

and SCHWEINIZ, in their admirable *Conspectus Fungorum*, seem to have given rise to this confusion, which has been farther increased by DE CANDOLLE in the *Flore Française*, under *E. purpureum*, although that author has, in the same work, very correctly described it under the name of *Betulæ*. PERSON, in his new *Mycologia Europæa*, a work of great merit, but very deficient in synonymes and microscopical investigation, has again united the two under *E. betulinum*, although, in a subsequent observation, he says that it grows chiefly on the superior surface, particularly if it is of a red colour. To clear up the matter, he has not given us a single reference, except the general one of *E. betulinum, roseum, and purpureum* of authors.

In the *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, I have observed, that *E. Betulæ* is almost invariably found of a deep purple colour, and very irregular in form, sometimes nearly covering the leaf, at others merely scattered over it. The colour becomes dingy in age, but does not entirely lose its character. Viewed with a pocket-magnifier, it appears not filamentous, but finely granulated.

*Erineum betulinum*, on the contrary, is more defined, and chiefly on, though not confined to, the lower surface. The colour changes from white to a ferruginous or dark tobacco colour. The tubes have some resemblance in their form, but are smaller, and more excentric. The whole plant, also, is never so confluent as the other, and is generally more or less sunk in a swollen portion of the leaf.

---

Fig. 1. *Erineum Betulæ*. Fig. 2. *The same, somewhat magnified*. Fig. 3. *The tubes or sporidia, highly magnified*.