Notes and Records

Alick Henrici*

I cannot pretend that the following notes have any sort of common theme, but it is a pleasure to record my thanks to Mario Tortelli for finding or photographing three of the species discussed. I present the first one as a quiz question. Fig. 1 shows something usually easily recognisable in the field and not uncommon. I remember many years ago being surprised when I was told what it was. Most field mycologists seem not to know it. Do you?

Too many generic names?

The latest tranche of updates to CBIB (Update 7, http://www.basidiochecklist.info/LatestUpdates.asp) proposes acceptance of no less than 36 generic names not currently used in Britain. All but one are transfers of species already known in Britain to genera recently described or revived. Fifteen of these arise from the partial dismemberment of just three genera: *Clitocybe* (6), *Hygrocybe* (5) and *Hyphodontia* (4). The one glowing exception is the addition to the British list of a member of the hypogeous boletoid genus *Chamonixia* by Caroline Hobart (see FM17(2): 60). In contrast only four genera are sunk: *Fibriciellum* in *Trechispora*, *Lenzites* in *Trametes*, *Mycoaciella* in *Mycoacia*, and surprisingly *Piptoporus*. *P. betulinus,* the type species, moves to *Fomitopsis* (its common *Hypocrea* parasite even grows on both!) while *P. quercinus* is clearly distinct, reverting to the genus *Buglossoporus* described for it in 1966 by Kotlaba & Pouzar.

Many of the above changes reflect a genuine increase in knowledge brought about by molecular research. But there has recently been considerable international concern about the sometimes irresponsible rush to establish poorly motivated new genera, exemplified by the hyper-splitting of *Boletus* already documented here *ad nauseam*. This has provoked publication of a 'code of conduct' by Vellinga, Kuyper *et al.* (2015) entitled 'Six simple guidelines for introducing new genera of fungi'. The 'et al.' comprises an international assemblage of 15 further prominent mycologists. They note with surprise just how few recently published genera are based on newly discovered species exhibiting new combinations of features. They cite examples of good practice with strong implicit criticism of several authors (uncited!) who delight in foisting new ill-supported and ill-documented genera on the world.

Fig.1. What is this? Hint: It's on its most usual host, an ash log, and enlarged around 1.5 times. Answer at the end of these notes. W. Kent, Saxten's Wood, TQ5864, 1 July 2016. Photo © Mario Tortelli.

*8, Victoria Cottages, Sandycombe Rd., Richmond, Surrey TW9 3NW

doi:10.1016/j.fldmyc.2016.10.008

Amanita in dispute

Redhead *et al*. (2016) have recently published a proposal to restrict *Amanita* to its mycorrhizal members, removing the small group of saprotrophs to a new genus *Saproamanita*, with *S. vittadinii* as type. This has provoked a very prompt response from Tulloss *et al.* (2016) simply entitled 'The genus *Amanita* should not be split'. Rod Tulloss is an immensely knowledgeable (and perfectionist) *Amanita* specialist. The nine co-authors of his response include both lead authors of the guidelines for new genera mentioned above. Redhead *et al*. claim to have followed these guidelines and also acknowledge 'cordial and constructive discussions' with Tulloss, but he declined the offer of co-authorship. This response paper argues against their claim at length and in detail in a manner that can hardly be considered cordial.

The *Saproamanita* proposal expands on an earlier one by Vizzini *et al.* who revived the name *Aspidella* for this same purpose (since found to be illegitimate). Combinations in *Saproamanita*, each by all four authors (Redhead, Vizzini, Drehmel & Contu) are made for 23 species, the only ones known in Britain being *A. inopinata*, *A. nauseosa* (alien described from a Kew hothouse), *A. singeri* and *A. vittadinii*. All the evidence points to the main mycorrhizal bulk of *Amanita* forming a monophyletic clade. The bone of contention is the much weaker evidence that the saprotrophs (inadequately sampled?) all do likewise. It would be tidy if they did. Even then much fuss and bother could be avoided by treating them simply as a basal subgenus of *Amanita*. As Tulloss *et al*. have it "nomenclatural stability, rather than nomenclatural inflation, may be a great and common good". It would have been similarly tidy if the primary split of the flowering plants had been into dicots and monocots, but that one didn't work out. It is quite likely this one won't either.

The spread of _Lindtneria panphyliensis_

I featured this distinctive bright yellow ± hydnoid corticioid species as a 'portrait' in FM two issues ago (FM17(2): 39–40), noting that although it was new to science as recently as 1990 we already had a scattering of British records. My account immediately needed amendment (FM17(3): 103) in the light of three more British finds. I am now indebted to Nico Dam for a map from the excellent Dutch distribution atlas www.verspreidingsatlas.nl showing 11 widely distributed Dutch sites, all from 1998 onwards. It must be a recent arrival in northern Europe; it can't have been either overlooked or consistently misidentified in both countries over a century or more of earlier recording. I begin to suspect that when first described from Italy it was, even there, a recent arrival, probably from somewhere outside Europe. That would account for the rapid spread more suggestive of 'alien invasion' than the mere response of a Mediterranean native to global warming.

Ceratiomyxa porioides - another spreading species

The very common white *Ceratiomyxa fruticulosa* fruiting over rotten logs is probably familiar to many readers who otherwise know little of myxomycetes. They may even know, or at least have been told, that it belongs in a different class from the true myxomycetes, forming its spores singly on the tips of fine stalks instead of in a sporangium. Much less well known and illustrated here (Fig. 2) is *C. porioides*, largely southern in Europe, once thought to be no more than a growth form of the rather variable *C. fruticulosa*, but now agreed to be a good species.

C. porioides was first recorded from Britain by Bruce Ing in October 2001 from Holme Fen, Huntingdonshire, found very conveniently on the only foray possible during a very wet weekend myxomycete workshop. See FM3(2) p.61 (2002) for a photo of that collection. The following year it appeared in Scotland on a sawdust heap at Dawyck Garden, Peebles. It was refound at the Holme Fen site in 2008, and is now also known from several sites in the Toys Hill area of W. Kent found by David Mitchell plus single sites in Surrey and W. Sussex.

C. fruticulosa is usually pure white and forms discrete sometimes branched stalks. In *C. porioides* these are united in a poroid structure and the plasmodium and young fruitbodies are lemon yellow, whitening only at maturity. It is quite conspicuous, so the lack of earlier records suggests a recent arrival worth looking out for in new areas. The material in Fig. 2 is just emerging from the plasmodial stage but already visibly poroid.