

February 17th. 1915.

Prof. Dr. P. A. Saccardo,

Padua, Veneto, Italie.

My dear Sir:-

Your name has been given to me as the authority of the systematic mycology and I therefore take the liberty to ask your opinion concerning to the new genus *Phaeosphaeria* I. Miyake (in Bat. Mag. Vol. XXIII, No. 266, p. 8, 1909). Mr. I. Miyake has described a fungus, quite different from *Leptosphaeria* Cattanei v. Thümen parasiting on the leaves of rice plants, which closely related to *Leptosphaeria* but no paraphyses, and on the other hand to *Sphaerulina* but with brown colored spores. On lacking the paraphyses, the said fungus must belong to *Mycosphaerellaceae*. From this standpoint, Mr. Miyake has established a new genus "<sup>P</sup>haeosphaeria" and at the same time he changed the scientific name *Leptosphaeria* Cattanei v. Thüm. to *Phaeosphaeria* Cattanei (v. Thüm.) I. Miyake.

Recently Mr. K. Hara has insisted that it is more proper to raise your subg. *Leptosphaerella* (in Syll. XIV, p. 19) to the genus instead of *Phaeosphaeria* Miyake. I believe that the subg. *Leptosphaerella* has been applied to the leaf growing *Leptosphaeria* D. G. (in Syll. II, p. 47), but afterwards it has been changed to the fungi belonging *Sphaerellaceae*, *Phaeophragmiae* not *Pleosporeae*, *Phaeophragmiae* (in Syll. XIV, p. 19). It seems to me that the



IMPERIAL AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION.

NISHIGAHARA, TOKYO JAPAN

Hara's opinion i. e. raising subg. *Leptosphaerella* to genus, is to be reasonable.

Since I am now studying of the parasitic fungi on rice plants, I should be greatly obliged to get your answer concerning to the above arguments. I am very sorry to trouble to you.

Trusting that I may have the pleasure of a reply from you, I am,  
very sincerely yours,

*Dr. S. Hori.*