



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation  
5th Floor, Hunt Library  
Carnegie Mellon University  
4909 Frew Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890  
Telephone: 412-268-2434  
Email: [huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu](mailto:huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu)  
Web site: [www.huntbotanical.org](http://www.huntbotanical.org)

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

#### *Usage guidelines*

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

#### *Statement on harmful and offensive content*

The Hunt Institute Archives contains hundreds of thousands of pages of historical content, writing and images, created by thousands of individuals connected to the botanical sciences. Due to the wide range of time and social context in which these materials were created, some of the collections contain material that reflect outdated, biased, offensive and possibly violent views, opinions and actions. The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation does not endorse the views expressed in these materials, which are inconsistent with our dedication to creating an inclusive, accessible and anti-discriminatory research environment. Archival records are historical documents, and the Hunt Institute keeps such records unaltered to maintain their integrity and to foster accountability for the actions and views of the collections' creators.

Many of the historical collections in the Hunt Institute Archives contain personal correspondence, notes, recollections and opinions, which may contain language, ideas or stereotypes that are offensive or harmful to others. These collections are maintained as records of the individuals involved and do not reflect the views or values of the Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation or those of Carnegie Mellon University.

#### *About the Institute*

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

have these peculiar tufts of hairs on the club. I have no ripe specimens, but I think these tufts are the immature ostioles. The peculiar crested branches at the top are conidial bearing only and do not



Fig. 1357.  
*Xylaria cristulata*.

develop perithecia. I think this is a tropical plant only, although I remember seeing in Peck's collection a plant that reminds me of it, which he had referred to *Xylaria cornu-damae*.

**ISARIA FLABELLIFORMIS AGAIN.**—In reading over our article on page 12 of *Xylaria Notes*, we notice that we failed to record the very point that we intended. While we think now that *Xylaria flabelliformis* is a conidial form of *Xylaria corniformis*, we do not believe that it transforms into the *Xylaria* condition as most conidial *Xylarias* do. In other words, we believe that *Xylaria corniformis* bears its conidial and asciferous spores on different stromata, as Petch has demonstrated is the case with *Xylaria nigripes*. We also have a letter from Professor Petch expressing the same view. He states that from the wood bearing these *Isaria* forms he has grown imperfect *Xylarias*, but has never succeeded in perfect development.

*Xylaria Thwaitesii*.—We note that we gave this as a synonym for *Xylaria cubensis* on page 5 of our *Xylaria Notes*, and for *Xylaria allantoidea* (teste Miss Wakefield) on page 6. The latter is an error (of ours) as we are advised by Miss Wakefield, who considers *Xylaria Thwaitesii* as a valid species.

*Xylaria fragiliformis*, page 11, is an error for *Xylaria flagelliformis*

## LETTER No. 62.

Acknowledgment of specimens received since last report. My best thanks are extended to those who favored me with specimens. Some of the notes that will be illustrated with photographs will be published in future issues of *Mycological Notes*.

In my printed letter I do not give authorities for names, believing that the binomial should represent a plant name, but in acknowledging the specimens to my correspondents, I give the "authority" in event they desire to use the same. All specimens are acknowledged by personal letter as soon as they come into my hands. Foreign correspondents may send specimens to my English address and they will reach me promptly, although in countries which have direct parcel post arrangements with the United States, it is best to send them by parcel post direct to me. Specimens may be sent to either of the following addresses:

C. G. LLOYD,  
224 West Court Street,  
Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Cincinnati, Ohio, June, 1916.

C. G. LLOYD,  
95 Cole Park Road,  
Twickenham, England.

AMES, FRANK H., New York:

*Hypoxylon coccineum*.—*Tremellodendron pallidum*.—*Trametes malicola*.—*Physalacria inflata*. (Cfr. *Myc. Notes*. Old Species, page 4, fig. 216-218.)—*Peziza* (*Lachnea*) *hemispherica*.—*Poria subacida*.—*Polystictus cinnamomeus*.—*Polyporus gilvus*.

BARTHOLOMEW, E., Kansas:

*Polyporus cuticularis*.—*Poria pulchella*.—*Lenzites trabea*.—*Polystictus velutinus*.

BENSON, BERRY, Georgia:

*Laternea columnata*, "fresh eggs."

BEWLEY, MISS A. K., Pennsylvania:

*Favolus europaeus*.—*Polystictus conchatus*.—*Geaster saccatus*.—*Polyporus gilvus*.—*Schizophyllum commune*.—*Lenzites betulina*.—*Peziza floccosa*.—*Polystictus cinnabarinus*.—*Tremellodendron pallidum*.—*Thelephora intybacea*.—*Polystictus conchifer*.

BIJL, VAN DER, P., South Africa:

*Fomes rimosus*.—*Fomes McGregori*.—*Fomes Robinsoniae*. (See Note 420.)—*Lenzites betulina*.—*Polystictus zonatus*.—*Polystictus versicolor*.—*Polystictus ochraceus*.—*Fomes connatus*.—*Stereum lobatum*. (See Note 421.)—*Fomes Caryophylli*.—*Fomes robustus*.—*Daedalea Eatonii*. (See Note 422.)—*Polystictus biformis*. (To be published in *Mycological Notes*.)—*Trametes cingulatus*.—*Irpex vellereus*. (To be published in *Mycological Notes*.)—*Grammothele mappa*? (To be published in *Mycological Notes*.)

B. Harvey

# THE MYTHS OF MYCOLOGY

AS NOTED BY

C. G. LLOYD

Part 1.

CINCINNATI, O.

DECEMBER 1917

It is my belief, and I think it will so impress anyone who investigates the history of mycology, that there has probably not been another subject that has been so crudely, blunderingly, carelessly, and inaccurately exploited as this subject. I expect to give a series of papers illustrating this, and I do it, believing that the plain situation should be set forth.

Outside of the early works of Persoon and Fries, there have been no practicable books printed on the subject by which a local worker could identify the fungi that he meets. Fries' Hymenomycetes Europaei, completed on his eightieth birthday, was the last workable book issued, and that is of much service only in determining the Agarics of Sweden. However, this is not Fries' fault, but rather that of the situation in Mycology.

Among all our modern books, I do not recall one that is practicable. The works of the English mycologists, particularly Cooke, Masee, and Smith, are simply cumulative publications, constituted largely of mistakes. There has been no real student of English mycology since the day of Berkeley. There is more truth in the old and original account in Berkeley's Fungi, Volume 2 (Cryptogamic), of Hooker's English Flora (1836) than there is in any book on the subject since issued in England.

In this country we have nothing whatever that is creditable. Hard's book is a good presentation of a few common species, but Hard never had any very extensive, critical knowledge of the subject. Marshall's book presents some very good photographs and figures, but the author of the text was woefully lacking in familiarity with the plants. A number of years ago, Atkinson got a little preliminary idea of the subject by sending dried specimens to Bresadola and Morgan, but his book is more noteworthy for what it omits than what it includes. I am told that Atkinson, in the years that have intervened since he wrote his book, has steadily been working with the Agaric subject, and no doubt at the present time could make a better presentation of it. Let us hope for his own sake, as well as that of science, that he will not fail to do it. McIlvaine's work was in the main a compilation of Peck's descriptions, and as nearly all compilations, it is of little practical use. McIlvaine was a mycophagist, not a mycologist.

Cooke's Handbook of Australian fungi is perhaps the worst textbook (on fungi) that was ever published. It is my belief that if the species were critically examined one half of the book would be found not true, and not half the recorded specimens correctly determined. That it is absolutely impracticable is evidenced from the results, for while many specimens are received from Australian correspondents, not a single Australian student has ever been able to determine his specimens even approximately from the Handbook. Rarely is a specimen received from Australia correctly determined.

Sur ce sujet, un seul traité systématique a été publié en France, la Flore de Quélet, parue en 1888, mais dont l'édition est épuisée. Quélet en France, Schroeter en Silésie, sont; si je ne me trompe, les deux seuls auteurs en Europe qui aient écrit des ouvrages composés de première main et basés sur observations personnelles. A ce double point de vue leurs livres ont une vraie valeur. Mais Quélet a gâté un ouvrage, d'ailleurs excellent, en "créant" un système nouveau et tout à lui. On n'y peut rien trouver dans recherches excessives; le jeu n'en vaut pas la chandelle. Tout y est embrouillé; les noms génériques sont changés, l'ordre des genres est bouleversé, l'ouvrage en est devenu un vrai fouillis, un tohu-bohu.

Ses associés et collaborateurs en France, membres de la Société Mycologique,