

Journal Review

Field Mycology, vol. 1, part 1.

New mycological magazine

published quarterly by Cambridge University Press for the British Mycological Society, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Surrey TW9 3AE, Great Britain.

Edited by Geoffrey Kibby. E-mail of the Editorial: FieldMycol@aol.com. ISSN 1468-1641.

Price: 16 pound sterling for individuals, 26 for institutions.

The first number of the new mycological journal *Field Mycology* was published in January 2000. According to its editors, it should be a full colour journal providing articles of interest about fungi to the field mycologists, covering all aspects of identification, conservation, recording and collection, for all ages and educational levels. The editorial board consists mainly of non-professional mycologists, members of the British Mycological Society (for instance G. Kibby – editor in chief, A. Henrici, R. Phillips etc.). Professional mycologists are represented by P. Roberts from the Herbarium of the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. Geographically, the articles deal with all aspects of field mycology with an emphasis on British and northern European fungi.

The papers in the first volume can be divided into several main groups: 1. methods of collecting, identification and documentation in the mycology of macromycetes, 2. portraits, comments and colour photographs of interesting fungal species, 3. user friendly identification keys and introductions to several genera or fungal groups, 4. book reviews, 5. a profile of an mycological group, 6. reports on new finds of selected species of fungi.

The first impression of the new journal is good and pleasant. It is printed on quality paper and the reproduction of colour photographs is true. The layout is well-arranged and makes the text easy to follow. In my opinion, it is very important that so much space is devoted to methodology. What we need is to improve our skills and knowledge to be able to understand the specifics and difficulties of mycology. For beginners it is always better to understand the variability of macromycetes and be able to recognise the important macro- and microcharacters more than superficially know hundreds of species. In future volumes the amount of pages devoted to identification keys could even be reduced (they are often misleading if not based on thorough monographic knowledge of a particular genus or group) in favour of methodological papers (for instance: how to recognise different type of hyphae, cystidia, how to use stains and microchemical reagents, what are the important diagnostic characters of individual genera, how to document interesting records etc.). Consequently, the reader will become familiar with the conceptional background of present mycology and then be able to work independently. The new journal is set up this way which is likeable.

A journal like *Field Mycology* certainly is very interesting for people from all parts of Europe. Regarding some minor inaccuracies (e.g. p. 12: *Gloiothete lactescens*: amyloid ornamented spores, wrong!, p. 17: the same species: spores smooth, correct!), the editorial work should be done more carefully to ensure correctness of the information.

Finally, I wish *Field Mycology* a lot of success, many satisfied readers and good weather for collecting fungi that will be presented on its pages!

Jan Holec