

ANAMORPHS OF OPHIOSTOMATOID FUNGI

Keith A. Seifert

Biodiversity Team (Mycology & Botany), Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, 960 Carling Ave., Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0C6, Canada.

seifertk@agr.gc.ca

Ophiostomatoid anamorphs were critical to the development of holomorph generic concepts in these fungi. Phialidic anamorphs with deep collarettes (formerly *Chalara*) were a critical character for differencing *Ophiostoma* from *Ceratocystis*. The recent recognition of *Grossmania* was also largely based on its *Leptographium* anamorphs. Monothetic interpretations of anamorphic characters led to recognition of many hyphomycete genera associated with *Ophiostoma*; later polythetic interpretations reduced that number. Heterogeneous distribution of *Chalara* and *Graphium* species, genera long associated with Ophiostomatoid anamorphs, led to the restriction of those genera to species closely related to their types. *Thielaviopsis* is now used for *chalara*-like anamorphs of *Ceratocystis*, *Hyalorhinocladiella* and *Sporothrix* for mycelial anamorphs of *Ophiostoma* and *Ceratocystiopsis*, *Pesotum* for synnematosus anamorphs of *Ophiostoma*, and *Leptographium* for macronematous anamorphs of *Grossmania*. Two other hyphomycete genera, *Ambrosiella* and *Dryadomyces*, neither with known teleomorphs, are now known to be phylogenetically related to the *Ophiostomatales*. The idea that anamorph genera must be monophyletic (e.g. the proposed distinction of *Phialographium* from *Pesotum*) could provoke recognition of more segregate genera. Delimitation of monophyletic genera for well-differentiated anamorphs is often achievable. Morphologically reduced anamorphs, often distributed unevenly in phylogenies, are sometimes divided into monophyletic groups without evident diagnostic morphological characters, but at other times are treated as plesiomorphic characters. Synanamorphy confuses nomenclature even more. If each anamorph is considered a taxon to be classified, rather than a character to assist classification, which anamorph warrants a taxonomic name? Workers with Ophiostomatoid fungi often overlook Rec. 59A.3 of the ICBN, which discourages giving anamorphs separate binomials when the teleomorph is known. Eventually mycology will adopt a single binomial system; when this happens; dual names will be an even bigger nomenclatural nuisance.