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Among the mycological collections made by the writer around Poona, India, there were three interesting and rare fungi which, on critical examination, were identified as species of the form genera Coryneum Nees, Phlyctaena Mont. & Desm. and Sirodesmium De Not., parasitizing respectively the living leaves of Glochidion hohenackeri Bedd., Canthus dicoccum (Wt.) Mesill, and Olea dioica Roxb., which on critical search of literature showed to be new host records. All the three fungi are foliicular parasites inciting leaf spots and necrosis often producing shot hole effect.

It was also interesting to note that none of the three fungus genera have been represented among the Indian fungi although they were established according to Saccardo (1884, 1886) as early as 1817 by Nees, 1847 by Montague et al. and 1849 by J. De Notaris respectively. However, there is a report of Coryneum mori Numeria by Butler in 1905 collected on the twigs of Mosus alba L. and Celtis australis which, however, has been since placed as a synonym of the form genus Thyrostroma (Vasudeva, 1960 p. 275.).

DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIES

Phlyctaena canthicola sp. nov. Seshadri.

Infection spots amphigenous, scattered, black, raised, measuring about 1 mm. Stroma hard, brittle, cushion-like black with one to two locules in a stroma, 362.5—870 × 245—580 μ. Pycnidial locules glabrous, non-ostiolate, containing oil globules, 145—232 × 145—217.5 μ. Conidiophores minute, hyaline, lining the entire cavity of the pycnidium. Pycnidiospores hyaline, slightly bent, linear, single celled, measuring 55.5—74.0 × 2.05 μ.
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Collected on the living leaves of *Canthium dicoccum* (Wt.) Mesill, by the writer at Matheran in the month of January 1964. Remarks: In view of the absence of any record of this fungus on this host genus, a comparison was made between this collection and the type species, *Phlyctaena vagabunda* Desm., with the results presented in Table I.

*Phlyctaena vagabunda* Desm., is inadequately described and hence a careful comparison is not possible. However, the table I would prove that the Indian collection is distinct from the type, not only

### Table I.
Comparison between the type species of *Phlyctaena* and the Indian species.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Habitat and host</th>
<th>Stroma</th>
<th>Pycnidia</th>
<th>Pycnidiospores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>P. vagabunda</em></td>
<td>Saprophytic on Phytalo-ceae etc., caulivorous</td>
<td>Minute, brown, fibrous, pseudoperithecia numerous</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Hyaline, curved, linear, 18-25 μ long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>P. canthicola</em></td>
<td>Parasitic on <em>Canthium dicoccum</em>, follicular</td>
<td>Black, hard, cushion-like, with one to two locules, 362.5-870 × 245-580</td>
<td>Globular, 145-232 × 145-217.5 μ</td>
<td>Hyaline, bent, linier, 74.0 × 2.05 μ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. *Phlyctaena canthicola*. A, Habitat. B, Section through infection spot. C, Conidiophores with conidia. D, Conidia.