

Addendum to „*Aurantioporus*“

The two combinations made in the genus *Aurantioporus*, in „Westfäl. Pilzbriefe“ IX, 6—7: 115, are not valid, as the place and page of the original publication of the basionyms were not mentioned (Seattle Code, 1972, Art. 33). For validation I here give the complete data:

Aurantioporus fissilis (Berk. et Curt.) H. Jahn **nov. comb.**, Basionym: *Polyporus fissilis* Berk. et Curt., in Journ. Bot. et Kew Misc. 5:234, 1853. (Overholts, in „The Polyporaceae of the United States, Alaska and Canada“, 1953, cites as basionym: *P. fissilis* Berk. et Curt., in Hooker's Jour. Bot. 1:234, 1849.)

Aurantioporus alborubescens (Bourd. et Galz.) H. Jahn **nov. comb.**, Basionym: *Phaeolus albosordescens* (Romell) subsp. *alborubescens* Bourd. et Galz., in Bull. Soc. Myc. de France XLI: 136, 1925. — Later published as species by the authors: *Phaeolus alborubescens* Bourd. et Galz., Hyménomycètes de France: 556, 1928).

H. Jahn