather than to Rabenhorst (or Cooke).

of course, only basionym, the valid publication of which was not questioned by Cooke, and, because that reference is to an invalidly published name without a description, it is worthless. The ‘reference’ to *Nodularia* Peck is a mere quotation of an other name in synonymy under *Aleurodiscus* Rab., and should evidently not be acceptable as a valid reference! Nothing can be detected in Cooke's account that could be valued as a valid (generic) description: the taxonomical (and partly quite erroneous) remarks all apply to *Peziza anamorpha* as a species, and not to *Aleurodiscus* as a genus. It is useless to interpret this descriptive matter as a description generico-specifica, since Rabenhorst's and Cooke's monotypic genus was not based on a new species. Compare also Cooke in *Grevillea* 3: 172. 1875. — Thus I return to the established view that the first to publish validly the name *Aleurodiscus* was Schroeter. This author was well aware of the status of Rabenhorst's name, for he added after the name "(Ohne Diagnose)." He supplied a generic diagnosis. — SPOERI. Schroeter included, besides *Peziza anamorpha*, a second species, — TYPOIFICATION. The species for which the name was introduced, and which was first especially indicated as the type by Burt (in Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn 5: 177. 1918) has been accepted by subsequent authors. — NOMEN CONSERVANDUM. The type species of *Cyphelka* Fr. (1822), *C. digita*is, is unique among the original members of that genus, and belongs, in my opinion, in the same genus as *Aleurodiscus anamorphus*, even if we restrict the latter genus to species with enormous basidia and voluminous spores. Thus it would become necessary to accept the name *Cyphelka* for what is now called *Aleurodiscus*. This would require new combinations for all members of the latter genus, except *Cyphelka digitalis* (A. & S.) ex Fr. and perhaps one or two other species. The remainder of the species of *Cyphelka* are to be located under one or more other generic names, if one regards *C. digitalis* as generically different from them, whether or not one retains the name *Aleurodiscus* or substitutes it by *Cyphelka*. So this point can be no hindrance in conserving *Aleurodiscus*. This was proposed by Donk (i.e. 1941). With the latter name conserved, *Cyphelka* remains free to be applied to all not yet properly classifiable species already described under that generic name, although it should be kept in mind that such a use is legally improper and only of a temporary character. For a considerable number of species of *Aleurodiscus* the name *Cyphelka* would be a misnomer. The proposal was supported by D. P. Rogers (in *Farlowia* 3: 483. 1949; 4: 15. 1950), and was provisionally adopted at the Stocke—

2 Cooke, as we have seen, rejected *Nodularia* Peck as being preoccupied and continued: *Aleurodiscus* appears to have the best claim for acceptance, since the original name of Persoon (*Peziza*) cannot well be retained."


Calypella Quélet, Ench. Fung. 216. 1886. — ETYMOLoGY: zelus, hidden. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): Cyphella cyclopis (Holm sk. ex Fr.) Fr. — SCOPE: Introduced with 18 species taken from Cyphella Fr. — TYPIFICATION. The first species, Cyphella infradubuliformis Fr. (which Quélet identified inaccurately with Cyphella abieticola P. Karst.), is an agaric with reduced gills: the name is an isonym of Heliotium guttatum A. & S., the type species (selected) of Persea Pers. (1825; see Donk in Bull. bot. Gdans. Wiel. 118: 137. 1949). It might be placed in Omphalina Quélet, sensu latissima or in Mycena (Pers.) ex S. F. Gray sensu latissima. It was unknown to Quélet by personal observation; he did not include it in his "Flora mycologique de France" (1888). The second species is Cyphella incisa (Pers.) ex Fr., a highly doubtful, very imperfectly known species. Both may well be excluded as less eligible. With the third species, Cyphella cyclopis, as the type, Calypella will be a convenient name for rather a large group of the genus Cyphella, the name of which was proposed and provisionally accepted as a nomen rejiciendum in view of Aneuridiaceae Rab. ex J. Schroet., q.v. I am not aware of a previous selection. Cyphella cyclopis is a common fungus in Europe and rather well known.


Chaetocypha Corda in Sturm, Deutschl. Fl. Pilze 2: 132. 1829. — Type species (only original species): Chaetocypha variabilis Corda. This species is imperfectly known. In his later work Corda himself (Ic. Fung. 5: 44. 1842; "Chaetocypha") buried it, with other generic names, under the caption: "Holt einen groszen Sarg"! Personally I do not consider it a basidiozmycete. Fries (Epicr. 569. 1838) placed it as a synonym under Cyphella goldbeckii Weim.; it does not agree with any of the current interpretations of that fungus. — Accepting Fries' identification and rejecting Cyphella Fr. as a later homonym on account of Cypheliun Aeh. (1814). O. Kuntze (Rev. Gen. Pl. 2: 847. 1891) substituted

Cymbella Pat. in Rev. mycol. No. 29: 27. 1886 — ETYMOLoGY: cymba, boat. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): Cymbella erosa Pat. & Dussap. spud Pat. — This is the same as the current interpretation
of Cyphella galeata (Schum. ex Fr.) Fr. — HOMONYM: Cymbella C. Agardh (1850; Cymbellaceae, Bacillariophyceae). — STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonym; three times renamed. — ISONYM: Chronocypella De-Toni & Levi (1888). Phaeocorynus Pat. (1887; preoccupied), and Phaeocorynus Pat. (1900; superfluous).

Cyphella.—See Cyphella.

Cypharium Clem.—See under Cyphella.


Cyphelopsis Donk in Mod. Nederl. mycol. Ver. 18-20: 128. 1931. — ETYMOLGY: the genus Cyphella; śphere, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): Solezium anomala (P.) Fuck. — SCOPE. Introduced with three species. — TYPIFICATION. The first species is regarded as the type by the author of the name, who forgot to mention this fact by an oversight.

Cytidia Quéñ., Fl. mycol. France 25. 1888. — ETYMOLGY: śphereus, hollow vessel. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): “Cytidia rutilans Pers. ltt. ad Mangeot.”—This species, which Quéñ himself (as described by him) identified with Corticium salearum (Fr.) Fr., is certainly the latter species, although the spore was given as “spherique (0mm003).” — compare also Burt (in Ann. Missouri bot. Gdn. 11: 11. 1924). — REMARK. Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 344. 1931) suggested as the type species transferred to the genus long after its foundation: Cytidia flocculenta (Fr.) Höhn. & L. — TYPONYMS. Coniochaeta (Fr.) P. Karst. (1889; preoccupied) and Coniochaeta P. Karst. (1892).


Diictorylus.—See Diictorylus.

Diictorylus.—See Diictorylus.

“Eiphras.”—Thelephora subgen. Eiphras Pers., Myc. europ. 1: 115. 1822. — This infrageneric epithet is here listed because it might be considered as published as a generic nomen autonymic. Persoon (i.e.) added it as described in the suprageneric description: “Fungilli hujus generis (?).”...
The term denoting the subgeneric rank of the name will be found mentioned in an observation under *Peziza capula* on page 231. — The group covered two species of which the first is the one best known: *Thelephora vulgaris* Pers. (selected type species). Its variety "*a. candida* Pers." was figured, and described before under the name of *Thelephora muscigena* Pers.


**Henningsomyces** O. K., *Rev. Gen. Pl.* 3 (3): 483. 1898. — **ETYMOLOGY:** P. Ch. Hennings; *myces* fungus. Gender: m. — **TYPE SPECIES** (selected): *Solenia candida* Pers. — **BASENYM:** "*Solenia* Hoffm. 1795" = *Solenia* Pers., *a.s.* (invalidated name). — It is incorrect to indicate Hoffmann (Deutschl. *Fl.* 2: pl. 8. 1795) as the author of *Solenia*. As Burt (*in Ann. Missouri bot. Gén* 11: 14. 1924) remarked: "The priority of Persoon's publication of *Solenia* is clearly established by Hoffmann's own work, for on the page of text following plate 8 he gives the full title of Persoon's work and its place of publication." — **SCOPE.** Because the name *Henningsomyces* was validly published through a reference, the type species should be selected from the genus as understood by Hoffmann, and because he is not the original author, the elements added by Hoffmann to Persoon's genus in its original circumscription become relatively unimportant since Hoffmann did not misapply the name. O. Kunzt' took the type in the definition of *Solenia* of Saccardo (*Syl. Fung.* 6: 424. 1888). — **TYPIFICATION.** The only original species of the basionym, corrected as to its author, viz. *Solenia candida* Pers., is here taken as the type. — **REMARK.** *Henningsomyces* was introduced because *Solenia* "Hoffm." was regarded as impracticable on account of *Solenia* "Hill 1751. 1773." — **HOMONYM:** *Henningsomyces* Sacc. (1905: Dothideales, Ascomycetes).

**Lachnellia** Fr., *Fl. scan.* 343. 1835. — **ETYMOLOGY:** *lachne* sheep's wool. Gender: f. — **TYPE SPECIES** (by original designation): *Peziza albo-violacea* A. & S. ex Fr. = *Lachnellia albo-violacea* (A. & S. ex Fr.) Fr. — **REMARKS.** The valid publication of this generic name in 1835 has been generally overlooked, as was pointed out by the Tulasnes (*Syl. Fung.* carpet. 3: 173 foot-note. 1865): "*Peziza albo-violaceae* L., *Lachnellia* Fr. — Friesianorum oliv tymplum primarium (Fr. *Scan.* p. 343) . . ."; and more recently by Nannfeldt. —


Compare also Fries' earlier remark under *Peziza albo-violacea*: "Species distinctissima, forsan novi generis typus." — [Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 96. 1822]. — Up till the present *Lachnellia* has functioned as a genus of Discomycetes. Besides Von Höhnel's choice (*Peziza barbata*), *Peziza flammea* A. & S. was suggested as the type species by Clements & Shear (Gen. *Fung.* 327. 1951). Scarrow (*in Mycologia* 24: 252. 1932) has already stamped Clements & Shear's choice as regrettable because it picked out the only operculate species and its acceptance would mean the suppression of the generic name *Perrotia* Boud., conveniently established for that fungus a considerable time before. There will certainly be considerable support for proposals to retain *Lachnellia* for some genus of Discomycetes, but it may be doubted whether it will be agreed upon such an important detail as the type species to be appointed. On the other hand, with the true type species restored, *Lachnellia* will come in handy for a genus of *Cyphelloccaceae* and I am going to adopt it accordingly. — **ISONYM:** *Lachnellia* Clem. in *Univ. Stud. Nebraska* 3 (1): 73. 1902. — Not validly published: no diagnosis, no reference. Introduced as follows: "*Lachnellia = Lachnum.*" Not *Lachnum* Retz. ex P. Karst. (1871: *Hyaloscyphaceae*, Ascomycetes).

**Lachnum** Clem. — See under *Lachnellia*.

**Leptoglossum** P. Karst. *in Bidr. Kjøn. Fl. Norden* 32: xvii, 342. 1879. — **ETYMOLOGY:** *lepto* - thin; *glossa* tongue. Gender: n. — **TYPE SPECIES** (selected): *Cauethreverus muscigenus* (Bull.) ex Fr. — **SCOPE.** Introduced for *Cauethreverus* Fr. *Fl. Europ.* Fr. (Syst. mycol. 1: 317, 322. 1821 (nom.) *Hym. europ.* 460. 1874). This name was not especially mentioned. P. A. Karsten treated two species, *Cauethreverus muscigenus* (first species) and *Cauethreverus glaucus* (Ratsch) ex Fr. (not an original species of Fries' tribus). — **TYPIFICATION.** Karsten's first species, perhaps the best known one of the original species, was already selected by Singer & A. H. Smith (*in Mycologia* 38: 270. 1946). — **HOMONYM:** *Leptoglossum* ( Cooke) Sacc. (1884: *Geoglossaceae*, Ascomycetes), *q.m.* — This name is often incorrectly dated from 1879, the year it was published as a subgeneric epithet: compare Donk (*in Bull. nat. Mus. Gen.* 11: 17;
Leptopus Karst.—See Leptopus.

Leptopus P. Karst. in Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 32: xvii, 242. 1879. —ETYMOLOGY: ëxëpës, thin and òk, ear, or rather: ëxëpës, thinness. Gender: m. —TYPE SPECIES (selected): Cantarellus retirugos (Bull.) ex Fr. —SCOPE: Introduced for Cantarellus retirugos (Bull.) ex Fr. (Hym. erup. 460. 1874) and a few species of Arctius Fr. When publishing the name, P. A. Karsten dealt with four species and a fifth, indicated as belonging doubtfully in the genus. First species: C. tenuissimus Fr. —TYPEIFICATION: Cantarellus retirugos was selected by Donk (in Bull. bot. Gdns. Buitenzorg III 17: 185. 1941) and by Singer & A. H. Smith (in Mycologia 38: 270. 1946); this species and C. lobatus (Pers.) ex Fr. were the two known to Karsten from personal observation. Earle (in Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 389. 1909; under “Leptopus”) considered C. tenuissimus as the type, a decidedly less eligible species (known to Karsten from the literature only) and defensible only when the first-species rule is to be applied rigidly. —REMARK: Leptoglossum P. Karst. and Leptopus were simultaneously published and the two groups are sometimes combined into one genus. As far as I am aware, Ricken (Blätterp. 5. 1910: “Die Abtrennung der umgewandelten Arten als Gattung Leptopus halte ich für belangst.”) was the first to place definitely one of the names in the synonymy of the other, retaining the name Leptoglossum, which thus becomes the correct one for the combination of the two genera. Maire (in Treub. Mua. Ci. nat. Barcelona 15: Sér. bot. No. 2: 52. 1933) preferred Leptopus for the combination. —VARIANT SPELLING: “Leptopos”. Earle (in Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 389. 1909). —HOMONYMS: Leptopus Lindl. (1833; Orchidaceae) and Leptotis Hoffmannsegg (1824; Compositae) should perhaps be considered orthographically different homonyms, the difference in spelling being too slight, and rather ‘internal’, the termination (final letter) being the same in all cases. —STATUS. If considered a later homonym, Leptopus P. Karst. would be impriparable.

Lomafia (Fr.) P. Karst. in Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk 48: 403. 1889. (German translation of Swedish diathesis in Bot. Cbl. 43: 384. 1890). —ETYMOLOGY: ëxëpës, border. Gender: f. —TYPE SPECIES (only species included): Cortioglossum salicinum (Fr.) Fr. —BASIONYM: Corticium sect. (?). Lomafia Fr. Hym. eup. 646. 1874 (= Corticium trib. Apus Fr., Epicr. 557. 1888; Thelephora trib. Apus subtrib. Aericartia sect. Cartilaginose Fr., Elench. 1: 169. 1828; Thelephora trib. Kuepinius sect. R. erbar. Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 441. 1821). —Fries (1874) included nine species of which one with doubt (“C. ? amorphum”). —SCOPE: Although this name is an avowed isonym of Corticium subdivision Lomafia Fr., because P. A. Karsten captioned the genus “Lomafia (Fr.),” the group was considerably restricted. Only one species was treated when the genus was founded. —REMARK: I, herewith, select C. salicinum as the type species of the Friesian subdivisions mentioned above, inclusive of the basionym of the generic name Lomafia, if such a procedure should still be necessary in view of Karsten’s restriction of the group. In case this selection should appear untenable, the type of the present generic name and of Lomafia P. Karst. should apparently be changed accordingly, in view of a recent alteration in the Rules (Art. 58) that seems to have been accepted at Stockholm. —HOMONYM: Lomafia R. Br. (1810: Pteleaceae; nomen conservandum). Lomafucum Raf. (1819; Umbelliferae) should not be considered a homonym. —ISONYM: Lomafina P. Karst. (1892), q.v. —STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonym and, therefore, changed into Lomafina P. Karst.


species: Nodularia balsamicola Peck. = Aleurodiscus amorphus (Pers. ex Fr.) J. Schr. — REMARK. See also under Aleurodiscus. — HOMONYMS: Nodularia Link ex Lyngbye (1819); Lemanaceae, Rhodophyceae) and Nodularia Mert. apud Jürg. (1822) ex Bornet & Flah. (1888); ‘Nostocaceae Heterocystae,’ Cyanophyceae). — STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonym.

[Peniophorina Hohn. in S. B. Akad. Wiss. Wien, math.-nat. Kl. 126 I: 285. 1917. — This genus was based on a collection identified by Von Höhnel with Chaetostroma pedicellatum Preuss. I saw Von Höhnel’s slides in the Farlow Herbarium and would rather not consider it as basidiomycete. Generally listed as a genus of “Thelephoraceae.”]


Pleurotopis (P. Henn.) Earle in Bull. N. York bot. Gdn 5: 412. 1909. — ETYMOLOGY: the genus Pleurotus; ψυκός, appearance. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES (selected for the avowed basynym, by original designation for generic name): Marasmius spodoleus Berk. & Br. = Pleurotus spodoleus (Berk. & Br.) Sing.—Compare Singletor (in Lilikoa 8: 444, 1942). — RASINYM: Marasmius sect. Pleurotopis P. Henn. in Engl. & Fr., Nat. Pfl.Fam. 1: 1**: 228. 1898. — This is Henning’s name for Marasmius subgen. Astus Fr. (Hym. europ. 480, 1874; Succ., Syll. Funq. 5: 567, 1887); it is factually nothing but a mere name change. Fries’ name was introduced for a single species, Marasmius spodoleus; Saccardo added several species from the world literature to M. spodoleus as the first species. Hennings gave a description only of this, his first, species: all other ones, that is, Saccardo’s to which again a few more were added, were only very briefly mentioned. Marasmius spodoleus should undoubtedly be taken up as the type species of Henning’s name. — SCOPE. Earle identified his genus categorically with the section of Saccardos.


Porotcheleum (Fr. ex Fr.) Fr., Syst. Orb. veg. 80. 1825. — ETYMOLOGY: πορος, pore; ψυκός, nipple. Gender: n. — TYPE SPECIES (selected): Poria finnibrata Pers. = Boletus finnibratus (Pers.) Pers. = Polyporus finnibratus (Pers.) ex Fr. — DRAVLATIZED NAME: Porotcheleum Fr., Obs. mycol. 2: 272. 1818. — When Fries used this name for the first time he attributed two species to it, Poria finnibrata and Porotcheleum lacernum Fr. Note the spelling. — RASINYM: Polyporus subgen. Porotcheleum (Fr.) ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 6, 506, 1821. — The species included this time are Poria finnibrata and Boletus subtilis Schrad. — It is of importance to decide whether Porotcheleum was published by Fries in 1821 as a generic name or as a subgeneric epithet. In the former case Porotcheleum would stand being the earlier one of a couple of homonyms; in the other case it would be the later one and thus impracticable. Fries preceded the name (among the omissions at the end of the first volume of “Systema”) by the number “VI B,” the ‘VI’ representing the genus Polyporus. In exactly the same manner ‘Coprinus’ and ‘Gomphus’ were established in the main text of the same volume as undoubtedly subgeneric epithets. The species in-
cluded were indicated as "P. P. familiariun" and "P. P. subtile." This obviously means 'Polyergus Porothelum familiariun' and 'Polyergus Porothelum subtile.' The termination of the epithets agrees in gender with "Porothelum" rather than with 'Polyergus.' In the index to the first volume of "Systema" both epithets were listed under Polyergus, with correct termination, Porothelum not being entered at all. In the general index (1823) to the whole work, Fries listed them as follows: "[POLYPORUS] [familiariun] Fr. (Porothelum familiariun) I. 506. El. I. 125" and "[POLYPORUS] subtile Fr. (Porothelum subtile) I. 506. El. I. 135," which shows that he admitted having made the combinations under Polyergus, although at the time of publishing the general index he considered the combinations under Porothelum the correct ones. The conclusion that 'Porothelum' was published in the first part of the starting-point book as a subgeneric epithet seems unavoidable. That indeed Fries in 1821 had changed his mind about the rank of the group becomes exceptionally clear when one compares pages 6 of the first volume of "Systema" and of his "Specimen Systematis Mycologicii" (1819). The latter publication consists of an advance issue of the first eight (1-8) pages of "Systema"; there one will find 'Porothelum' as a generic name placed between, and equivalent to, Hydnum and Stereum, printed in capitals and consecutively numbered with those genera. On the corresponding page in "Systema," 'Porothelum' appears in italics as a subgeneric epithet under Polyergus, to which it was transferred, and is not numbered as a genus any longer. In Fries' "Elenchus" (1: 125. 1828) the group appeared again as "VI. B. POROTHELUM" but in this case it was spoken of as "Genus omnino distinctum." — In 1821 one of the two original species of 1818, Porothelum lacera, was not mentioned. — SCOPE. When in 1825 the name was definitely accepted by Fries as a generic one, the species are those of 1821 and in the order given. — TYPOGRAPHY. There is no doubt that Porothelum lacera was the leading species to Fries himself. It was already suggested as the type species by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 347. 1931) for the name as published in 1818. — VARIANT SPELLING: "Porothelum": Reichenb., Conspl. Reg. v. 14. 1828 (n.v.); Fr., Gen. Hym. 12. 1836, etc. — In later years Fries preferred invariably this slightly modified spelling, the one at present universally used. — HOMONYM: Porothelum Eschw. (1824); Trypethelium, Lichenes. — STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonym. — ISONYMN. Because I consider the type species representing a valid genus, and because this genus appears to have no correct name, the following new names are proposed: Stigmatocepa Donk, nom. nov. [basinym: Polyergus subgen. Porothelum (Fr.)

ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 506. 1821] and Stigmatocepa familiariun (Pers. ex Fr.) Donk, comb. nov. [basinym: Polyergus familiariun (Pers.) ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 506. 1821].

Porothelum.—See Porothelum.

Pseudodasycepa Velen., Nov. mycol. 1: 167. 1939. — ETYMOLOGY: — TYPE SPECIES (selected); Cyphella hyperici Velen. — VALID PUBLICATION & SCOPE. In an observation to the species mentioned, Velonovsky wrote that he considered it and the preceding one, Cyphella gravolosa (Fuch.) Fuch., as forming a distinct genus. Short diagnosis added. — TYPOGRAPHY. The species under which the genus was founded is here considered the type.

Rimbauchia Pat. in Bull. Soc. mycol. France 7: 159. 1891. — ETYMOLOGY: A. Rimbach. Gender: f. — TYPE SPECIES: Rimbauchia paradoxa Pat. — REMARK. Owing to the upturned cup this genus does not answer to the defition of "Cyphellaceae" as adopted in the present paper.

Solenia Pers. ex Fr., Syst. mycol. 2 (1): 200. 1822. — ETYMOLOGY: — TYPE SPECIES (selected; only original species of devalitated name): Solenia candida Pers. — DEVALIATED NAME: Solenia Pers. in Nones Mag. Bot. 1: 116. 1794 (= Tent. 36. 1797). — The one original species is Solenia candida. — SCOPE. When validly re-publishing the name, Fries included four species, the second of which is Solenia candida. — TYPOGRAPHY. Persoon's original species is to be considered the type. It was already suggested as such by Clements & Shear (Gen. of Fungi 345. 1931) for "Solenia Hoffm." — HOMONYM: Solena Lenn. (1790); Cucurbitaceae). Solena Willd. (1797); Rubiaceae). Solenia Agrif. (1822); Ulvaceae, Chlorophyceae), and Solenia J. Hill ex O. K. (1898); Boletaceae). — ISONYMN: Henneingromyces O. K. (1898). — STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonyms so that a new name was introduced for it, Henneingromyces O. K.

Stigmatocepa Kalchb., in GREVILL. 10. 1882. — ETYMOLOGY: — TYPE SPECIES (only original species): Stigmatocepa circuma Kalchb. — HOMONYM: — ISONYN: — STATUS. Impracticable on account of the earlier homonymy, so that a new name was introduced for it, Henneingromyces O. K.

1932) considered Tapesia fusca (Pers.) Fuck. as the type species, one of the Ascomycetes.

Trabeocalaria Bonord.—See “Polyporaceae.” The type species, Trabeocalaria villosa Bonord., seems a remarkable form of Merulius tremelloides (Schrad.) ex Fr.

Ureocalyx Velen.—See “Agaricaceae.”


The Genus Carex in Malaysia

E. Nehms

Summary

This is a fully descriptive account of the 168 species of Carex known to occur in Malaysia. They are arranged in three subgenera: Subgenus Isochoreovis (35 species), Subgenus Carex (85 species), and Subgenus Vigna (8 species). These are in turn divided into 33 sections. The classification of these Malaysian Carexes differs radically from past systems (cf. that of Kükenthal, Engl. Pflanzenreich, 1909) and is based on the phylogenetic views of the author.

Following the descriptions are citations of all the specimens seen by the author, and a few not seen but which have mainly been determined by Kükenthal. The majority of the specimens came from Borneo (Buitenborg sub 1500 sheets) and Leiden (about 800, including important historical specimens).

About half of the species are restricted (endemic) in one or another of the island areas into which Malaysia can be conveniently divided: 18 species in New Guinea, 15 in the Philippines, 5 in Formosa and in Sumatra, 4 in the Malay Peninsula, 3 in Java and Celebes, 2 in the Malayan, and 1 in the Lesser Sunda Islands. The remaining 88 species have a slighty to much wider distribution, the chief connection being with India, and, to a slightly less extent, Japan and China.

Keys are provided to the species as a whole, to the subgenera, the sections, and to the species in each section.

The introductory part of the work explains, among other things, the classification, the relative taxonomic value of characters in the descriptions, distribution, and sources of the material.

Introduction

Kükenthal’s great monograph on Carex and the three much smaller genera, Schoenoxiphium, Kabasia, and Umezia, which all together form his subfamily Caricoideae (tribe Cariceae Nees), appeared in Engler’s “Pflanzenreich” as long ago as 1909, and in recent years there has been an increasing need for a complete revision of the genus Carex. Kükenthal’s account comprised fewer than 800 species; those now known and described are probably three times that number or even more. The task of bringing Carex up to date has already been partly accomplished, and, as might be expected, on a regional basis. The monographing of such a vast group of plants would be too great a task for one man. In the nineteen-thirties Mackenzie produced a volume on the North and Central American Carexes;


[Part 2 of this volume was issued August 18, 1951]