

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY,
DAIRY DIVISION.

Storrs, Connecticut, U.S.A. July 28, 1908.

Prof. P.A. Saccardo,

Padua, Italy.

Dear sir:

I have been working over your species of *Penicillium*. I find that *P. olivaceum* of Wehmer is the same as *P. digitatum*. In citing the literature of this species you go back to Micheli-plate 91 fig. 3, citing your use of *digitatum* from Fries, who cites it from Persoon, and it is also cited from Bulliard and the same authors note also that Linnaeus in 1753 used the same plate in ~~Micheli's~~ Micheli's *Genera Plantarum* as the basis of *Mucor caespitosus*. I have found your material in *Mycotheca italica* no. 986 in the Herb. of the U.S. Dept. Agr. I am satisfied that I know therefore what you mean by this species ~~xx~~ but in using the name I am unable to find out whether you based such use upon definite certainty that this was *Monilia digitata* according to Fries and Persoon or not? Was this included in the Herbarium of Micheli? In other words, do we know what Micheli's plate 91 fig. 3 really was? If we do, ~~x~~ rules of nomenclature would make this *P. caespitosum* (L). If we do not know what Micheli and Persoon worked with, do we not come down to your material 1881 as referred to in *Fungi italici* as the first full description with material known? I would be very much obliged to you if you would write me your opinion as to the proper use of this name. In a paper I am just sending in, I am letting it stand as *P. digitatum* Sacc. non Fries! What do you think?

Very truly yours,

(Charles Thom).

Charles Thom

Siccome l' *Aspergill* ^{altr.} *penicillinus* en. Mich. p. 211 è indicato
 del suo autore come esclusivo. noi che per frutto e limbo e
 per 1000 le chiamo *Aspergill* ^{altr.} *Dycteta*, notando che è *glauca*
 io trova. forse apparte la spec. *peculiaris* citata. Tant' più
 che ~~non può esser~~ l' *Aspergill* *caespitos* L' (α e β)
 è veramente una spec. complessa e si veda la tab. 91
 fig. 3 di Kribel. è di Linna citata anche per *Penicilli-*
mutuum. Io invece giudico che il nome di *P. Dycteta*
 (Pers.) Sac. per la spec. citata dovess. ess. mantenuto.