

Hapalophragmiopsis Vs. Triphragmium.

By S. V. Venkatarayan, Plant Pathologist, Agricultural Department,
Bangalore, India.

In a recent paper entitled "On *Hapalophragmiopsis ponderosum*", Thirumalachar & Narasimhan (1951) have made some observations on the writer's (1951) transfer of *Hapalophragmiopsis* (*Hapalophragmium*) *ponderosum* to *Triphragmium ponderosum*, which would not bear scrutiny. Instead of calling to their aid facts in the morphology of the fungus they have made a personal attack on the writer which is hardly relevant to a discussion of the issue in question. Their comments on "published descriptions" in "old literature" are uncalled for, as these have the sanction of the International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature: "in some species, however, the type is a description or figure given by a previous author". As to misinterpreting literature and rules, that seems to be their special privilege. In defending Thirumalachar's action in adopting the 'opsis' ending for his genus, they enlarge on Recommendation XI (b), but conveniently ignore X (f). The latter recommendation urges "not to give a genus a name whose form is rather that of a sub-genus or section", which *Hapalophragmiopsis* obviously is, as per Recommendation XI (b). The — *oides* or — *opsis* endings might have been made in the past before the recommendations were made, but in the words of Recommendation X, "botanists who are forming generic names show judgment and taste by attending" to them.

As for constancy in the position of the spore forms in rusts, while Thirumalachar & Cummins (vide Thirumalachar & Mundkur, 1949 a) opined that the pycnia were conservative to variation next only to telia, Thirumalachar & Mundkur (1950), in a consideration of *Tegillum*, admit that "the subcuticular or sub-epidermal condition is a constant feature and therefore has diagnostic value only in the case of pycnia, while in the other spore forms such a condition is subject to variation." Even this is open to question as Mains found subepidermal pycnia, uredia and telia in *Desmotelium*, and Sydow reported them to be subcuticular. The pycnia in *Didymopsora toddaliae*, and *D. macrospora* are intra-epidermal in contrast to the sub-epidermal nature in the type species *D. solani-argentei*. On this basis, however, Thirumalachar (vide Thirumalachar & Mundkur, 1950 a) erected

- Sydow, H. & Petrak, F. (1931) *Micromycetes philippinenses*. Ser. II. Annal. Myc. XXIX. p. 160.
- Thirumalachar, M. J. & Mundkur, B. B. (1949) *Genera of Rusts I*. Ind. Phytop. II. p. 65—101.
- Thirumalachar, M. J. & Mundkur, B. B. (1949 a) *Genera of Rusts II*. Ind. Phytop. II. p. 193—244.
- Thirumalachar, M. J. & Mundkur, B. B. (1950) *Genera of Rusts III*. Ind. Phytop. III. p. 4—42.
- Thirumalachar, M. J. & Mundkur, B. B. (1950 a) *Genera of Rusts, Appendix*, Ind. Phytopath. III. p. 203—204.
- Thirumalachar, M. J. & Narasimhan, M. J. (1951) *Critical notes on some plant rusts III* (4. On *Hapalophragmiopsis ponderosum* (Syd. et Butl.) Thirum. Sydowia V p. 476—483.
- Venkataraman, S. V. (1951) *Triphragmium ponderosum* (Syd. & Butl.) n. comb. Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. XXXIV. p. 237—239.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Sydowia](#)

Jahr/Year: 1953

Band/Volume: [7](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Venkatarayan S. V.

Artikel/Article: [Hapalophragmiopsis Vs. Triphragmium. 117-120](#)