

PIMINA PARASITICA GROVE.

By A. Lorrain Smith, F.L.S.

This peculiar fungus which was discovered by Greenwood Pim growing on the hyphae of *Botrytis* sp. was described by Grove as gen. and nov. sp. in Journ. Bot. xxvi. p. 206, 1888. Pim himself published a photographic plate of the fungus with a description in the second number of the Tráns. Brit. Mycol. Soc., Vol. I. p. 65, 1898. A microscopic preparation was placed in the herbarium of the British Museum.

In more recent years a fungus occurring among moulds on the cork of a bottle of preserved fruits has been described at length by P. Vuillemin as *Urophiala* gen. and nov. sp. (Bull. Soc. Sci. Nancy, Sér. 3, xi. p. 158 (pls. 4-5), 1910). The description and figures leave absolutely no doubt that he was dealing with the same genus if not the same species.

The genus is of particular interest as Vuillemin has given it an important place in his scheme of classification of the Hyphales or Hyphomycetes. In this scheme, he insists on the systematic importance of the insertion of the spore or conidium. He distinguishes four different types of insertion: the conidia may be borne (1) directly on the hyphae; (2) at the top of a conidiphore; (3) on a specialised cell or sterigma which he terms a phialide to distinguish it from the sterigma of the Basidiomycetes, or (4) on a phialide which rises from a specialised cell or prophialide. These he groups as four orders:

I. Sporotricheae: spores borne directly on the hyphae, ex. *Sporotrichum*.

II. Sporophoreae: spores borne directly on a sporophore, ex. *Acremonium*.

III. Phialideae: spores borne on a sterigma or phialide, ex. *Spicaria*.

IV. Prophialideae: phialide rising from a prophialide, ex. *Urophiala* (*Pimina*).

In the last order Vuillemin places three families each containing one genus, I. Urophialaceae, II. Coemansiaceae, III. Coronellaceae.

His descriptions of *Urophiala* are as follows:

Urophiala Vuill. nov. gen.

Mycelium creeping, subhyaline; fertile hyphae erect, dark-coloured septate, simple, always of three parts: (1) a continuous or uni-septate stalk; (2) the head (or prophialide) brown, incurved bearing three, rarely two, spore bearing phialides; (3) apical filaments faintly coloured. Phialides ventricose, the apex curved, beaked, soft, soon evanescent, rarely rigid. Conidia solitary, acrogenous, hyaline, round or oblong, smooth.

Urophiala mycophila nov. spec.

Mycelium effuse, creeping, ca. 1μ thick; fertile hyphae fuliginous, 20–34 μ high; stalk 4–17 \times 2.5–4 μ ; prophialide 9–11 μ high, 4 μ thick, to 7–7.5 μ wide, with apical filament 6–8 \times 1.75–2 μ ; phialide subhyaline, ascending, 4 \times 3–3.5 μ ; conidia ovoid, 5–7 \times 4–5 μ .

On cork among Mucedineae. Cultivated in a test-tube on carrot. Beyond stating that the fungus grows in association with moulds, Vuillemin does not say that it is parasitic, and there is also no clear evidence that our British species is parasitic on the *Botrytis*. The microscopic preparation is somewhat imperfect, but the prophialides correspond exactly in form with the French specimens. *Pimina* is closely associated with *Botrytis* conidiophores and may be parasitic but it also grows outside the "host" filament. Vuillemin to whom the matter has been submitted recognises the generic resemblance of the plants but considers them specifically distinct as Grove's plant is on the whole larger. It seems impossible to be absolutely sure until fresh specimens are found. Vuillemin is of opinion that Grove's genus should rank as a *nomen nudum* on account of the very imperfect description which applies more nearly to *Urobasidium*.

If Vuillemin's contention be accepted, the British species would become *Urophiala parasitica*, but if as unfortunately seems probable *Pimina* should be held to have true priority then the French species would become *P. mycophila*.