

(1655) Proposal to conserve the name *Ustilago scitaminea* against *Ustilago amadelpha* (Fungi, Ustilaginomycetes, Ustilaginaceae)

Kálmán Vánky¹ & Roger G. Shivas²

¹ Herbarium Ustilaginales Vánky, Gabriel-Biel-Str. 5, D-72076 Tübingen, Germany. vanky.k@cityinfonyet.de (author for correspondence).

² Queensland Department of Primary Industries, Plant Pathology Herbarium, 80 Meiers Road, Indooroopilly, Queensland 4068, Australia. roger.shivas@dpi.qld.gov.au

(1655) *Ustilago scitaminea* Syd., Ann. Mycol. 22: 281. 1924 [*Fungi*], nom. cons. prop.

Typus: India, Bengal, Bhagalpur, [on *Saccharum officinarum* L.] 26.VIII.1907, E. J. Butler, Sydow, Ust. 384, Herb. Ustilaginales Vánky 4454.

(=) *Ustilago amadelpha* Syd. & al., Ann. Mycol. 10: 249, 1912, nom. rej. prop.

Lectotypus (vide Vánky in Mycotaxon 89: 114. 2004): India, Bengal, Muzaffarpur [‘Mozaffarpur’] District, Awapur, “in paniculis et apice culmorum *Andropogonii* spec. [prob. misident.] 15.4.1911, E. J. Butler 1425”, HCIO.

scitaminea to the scarcely known *U. amadelpha*, or maybe more correctly to a “*Sporisorium amadelphum*”, conservation of the name of *U. scitaminea* against *U. amadelpha* is proposed.

If the proposal is accepted the correct name for the smut will either be the familiar *Ustilago scitaminea*, or else *Sporisorium scitamineum* for those who consider that the species belongs to that genus.

Ustilago scitaminea is the common, well-known, cosmopolitan sugarcane smut, a major disease that has seriously threatened sugarcane production in many countries. The name was lectotypified by Vánky (in Mycotaxon 41: 492. 1991); in addition to the lectotype, there are numerous isolectotypes represented by Sydow, Ustilagineen no. 384 (as *Ustilago sacchari*). Recently, Vánky (Mycotaxon 89: 114. 2004) demonstrated that the type of *U. amadelpha* Syd. & al. is identical with *U. scitaminea*, making that name a synonym of the older *U. amadelpha*, which was based entirely on Butler 1425 cited above. Vánky (l.c. 2004) indicated the specimen at HCIO as type (see also Mundkur, Trans. Brit. Mycol. Soc. 23: 104. 1939) and that there is an isotype in Herb. Ustilaginales Vánky as No. 16373.

Vánky (in Australas. Plant Path. 29: 160. 2000) noted that the presence of sterile cells, columella and peridium in *Ustilago scitaminea* are characters of *Sporisorium* rather than *Ustilago*. He also argued that “because of the general usage of the name, *Ustilago scitaminea*, for such an important disease as sugarcane smut, it is not practical to transfer it into *Sporisorium* and then to propose the name *U. scitaminea* for conservation”. Piepenbring, Stoll & Oberwinkler (in Mycological Progress 1: 75, 2002) introduced the new combination *Sporisorium scitamineum* on the basis of the same three morphological characters identified by Vánky (l.c.) as well as molecular data.

Probably because of its supposed *Andropogon* host, *U. amadelpha* has, to our knowledge, been mentioned previously only by Zundel (in Mycologia 22: 127. 1930), who “re-described” it on no cited basis, and Mundkur (l.c.), who clearly doubted the identity of the host, which we now believe is probably *Saccharum*. To avoid the change of *U.*