

Sareomycetes: More Diversity than Meets the Eye

James Kameron Mitchell (✉ jmitchell@fas.harvard.edu)

Harvard University <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3359-6165>

Isaac Garrido-Benavent

National Museum of Natural Sciences: Museo Nacional de Ciencias Naturales

Luis Quijada

Harvard University

Donald H. Pfister

Harvard University

Research

Keywords: 4 new taxa, Atrozythia, cryptic diversity, integrative taxonomy, resinicolous fungi, Sarea, Zythia

Posted Date: September 25th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-81501/v1>

License:   This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published on March 16th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43008-021-00056-0>.

Abstract

Since its resurrection, the resinicolous discomycete genus *Sarea* has been accepted as containing two species, one with black apothecia and pycnidia, and one with orange. We investigate this hypothesis using three ribosomal (nuITS, nuLSU, mtSSU) regions from and morphological examination of 70 specimens collected primarily in Europe and North America. The results of our analyses support separation of the traditional *Sarea difformis* s.l. and *Sarea resinae* s.l. into two distinct genera, *Sarea* and *Zythia*. *Sarea* as circumscribed is shown to comprise three phylospecies, with one corresponding to *Sarea difformis* s.s. and two, morphologically indistinguishable, corresponding to the newly combined *Sarea coeloplata*. *Zythia* is maintained as monotypic, containing only a genetically and morphologically variable *Z. resinae*. The new genus *Atrozythia* is erected for the new species *A. klamathica*. *Arthrographis lignicola* is placed in this genus on molecular grounds, expanding the concept of *Sareomyces* by inclusion of a previously unknown type of anamorph. Dating analyses using additional marker regions indicate the emergence of the *Sareomyces* was roughly concurrent with the diversification of the genus *Pinus*, suggesting that this group of fungi emerged to exploit the newly-available resinous ecological niche supplied by *Pinus* or another, extinct group of conifers. Our phylogeographic studies also permitted us to study the introductions of these fungi to areas where they are not native, including Antarctica, Cape Verde, and New Zealand and are consistent with historical hypotheses of introduction.

Introduction

Conifers, particularly in the families *Araucariaceae*, *Pinaceae*, and *Cupressaceae*, produce resins in their tissues (Langenheim 2003) as part of a complex defense system to protect against herbivores (Smith 1961; Rudinsky 1966; van Buijtenen and Santamour 1972), pathogenic fungi (Whitney and Denyer 1969; Gibbs 1972; Hart et al. 1975; Yamada 2001), protists (Krupa and Nylund 1972; Bunny and Tippett 1988), and bacteria (Hemingway and Greaves 1973; Hartmann et al. 1981). To protect against fungi, resins have the potential to act in several different manners. First, they present a physical barrier to penetration by fungal hyphae (Verrall 1938; Shain 1971; Rishbeth 1972; Prior 1976). When soft, resin can flow, trapping fungal hyphae and spores; when hard, the resin is difficult to penetrate. Furthermore, the components of the resin can inhibit the growth of fungi, acting as a chemical barrier (Cobb et al. 1968; Hintikka 1970; De Groot 1972; Fries 1973; Väisälä 1974; Chou and Zabkiewicz 1976; Bridges 1987; Yamamoto et al. 1997). Despite this apparently inhospitable environment, there are a number of so called "resiniculous" fungi that have evolved to exploit this niche (Cappelletti 1924; Selva and Tuovila 2016).

The study of fungi growing on conifer resins has a long history, dating back to the fathers of mycology (Persoon 1801; Fries 1815, 1822). The first species described was *Helotium aureum*, described in 1801 by Christiaan Persoon, though he made no mention of the resinicolous habit (Seifert and Carpenter 1987). Thus, the first author to describe fungi dwelling on resin was Elias Fries, who described three such fungi in 1815. *Sphaeria resinae* and *Lecidea resinae* were described as sharing the same habitat and easily confused; these were later determined to represent the anamorphic and teleomorphic states of the same fungus, currently known as *Sarea resinae* (Fr.) Kuntze (Ayers 1941; Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981). The third species, *Racodium resinae*, described from *Picea* resin, is a synnematous hyphomycete now called

Sorocybe resinae (Fr.) Fr. (Seifert et al. 2007). These three Friesian species were followed by *Cytospora resinae*, described by Christian Ehrenberg in 1818 (Ehrenberg 1818); this was later determined to be a synonym of Fries' *Sphaeria resinae* (Fries 1823; von Thümen 1880). The last of these early species was described in 1822, again by Fries, as *Peziza difformis* [now *Sarea difformis* (Fr.)Fr.]. No new resinicolous taxa were noted until Arnold (1858).

The two species assigned to the genus *Sarea*, *S. resinae* and *S. difformis*, are the most commonly collected and reported of these resinicolous fungi. A search of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) database for *S. resinae* yielded 1261 records, and a search for "*Sarea resinae*" on Google Scholar yields 249 results, with *S. difformis* giving 519 records and 196 results, respectively. In contrast, *Sorocybe resinae* gives only 24 records and 56 results (accessed 13 July 2020). In addition to frequent reports, the two *Sarea* species have also been a subject of some interest regarding their systematic placement, which has been unclear (Reeb et al. 2004; Miadlikowska et al. 2014). A recent study resolved the uncertainty and has supported the erection of a new class in *Pezizomycotina*, *Sareomycetes* (Beimforde et al. 2020). This study, as well as a recent study that yielded 31 endolichenic isolates of *Sarea* species (Masumoto and Degawa 2019), have illustrated that both *Sarea* species are genetically diverse. This pattern is present in published sequences of both *Sarea* species deposited in public repositories. Sequence similarity and phylogenetic analyses also suggest that *Arthrographis lignicola* Sigler, though morphologically unlike *Sarea* species, is a close relative (Giraldo et al. 2014). This, combined with the wide distributions of these species, suggest a higher than known diversity, both obvious and cryptic, in *Sareomycetes*. The aim of this study is to assess this diversity.

To assess this diversity within *Sareomycetes*, an integrative taxonomic approach was employed. Fresh and fungarium specimens of orange (*Sarea resinae*) and black (*S. difformis*) species from around the world were borrowed or collected and examined morphologically. Where possible, DNA was extracted, and several regions amplified and sequenced. Two multi-locus datasets were assembled to investigate species boundaries and their phylogenetic relationships, as well as to provide further insights on the evolutionary history of *Sareomycetes* on a temporal and spatial scale.

Materials And Methods

Specimens Examined and Microscopic Examination

During the course of this study, a number of specimens of *Sarea* were collected and examined by the authors. The host range and distribution of these specimens were broad, with collections from the United States (California, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Vermont) made by the first author and collections from Austria, Cape Verde, Spain and Switzerland made by the second author. Further specimens were collected by and lent by Tomás J. Curtis (Ohio), Alden C. Dirks (Michigan, Wisconsin), Michael Haldeman (Idaho, Washington), Jason M. Karakehian (Maine, Massachusetts, Newfoundland), Elizabeth Kneiper (Maine, Massachusetts), Jiří Malíček (Czechia), Rubén Negrín Piñero (Canary Islands), Donald H. Pfister (Dominican Republic), Michaela Schnull (New York), Judi Thomas (Missouri), Per Vetlesen (Norway), and Andrus Voitk (Newfoundland). Further specimens of *Sarea*

and other critical materials from the following fungaria were studied: B, CANL, DUKE, FH, H, K, LD, MICH, NCSLG, NY, TFM, TNS, and TROM (acronyms following Index Herbariorum, <http://sweetgum.nybg.org/science/ih/>).

Microscopic examination of hymenial elements was conducted using free-hand sections cut under a dissecting microscope (Wild M5; Leica Geosystems, Heerbrugg, Switzerland) and of the excipulum using sections made on a freezing microtome. Microtome sections were prepared by stabilizing water-hydrated apothecia on a freezing stage (Physitemp BFS-MP; Physitemp Instruments LLC, Clifton, NJ) with a diluted gum arabic solution and sectioning with a sliding microtome (Bausch & Lomb Optical Co., Rochester, NY) set at approximately 25 μm . The resulting sections were applied serially to a clean glass slide and allowed to adhere by drying in the remaining gum arabic. Slides were prepared under a dissecting microscope (Olympus SZX9; Olympus Corporation, Tokyo, Japan) and studied with a compound microscope (Olympus BX40; Olympus Corporation, Tokyo, Japan). Digital images were captured with an Olympus XC50 USB camera (Olympus Corporation, Tokyo, Japan). Hand sections were studied with a compound microscope (Motic B1; Motic, Hong Kong, China). Except for two fresh collections studied alive in tap water (Fig. 1, b1-d2, Fig. 2, b1-d3) and a culture studied on PDA (Fig. 1, n), all the other specimens (Fig. 1, g1-m2, o1-o4, Fig. 2, e2-e9, f2-f9, g2-g9, h2-h9, i2-i9, j2-j9, k2-k9, l2-l9, m2-m9, Fig. 3, b1-d4), were pre-treated in 5% KOH prior to morphological studies. Melzer's reagent (MLZ) was used to test amyloidity and Congo red (CR) to contrast cells walls. Images were captured with a Moticam 2500 USB camera and processed with the software Motic images Plus 2.0 (Motic, Hong Kong, China). The 95% confidence intervals of the median were calculated with SPSS 15.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) for each morphological feature. Measurements are given as follows: (the smallest single measurement) smallest value for percentile of 95% - Largest value for percentile of 95% (largest single measurement). Whenever possible, biometric values are based on ≥ 10 measurements for each character on an individual specimen.

Culturing

Some specimens were grown in axenic culture. Cultures were generated from ascospore shoots. A living apothecium was placed oriented upward on a dab of petroleum jelly on a filter paper. This assemblage was then placed in the lid of an upside-down, sterile petri dish containing either potato dextrose agar (PDA) or cornmeal agar (CMA) prepared according to the manufacturer's instructions (HiMedia Laboratories Pvt. Ltd., Mumbai, India). The filter paper was saturated with water, and the chamber sealed with Parafilm (Bemis Company, Inc., Neenah, WI). After incubation at room temperature for one or two days, the lid was removed and replaced with another sterile lid. The culture was then allowed to grow at 25 °C for up to one month before sampling.

DNA Extraction, PCR, and Sequencing

DNA extractions were performed from axenic culture when available and from fresh or preserved apothecia or pycnidia otherwise. Fresh or plentiful dried material was extracted by grinding 1–2 apothecia, 3–4 pycnidia, or a rice grain-sized slice of a culture and employing the DNeasy Plant Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Venlo, Netherlands) following the manufacturer's recommendations. Preserved or scanty material was extracted by

grinding .25 – 2 apothecia or 2–3 pycnidia and employing the QIAamp DNA Micro Kit (QIAGEN, Venlo, Netherlands), again following the manufacturer's recommendations.

Three rDNA regions were amplified: the internal transcribed spacer regions plus 5.8S gene (nuITS), the nuclear large subunit ribosomal RNA gene (nuLSU), and the mitochondrial small subunit ribosomal RNA gene (mtSSU). For older material, nuITS was obtained in two parts by employing the primer pairs ITS1-F (Gardes and Bruns 1993) + 5.8S (Vilgalys and Hester 1990) and 5.8S-R (Vilgalys and Hester 1990) + ITS4 (White et al. 1990). For other extractions nuITS + nuLSU was amplified in one or two pieces, using the primer pairs ITS1-F + LR5 (Vilgalys and Hester 1990), ITS1-F + LR3 (Vilgalys and Hester 1990) and LR0R (Rehner and Samuels 1994) + LR5, or ITS1-F + ITS4 and LR0R + LR5. The region mtSSU was amplified using the primer pair mrSSU1 + mrSSU3R (Zoller et al. 1999). For our dating analysis, two additional genes were obtained for a small subset of fresh specimens, the nuclear small subunit ribosomal RNA gene (nuSSU) and the second largest subunit of RNA polymerase II gene (*RPB2*). The nuSSU was obtained employing the primer pair NS1 + NS4 (White et al. 1990). *RPB2* was amplified in two pieces, employing the primer pairs fRPB2-5F + fRPB2-7cR and fRPB2-7cF + fRPB2-11aR (Liu et al. 1999). All primers were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (Coralville, IA).

When nuITS + nuLSU was amplified in a single piece, REExtract-N-Amp PCR ReadyMix (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) was used; when amplified in multiple parts or amplifying nuSSU, EconoTaq DNA Polymerase (Lucigen, Middleton, WI) was used. Amplification was performed for mtSSU and *RPB2* using Q5 High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA). All PCR reactions were performed using 5 µL of full strength, 1/10 dilution, or 1/100 dilutions of the DNA extracts as templates in a total reaction volume of 25 µL and utilized either a Mastercycler ep gradient (Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany) or a C1000 Touch Thermal Cycler (Bio-rad, Hercules, CA). All PCR protocols are included in File S1.

PCR products sometimes contained multiple bands. In these cases, the band of interest was excised from a 2% agarose gel and purified using either a QIAquick Gel Extraction Kit (QIAGEN, Venlo, Netherlands) or a Monarch DNA Gel Extraction Kit (New England BioLabs, Inc.). Otherwise, single-band PCR products were purified with a QIAquick PCR Purification Kit (QIAGEN) or a Monarch PCR & DNA Cleanup Kit (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA). In the case of faint PCR products, reamplification was performed using 5 µL of a 1/100 dilution of the previous PCR product as template in a total reaction volume of 25 µL using the same polymerase, primers, reaction recipe, and cycling parameters as previously.

In preparation for sequencing, all purified products were run on a 1% agarose gel with 0.0001% GelRed Nucleic Acid Stain, 10,000X in Water (Biotium, Hayward, CA) added for DNA visualization and using Gel Loading Dye Purple (6x), no SDS (New England BioLabs, Ipswich, MA). UV photographs of gels were taken with an Alphamager EP (Alpha Innotech, San Leandro, CA), and band fluorescence was estimated using the AlphaView software (Alpha Innotech, San Leandro, CA). Purified PCR product concentration was assessed by comparison with the fluorescence of the bands in Low DNA Mass Ladder (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) run on the same gel. All PCR products of all genes were sent to GeneWiz Inc. sequencing facilities (Cambridge, MA) for Sanger Sequencing. The forward and reverse sequences from each PCR product were edited and a consensus sequence generated using Sequencher v. 5.1 (GeneCodes, AnnArbor, MI). All sequences were

submitted to GenBank, with accession numbers listed in Table S1. Our alignments were submitted to TreeBase (XXXXXXXXXX).

Assembling Published Sareomycetes Sequences

Sequences of species in *Sareomycetes*, either already identified or identified by us through BLAST similarity, are available on public databases such as GenBank, UNITE (Nilsson et al. 2019), and the NARO Genebank Microorganism Search System (https://www.gene.affrc.go.jp/databases-micro_search_en.php). Those nuITS sequences used from these databases were restricted to complete or nearly complete (> 450 bp). The identified sequences were obtained by searching GenBank and the NARO Genebank Microorganism Search System for *Sarea*, *Sarea resiniae*, *Sarea difformis*, or *Arthrographis lignicola* and downloading those sufficiently complete nuITS and nuLSU sequences (71 and 19 sequences, respectively).

Unidentified and misidentified sequences were found by searching GenBank using the Nucleotide Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST) (Altschul 1997) with nuITS, nuLSU, and mtSSU sequences derived from morphologically identified specimens. The "distance tree of results" feature was employed, with sequences identified as *Lecanoromycetes* species excluded from consideration. The remaining sequences on branches with or adjacent to identified *Sareomycetes* sequences were downloaded and identified by comparison to further sequences of identified specimens. This yielded an additional 30 sequences. Two of these were discarded because they were identified as chimeric by BLASTing their nuITS1 and nuITS2 portions separately. This method was used to determine that KF274061 consists of a nuITS1 region from *Sarea resiniae s. lat.* and a nuITS2 region from an unidentifiable fungus with affinities to *Leotiomyces*, and KM104053 consists of a nuITS1 region from *Sarea difformis s. lat.* and a nuITS2 region from *Sarea resiniae s. lat.* In addition, the UNITE database was searched by examining sequences unique to the UNITE database included in the 8 species hypotheses for the genus *Sarea* and the 11 species hypotheses for the genus *Arthrographis*. These were downloaded and identified by comparison with sequences of identified specimens; low similarity sequences were discarded. In this way, 8 sequences were identified.

Host, locality, and specimen/culture strain data were determined for all published sequences by consulting the information provided in the source database, relevant publications, and relevant culture collection databases (e.g. <http://www.wi.knaw.nl/collections/>, <https://www.atcc.org/>, and <https://www.uamh.ca/searchCatalogue.php>). These data as well as accession numbers and updated identifications are included in Table S1.

Sequence Alignments

MAFFT v. 7.308 (Kato 2002; Kato and Standley 2013) was used to generate a multiple sequence alignment (MSA) independently for each marker with the following parameters: the FFT-NS-I x1000 algorithm, the 200PAM / k = 2 scoring matrix, a gap open penalty of 1.5 and an offset value of 0.123. The resulting alignments were manually optimized in Geneious v. 9.0.2 (a) to replace gaps at the ends of shorter sequences with an IUPAC base representing any base ("N"), and (b) to trim ends of longer sequences in the nuITS MSA that included part of the 18S–28S ribosomal subunits. The software GBlocks v. 0.91b

(Castresana 2000) was used to automatically remove ambiguously aligned regions in the nuITS and mtSSU MSAs using the least stringent parameters but allowing gaps in 50% of the sequences.

Phylogenetic Tree Inference

The online version of RAxML-HPC2 hosted at the CIPRES Science Gateway (Stamatakis 2006; Stamatakis et al. 2008; Miller et al. 2010) was used to estimate a three-locus phylogeny under a Maximum Likelihood (ML) framework based on a dataset comprising specimens with at least two available sequenced markers. Several specimens of *Pycnora* were included as outgroup to root phylogenetic trees. Prior to concatenation, and to test for topological incongruence among sequence datasets, we inferred ML trees independently for each locus with RAxML-HPC2, using 1000 bootstrap pseudoreplicates, and assumed bootstrap values $\geq 70\%$ as significant for conflicting relationships among the same set of taxa (Mason-Gamer and Kellogg 1996). Because no conflicts were detected, the RAxML analysis was conducted using the GTRGAMMA substitution model for the four delimited partitions (nuITS1 + 2, 5.8S, nuLSU, mtSSU) and 1000 rapid bootstrap pseudoreplicates were implemented to evaluate nodal support. Evolutionary relationships were additionally inferred in a Bayesian context using MrBayes v. 3.2.6 (Ronquist et al. 2012). Optimal substitution models and partition schemes for these four sequence data partitions were estimated with PartitionFinder v. 1.1.1 (Lanfear et al. 2012) considering a model with linked branch lengths and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). This analysis favoured the SYM + Γ model for the nuITS1 + 2 partition, the K80 + I + Γ for the 5.8S + nuLSU, and the HKY + I + Γ for the mtSSU. The analysis was then conducted with two parallel, simultaneous four-chain runs executed over 5×10^7 generations starting with a random tree, and sampling after every 500th step. The first 25% of data were discarded as burn-in, and the 50% majority-rule consensus tree and corresponding posterior probabilities were calculated from the remaining trees. Average standard deviation of split frequencies (ASDSF) values below 0.01 and potential scale reduction factor (PSRF) values approaching 1.00 were considered as indicators of chain convergence. Tree nodes showing bootstrap support (BP) values equal or higher than 70% (RAxML analysis) and Bayesian posterior probabilities (PP) equal or higher than 0.95 (MrBayes analysis) were regarded as significantly supported. Phylogenetic trees were visualized in FigTree v. 1.4 (available at <http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>) and Adobe Illustrator CS5 was used for artwork.

Species Discovery-Validation Approach

Based on the existence of well-delimited and highly supported clades in the three-locus phylogenetic tree inferred above, we assessed species boundaries independently for the orange and black *Sarea*. To this end, we used the distance-based Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery method (ABGD) (Puillandre et al. 2012), restricting the analyses to specimens with available data for the fungal barcode nuITS. The analyses used the Kimura two-parameters (K2P) model to estimate genetic distances, a transition/transversion value of 3.95 (orange *Sarea*) and 3.07 (black *Sarea*) calculated with MEGA v.5.2 (Tamura et al. 2011), a P_{max} of 0.01, and different values for the relative gap width (X). Subsequently, the Bayes Factor Delimitation (BFD) method, which allows for topological uncertainty in gene trees and incongruences among gene trees, was chosen to compare the two species boundary hypotheses generated for the black *Sarea* on the basis of our morphological study of the specimens, and the ABGD and phylogenetic results (Table 1). *BEAST (Heled and Drummond 2010; Drummond et al. 2012) was used to build the two competing models. These

comprised a three-locus dataset in which specimens with identical sequences were removed to avoid sequence redundancies; the number of specimens left was 85, including outgroup specimens. The same optimal substitution models and partition schemes selected in the MrBayes analysis were used for the *BEAST analyses except for the substitution model TrNef + I + Γ , which was preferred for the 5.8S + nuLSU partition. An uncorrelated relaxed lognormal molecular clock was chosen for the three markers based on a preliminary assessment of the adequacy of strict clocks in MEGA 5.0 (Tamura et al. 2011) (see Table S2). The mean clock rate was fixed to 1.0 for nuITS whereas rates were co-estimated for nuLSU and mtSSU under a uniform prior (1×10^{-5} , 5). A birth-death process tree prior was imposed after conducting preliminary Bayes factors comparisons of Maximum Likelihood Estimates (MLE) calculated with Path Sampling and Stepping-Stone (Lartillot and Philippe 2006; Xie et al. 2011) for models implementing alternative tree priors (see Table S2). By using this tree prior we accommodated incomplete sampling and speciation of nodes in the topology. The *BEAST analyses used a piecewise linear and constant root model for population size (Grummer et al. 2014). Hyperpriors for the birth-death process tree prior and species population mean were given an inverse gamma distribution with an initial value of 1 or 0.1, shape parameter of 1 or 2 and scale of 1 or 2, respectively. Default (but informative) priors were given for the remaining parameters across all analyses. Finally, *BEAST runs of 1.5×10^8 generations, saving every 15000th tree, were performed using the CIPRES Science Gateway (Miller et al. 2010). Tracer v.1.7 (<http://tree.bio.ed.ac.uk/software/tracer/>) was used to check for convergence, assumed if effective sample sizes (ESS) were > 200. Then, MLE for the two species boundary models were calculated using Path Sampling and Stepping-Stone, with default settings. Bayes Factors were calculated following Hedin et al. (2015). $2\ln\text{BF} > 10$ indicate very strong evidence against a model as compared with the best (Kass and Raftery 1995).

Table 1
Species delimitation hypotheses in *Sarea*

	Distinct species	Motivation	Path Sampling		Stepping-Stone	
			Ln (Marginal Likelihood)	2ln (Bayes Factor)	Ln (Marginal Likelihood)	2ln (Bayes Factor)
Model 1 (three <i>Sarea</i> spp.)	<i>Sarea difformis</i> / <i>S. coeloplata</i> 1 / <i>S. coeloplata</i> 2	Morphological observations and three-locus phylogenies (RAxML and MrBayes)	-7867.9101	N/A	-7868.3128	N/A
Model 2 (two <i>Sarea</i> spp.)	<i>Sarea difformis</i> + <i>S. coeloplata</i> 1 / <i>S. coeloplata</i> 2	ABGD nuITS	-7873.5589	11.2976	-7874.1365	11.6474

Marginal likelihood and Bayes factor values for two alternative species delimitation hypotheses in *Sarea* and their motivation. The best model is highlighted in bold.

Polymorphism Statistics, Haplotype Networks, and Neutrality Tests

DNA polymorphism was assessed for each candidate species delineated by the species discovery-validation approach. The software DnaSP v.5.10 (Librado and Rozas 2009) was used to compute the number of segregating sites (s), number of haplotypes (h), haplotype diversity (Hd) calculated without considering gap positions, and nucleotide diversity (π) using the Jukes & Cantor (1969) correction. For these calculations, we used the original nuITS dataset (i.e. not processed with GBlocks), and the GBlocks-trimmed mtSSU alignment because of the high occurrence of large indels. In the nuLSU dataset, three black *Sarea* sequences and 19 out of 51 orange *Sarea* sequences were removed due to the high number of “N” base calls. Next, statistical parsimony using the method TCS (Clement et al. 2002) as implemented in PopART v.1.7 (Leigh and Bryant 2015) was used to infer relationships among haplotypes of the orange and black *Sarea s.l.* These haplotypes were inferred with DnaSP v. 5.10 considering sites with alignment gaps and removing invariable sites and were labelled according to their geographic origin. Finally, deviations from neutrality, which are useful for interpreting past population size changes, were tested with Tajima’s D and Fu’s F_s statistics in DnaSP v.5.10 using the number of segregating sites. The significance of these tests was assessed based on 10^4 coalescent simulations.

Estimating the Age of the Crown Node of Sareomycetes

To infer the age of the crown node of class *Sareomycetes*, a six-locus dataset was compiled using sequences from nine *Sarea s.l.* specimens and sequences retrieved from GenBank representing major clades in the *Ascomycota* tree of life. For ascomycete taxa compilation, we followed Pérez-Ortega et al. (2016), Lutzoni et al. (2018) and Voglmayr et al. (2019). Together with the four basidiomycete species included as outgroup, the final dataset consisted of 169 taxa (Table S3).

Alignments of the nuSSU, nuLSU, mtSSU, RPB1, RPB2 and *tef1- α* were carried out in MAFFT v. 7.308 as implemented in Geneious v. 9.0.2 using the same algorithm parameters as above. Manual optimization of the resulting MSAs consisted in removing clearly ambiguously aligned and intronic regions in rDNA marker datasets (nuSSU, nuLSU and mtSSU), as well as non-coding regions (introns) in the protein-coding markers (RPB1, RPB2 and *tef1- α*). Sequences of the latter three datasets were also translated into amino acids to spot misaligned regions generating stop codons. Finally, “N”s were used to fill gaps at the ends of shorter sequences. The resulting alignment lengths were: nuSSU (1629 bp), nuLSU (1305 bp), mtSSU (651 bp), RPB1 (1100 bp), RPB2 (2001 bp), *tef1- α* (1209 bp), for a total length of 7895 bp. PartitionFinder v. 1.1.1 was used to estimate the optimal number of partitions of the data along with their corresponding best-fitting nucleotide substitution model using the linked branch lengths option and the Bayesian Information Criterion for model selection. Eight independent data blocks were suggested: 1) nuSSU, 2) nuLSU, 3) *tef1- α* codon1, 4) *tef1- α* codon2, RPB1-codon2, RPB2-codon2, 5) *tef1- α* codon3, 6) RPB2-codon1, RPB1-codon1, 7) RPB2-codon3, RPB1-codon3, and 8) mtSSU. The GTR + I + Γ substitution model was selected for all partitions but 1 (SYM + I + Γ), 2 (TRN + I + Γ), 3 (HKY + I + Γ), and 5 (GTR + Γ). Before assembling the six-locus dataset, potential topological conflicts among markers were visually explored on single-locus ML phylogenetic trees calculated with the online version of RAxML-HPC2 with 1000 bootstrap pseudoreplicates conducted to retrieve nodal support values.

Among all available fossils that may be used to calibrate a class-wide fungal phylogeny (see Lücking & Nelsen 2018 and Samarakoon et al. 2019), we chose six ascomycete fossils, whose details and associated reference publications are in Table S4. Divergence times and a tree topology were then co-estimated in BEAST v. 1.8.1. XML files were prepared in BEAUti v 1.8.1 (Drummond et al. 2012) using the above-mentioned six-locus dataset with the corresponding partitions and nucleotide substitution models. Additional settings included selection of an uncorrelated lognormal relaxed clock for each marker and a birth-death prior, and the use of a rooted, strictly-bifurcating ML topology obtained in RAxML as a starting tree. This ML tree was previously transformed into ultrametric using the function *chronos* in the R package *ape* (Paradis et al. 2004). In the prior settings step, we forced to co-estimate the average rate of evolution of each locus by setting the priors for the *uclid.mean* parameter to uniform (10^{-5} , 0.01). The taxa and prior distributions used to set the fossil calibrations are detailed in Table S4. Fourteen independent BEAST runs of 200 million generations each were carried out, logging parameters and trees every 2×10^4 generations. Then, Tracer v. 1.7 was used to check for convergence and mixing, making sure that ESS were well above 200. After implementing an adequate burn-in portion to the sampled trees in each run, a total of 8×10^4 remaining trees were combined in a single file using LogCombiner v1.8.1 (<http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/logcombiner>). Because the resulting file exceeded 6 GB and could not be handled by TreeAnnotator v.1.8.1 (<http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/treeannotator>), we implemented a custom script to generate ten files with 4×10^4 randomly drawn trees each. These were then processed with TreeAnnotator v.1.8.1 to generate ten maximum clade credibility trees with annotated median node heights. Age estimates in million years ago (Ma), 95% High Posterior Density (HPD) intervals, and average substitution rates for markers reported in this study are the result of averaging over these ten annotated tree files.

Inferring a Time Frame for The Diversification of Sareomycetes

We implemented a secondary calibration approach in BEAST v.1.8.1 on the concatenated three-marker dataset used in the BFD analysis (see section Species discovery-validation approach) to estimate a temporal context for the diversification of the main lineages of *Sareomycetes*. First, a time estimate of 120.88 Ma (181.35–75.76 Ma, 95% HPD) was used to calibrate the crown node of *Sareomycetes* based on results of our previous six-locus dating analysis. This calibration was set as a prior using a normal distribution (mean = 120.88, stdev = 35); average substitution rates for the three loci (nuITS, nuLSU and mtSSU) were co-estimated under a uniform prior (10^{-5} , 0.01). For comparison, we additionally estimated divergence ages using four different substitution rates: a) a mtSSU rate of 3.28×10^{-10} s/s/y inferred for the *Sareomycetes* clade in the six-locus dating approach, b) a nuLSU rate of 2.68×10^{-10} s/s/y inferred for the *Sareomycetes* clade as well, c) a nuITS rate of 2.52×10^{-9} s/s/y calculated for the fungal order *Erysiphales* by Takamatsu and Matsuda (2004), and d) a nuITS rate of 3.41×10^{-9} s/s/y calculated for the lichenized fungal genus *Melanohalea* by Leavitt et al. (2012).

For all analyses, remaining BEAST parameters, especially the clock and tree prior models were set identical to the BFD analyses, and the run consisted on 7.5×10^7 generations, saving every 7500th tree. A 25% of

burn-in was selected in the TreeAnnotator step. Chronograms were drawn with FigTree v. 1.4.

Results

Molecular Sequence Data

Molecular data were obtained from 70 collections. From these, we produced 212 sequences: 70 nuITS, 63 nuLSU, 61 mtSSU, 9 RPB2, and 9 nuSSU (Tables S1 & S3). The nuITS alignment of the 202 sequences produced *de novo* and downloaded from GenBank was 524 bp long; 192 positions were variable and 38 were singleton sites. After processing the alignment with GBlocks, 482 positions (91% of the original alignment) were retained in 24 selected blocks; 172 positions were variable and 33 were singleton sites. The nuLSU alignment comprised 92 sequences and was 914 bp in length; the number of variable and singleton sites were 87 and 21, respectively. The original mtSSU alignment was composed of 75 sequences and 977 positions, of which 253 were variable and 21 were singleton sites. The use of GBlocks trimmed the alignment to 691 bp (70% of the original alignment), displaying 152 variable and ten singleton positions. Last, the concatenated three-locus (nuITS, nuLSU and mtSSU) dataset used for (a) estimating a phylogeny, (b) species validation with the BFD method, and (c) inferring the timing of diversification of *Sareomyces* was composed of 87 specimens of which 63 had data for the three loci. The total number of bp was 2088, including 398 variable and 75 singleton sites.

Phylogenetic Reconstructions

The single-locus phylogenies produced with RAxML had InL values of -3158.2564 (nuITS), -2229.9957 (nuLSU) and -2375.8252 (mtSSU). The nuITS and mtSSU phylogenies showed strong nodal support for (a) a clade including all orange *Sarea s.l.* (hereafter referred to as *Zythia resiniae*; see section Taxonomy below), and (b) a clade assigned to the new genus *Atrozythia* (see section Taxonomy below) including two species composed of a few specimens each (Figs. S1-S3). The two taxa referenced below as *Sarea coeloplata* 2 and *S. difformis s.s.* also formed well delimited and highly supported clades in these two phylogenies; however, *S. coeloplata* 1 was monophyletic with high support only in the mtSSU topology. A supported sister relationship was found for *Zythia* and *Atrozythia*, whereas a clade comprising the three *Sarea* species was only supported in the mtSSU topology, in which *S. coeloplata* 1 and *S. difformis* appeared as sister species. The nuLSU phylogeny only delimited the *S. coeloplata* 2 clade with support, and a specimen assigned to the new species *A. klamathica* was found interspersed in a non-supported clade including *Z. resiniae* specimens (Fig. S2). No clear relationships among the main nuLSU lineages were inferred. On the other hand, three-locus phylogenies inferred with RAxML and MrBayes showed high support (100% BP, PP = 1) for the clades comprising the genera *Zythia*, *Atrozythia* and *Sarea* (Fig. 4). In *Zythia*, these two phylogenetic reconstruction methods were not coherent in delimiting well-supported subclades; only a basal lineage containing samples from Northern and Central Europe, North America, the Iberian Peninsula, and Macaronesia (Cape Verde Is.) showed strong nodal support by both methods. The *Atrozythia* clade was split into two well-supported clades, one corresponding to the new species *A. klamathica* (see section Taxonomy below), and the other to *A. lignicola*. The *Sarea* clade segregated in three well delimited and supported subclades, each corresponding to three different species: *S. difformis* and *S. coeloplata* 1 & 2. All three lineages are

distributed across the Northern Hemisphere (North America and Europe) and occur mainly on *Pinus* and *Picea* resin. Interestingly, in *S. coeloplata* 1, samples from the Iberian Peninsula and Macaronesia (Cape Verde Is.) formed a well-supported subclade sister to the bulk of North American and Northern-Central European specimens. This situation also occurred, although not so markedly, in *S. coeloplata* 2.

Species Delimitation

The ABGD analyses conducted on the *Zythia* (orange specimens) and *Sarea* (epruinose black specimens) nuITS datasets did not reveal clear barcode gaps. In *Zythia*, ABGD rendered 6 to 52 different partitions (i.e., putative species) when the relative gap width (X) was set to 0.5, but initial and recursive partitions only converged in the 52-partitions solution (Fig. S4). With $X=1$, convergence was found for 1 and 52-partition solutions. In agreement with our morphological data, we hereafter considered the existence of only one *Zythia* species. In *Sarea*, although a barcode gap was not strictly found, ABGD analyses using varying levels of X (0.5, 1 and 1.5) suggested the combination of specimens assigned to *S. difformis* and *S. coeloplata* 1 into one single partition (Fig. S5). As this solution contradicted our morphological observations of specimens suggesting the existence of three species in *Sarea*, a hypothesis in agreement with the multi-locus phylogenetic results, we compared the two alternative species delimitation models with the BFD method. Marginal likelihood values for the considered models calculated through Path Sampling and Stepping-Stone are shown in Table 1. Bayes factor comparisons favoured the three species model over the two species model.

Genetic Polymorphism, Neutrality Tests and Phylogeographic Structure

Genetic diversity indices, such as the numbers of segregating sites and haplotypes, were greater for *Zythia resiniae* than for any *Sarea* species across different markers (Table 2). The nucleotide diversity index behaved in a similar way except for the mtSSU marker: though four times as many specimens of *Z. resiniae* as *S. difformis* were included in their respective analyses, *S. difformis* showed slightly higher values than *Z. resiniae*. Haplotype diversity values were comparable among species and markers, although *S. coeloplata* 2 consistently showed lower values. However, these results must be interpreted with caution due to the uneven number of studied specimens for each species, e.g. *Z. resiniae* incorporated three to eight times more individuals in the analyses than the remaining species. Neutrality tests gave significant negative values of Fu's F_s in *S. coeloplata* 1 and *Z. resiniae* based on nuITS data (Table 2), indicating a population expansion. Negative values of Tajima's D and Fu's F_s were also obtained for the same species as well as *S. difformis* using the nuLSU dataset; however, these were not statistically significant. Tajima's D tests of mtSSU data generated positive values for all species,

Table 2
Polymorphism statistics and neutrality tests for *Sarea* spp. and *Zythia resinae*.

Dataset	n	bp	Gaps/missing	s	h	Hd	π (JC)	Tajima's D	Fu's Fs
nuITS									
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 1	22	482	48	17	14/20	0.948	0.00662	-1.41635	-7.954(**)
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 2	15	483	31	17	7/12	0.838	0.01186	0.05176	0.91
<i>Sarea difformis</i>	17	482	28	31	13/13	0.956	0.01754	-0.58929	-2.987
<i>Zythia resinae</i>	118	511	115	71	48/68	0.96	0.02835	-0.55575	-12.831(*)
nuLSU									
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 1	8	909	382	4	4/7	0.786	0.00251	-0.62573	-0.674
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 2	8	907	381	13	4/6	0.75	0.00803	-0.84352	1.756
<i>Sarea difformis</i>	10	908	415	9	7/7	0.911	0.00548	-0.67784	-2.631
<i>Zythia resinae</i>	32	906	226	34	16/17	0.897	0.0114	-0.32928	-1.648
mtSSU									
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 1	5	741	35	12	4/4	0.9	0.00973	1.30583	0.98
<i>Sarea coleoplata</i> 2	8	740	17	14	4/4	0.75	0.01013	1.74512	3.209
<i>Sarea difformis</i>	11	750	72	33	6/8	0.8	0.01919	0.61079	3.46
<i>Zythia resinae</i>	40	691	36	35	14/18	0.931	0.01301	0.08728	-0.796
*: 0.01 < p-value < 0.05; **: p-value < 0.01									

Polymorphism statistics and neutrality tests results for each marker (nuITS, nuLSU and mtSSU), and *Sarea* spp. and *Zythia resiniae*. Columns contain the number of sequences (n), their length (in bp), the number of positions in the alignment with gaps and missing data, the number of segregating sites (s), the number of haplotypes (h ; value after vertical bar was calculated considering gaps in the alignment), haplotype diversity (Hd), nucleotide diversity (π) using the Jukes and Cantor (1969) correction, and results of neutrality tests. but these were not significant as well.

Tokogenic relationships among the 48 nuITS haplotypes of *Zythia resiniae* revealed no geographic structure as haplotypes from North America, Northern/Central Europe and Eastern Asia were widespread across the network (Fig. 5A). Identical haplotypes were shared among widely distant regions: (a) North America and Eastern Asia, and (b) North America, the whole of Europe and the Macaronesian islands. The two studied New Zealand haplotypes were not closely related: whereas one was relatively close to a haplotype shared between North America and Eastern Asia, the other was linked to a haplotype shared between Northern/Central Europe and the Macaronesia. The Caribbean haplotype was close to a North American one. As for *Sarea s.l.*, the network delimited the three considered species well (Fig. 5B). These showed differing levels of intraspecific diversity. For instance, haplotypes of *S. difformis* were separated from each other by a higher number of mutations than haplotypes of *S. coeloplata* 1 & 2. At the geographical scale, whereas haplotypes from any of the considered Northern Hemisphere regions were widespread across the network, we found no haplotypes shared between widely distant localities, except for an Antarctic haplotype shared with Northern/Central Europe and the Iberian Peninsula. These observations may also be due to the limited number of specimens studied compared to the scenario revealed for *Z. resiniae*. Finally, in *S. coeloplata* 1 & 2, some Iberian Peninsula and Macaronesian haplotypes showed an increased number of separating mutations; further, *S. coeloplata* 1 haplotypes from these two regions were closely related.

Age Estimates for the Crown Nodes of Sareomycetes and Main Lineages Within

The maximum clade credibility (MCC) tree with 169 fungal taxa and divergence estimates obtained with BEAST showed posterior probabilities (PP) of 1.0 for all inner nodes except for the sister relationship between the clades allocating *Coniocybomyces*+*Lichinomyces* and *Lecanoromyces*+*Xylobotryomyces*+*Eurotiomyces* that received a support of PP = 0.96 (Fig. S6). The *Orbiliomyces* and *Pezizomyces* formed a clade at the base of *Pezizomycotina* which was dated back to 412.59 Ma (453–400 Ma, 95% HPD). This result is in agreement with previous dating studies of Beimforde et al. (2014) and Pérez-Ortega et al. (2016). The class *Sareomycetes* was revealed to be sister to *Geoglossomycetes* with high support (PP = 1.0). The split between these two lineages might have occurred during the Middle Jurassic (ca. 168.20 Ma; 327.24–109.14 Ma, 95% HPD). The crown node of class *Sareomycetes* was dated to the Lower Cretaceous, ca. 120.88 Ma (181.35–75.76 Ma, 95% HPD) according to our six-locus dating using several fossils as calibration points; however, the use of alternative dating methods in our second step (see section “Inferring a Time Frame for The Diversification of *Sareomycetes*” in Materials and Methods), which was based on a three-locus dataset, provided different time intervals for such an event (Fig. 6; Fig. S7; Table S5). Hence, median age estimates obtained with secondary calibrations drawn from our first, six-locus dating

analysis generated similar time intervals as expected (ca. 101.33 to 134.59 Ma, Lower Cretaceous), whereas the use of the *Erysiphales* and *Melanohalea* nuITS substitution rates shifted this temporal window towards more recent geological times (Paleocene-Eocene, ca. 64.25–47.74 Ma). We then drew the corresponding rate of evolution of the *Sareomycetes* nuITS from the posterior distribution of our three-locus analysis (first analysis in section “Inferring a Time Frame for The Diversification of *Sareomycetes*” in Material and Methods) using the parameter *.rate* as reported in FigTree. The value was 1.269×10^{-3} s/s/Ma (minimum and maximum 95% HPD values: 8.528×10^{-5} and 3.075×10^{-3} s/s/Ma) which implies a more slower rate of evolution for this region compared to estimates in the *Erysiphales* (2.52×10^{-3} s/s/Ma) and *Melanohalea* (3.41×10^{-3} s/s/Ma).

The five chronograms inferred for estimating a time frame for the diversification of *Sareomycetes* showed high posterior probabilities supporting relationships among the main lineages except for the sister relationship between *Sarea difformis* and *S. coeloplata* 1 (PP = 0.93–0.94). Similar to previous results, divergence ages obtained with *Erysiphales* and *Melanohalea* nuITS substitution rates generated much more recent time estimates (Table S5). All in all, the origin and diversification of *Zythia*, *Atrozythia* and *Sarea* occurred during the Tertiary (Table S5). Thus, the crown nodes of *Zythia* and *Sarea* were estimated in the Eocene and Miocene, whereas that of *Atrozythia* in the Oligocene-Miocene (Fig. 6). The split between the two *Atrozythia* species (*A. klamathica* and *A. lignicola*) probably occurred during the Miocene. The crown nodes of the three *Sarea* species were placed in the Oligocene-Miocene. Finally, the different dating strategies estimated that intraspecific diversification in the three studied genera occurred < 10 Ma, in the Neogene and Pleistocene (Figs. S8-S12).

Taxonomy

Although the terms "holotype" and "lectotype" as defined in Article 9 of the International Code of Nomenclature for Algae, Fungi, and Plants (ICN) (Turland et al. 2018) do not apply to names at ranks higher than species, they will be used by analogy here to indicate type species of monotypic genera or type species selected by their authors and type species selected by later authors, respectively (Art. 10, Note 1).

Exclamation points after specimen identifiers indicate that they were examined by the authors. Color coding refers to Inter-Society Color Council (1976).

Sareomycetes Beimforde, A.R. Schmidt, Rikkinen & J.K. Mitch., *Fungal Syst. Evol.* **6**: 29 (2020).

Sareales Beimforde, A.R. Schmidt, Rikkinen & J.K. Mitch., *Fungal Syst. Evol.* **6**: 29 (2020).

Zythiaceae Clem., *Gen. Fung.*: 128 (1909).

Synonym: *Sareaceae* Beimforde, A.R. Schmidt, Rikkinen & J.K. Mitch., *Fungal Syst. Evol.* **6**: 29 (2020).

Atrozythia J.K. Mitch., Quijada, Garrido-Ben. & Pfister, **gen. nov.**

MycoBank XXXXXX.

Diagnosis: Apothecia of *Atrozythia* differ from *Zythia* in their color (black vs. orange) and from *Sarea* because of their white to light blue gray pruina. Paraphyses in *Atrozythia* are unbranched whereas those in *Sarea* are always branched or anastomose, at least in the basal cells. *Zythia* can have unbranched paraphyses but differs from *Atrozythia* in the amount and color of lipid guttules, orange and abundant vs. yellowish and sparse, respectively. *Atrozythia* has a hyaline ectal and medullary excipulum that are sharply delimited by a narrow dark brown pigmented layer; in *Zythia* there is no brown pigmented layer between these layers. In *Sarea* the medullary excipulum is always differentiated by its dark brown color.

Etymology: from the Latin for black (*ater*) and the genus name "*Zythia*," referring to the macroscopic resemblance to *Zythia* species, but with a dark coloration.

Holotype species: *Atrozythia klamathica* J.K. Mitch. & Quijada *sp. nov.*

Description. Teleomorph: See description for *Atrozythia klamathica* J.K. Mitch. & Quijada *sp. nov.* below.

Anamorph: See description of *Arthrographis lignicola* Sigler in Sigler & Carmichael, *Mycotaxon* **18**(2): 502–505 (1983).

Notes: This genus currently encompasses two species, both apparently uncommon or under-collected, with one known only in an apothecial teleomorphic state and the other only in a hyphomycetous anamorphic state. Both are found on dead or living conifers; there are some indications of a resinicolous habit in the type species, *A. klamathica sp. nov.*, but additional information is needed to elucidate the ecology of these fungi. In our phylogenetic analyses, the affinities of this group apparently lie closer to the genus *Zythia* than to *Sarea*, but *Atrozythia* species are located on a relatively long branch compared to these two genera. There are apparently no closely matching, unnamed environmental sequences on GenBank assignable to this genus, possibly suggesting rarity rather than merely being overlooked.

Atrozythia klamathica* J.K. Mitch. & Quijada *sp. nov.

MycoBank XXXXXX.

Etymology: named for the collection locality of the holotype, Klamath National Forest.

Diagnosis: See generic diagnosis above.

Type. USA: California: Siskiyou County, Klamath National Forest, southwest side of Forest Route 17N11, 41°50'03.6"N 123°25'42.1"W, 566 m a.s.l., apothecia on resinous wounds of living young *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*, 12 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0068 (FH XXXXXXXXX! – holotype, MBT XXXXXXXXX).

Description. Teleomorph apothecial. *Apothecia* discoid to cupulate, scattered, erumpent from the resin, consistency coriaceous and ascomata slightly shrunken when dry, but expanding and fleshy when moist, 0.7–1.2 mm diam., up to 1 mm high, subsessile to short-stipitate (0.1–0.3 × 0.2–0.3 mm), stipe narrower toward the base. *Disc* concave to plane, round or somewhat irregular by internal growing pressure, smooth or slightly wrinkled, black (267.black) to dark grayish brown (62.d.gy.Br), with or without light white (263.White) to light blue gray (190.l.bGray) coating pruina; margin distinct, raised when immature but not

protruding beyond the hymenium when mature, 0.5–1 mm thick, entire and smooth or radially cracked, concolorous with hymenium and usually pruinose. *Receptacle* concolorous with hymenium and margin, strongly roughened, more heavily pruinose, pruina extending downward on the stipe, anchoring hyphae surrounding the receptacle from base of stipe to lower flank and rarely at margin. Pruina can be lost during development and is usually more frequent in immature apothecia. *Asci* (103)131–158(166) × (27.5)29.5–36.5(40.5) µm, cylindric-clavate, multispored, mature asci 35–50 µm below the hymenial surface prior to spore discharge, ascus dehiscence rostrate, inner wall material expanding, protruding c. 40–50 µm, reaching the hymenial surface at spore discharge; apex hemispherical, thick-walled, strongly staining in CR, apex with an apical chamber, apical wall 3–5 µm thick, chamber later disappearing and apical tip thickening, becoming 10–15.5 µm thick, projecting into the ascus, becoming dome-like, with intermediate morphologies also observed, inner wall not or faintly amyloid, outer wall intensely amyloid; lateral walls 1–3.5 µm thick, asci covered with an amyloid gel layer; base arising from a perforated crozier. *Ascospores* 1.8–2.3 µm diam, globose to subglobose, hyaline, inamyloid, aseptate, wall slightly thick and with one eccentric medium gray (265.med.Gy) lipid guttule. *Paraphyses* embedded in a thick, hyaline layer of gel, cylindrical, uninflated to medium clavate, straight or slightly wavy, terminal cell (5.5)6.5–9(11.5) × 2–3.3(4.5) µm, covered by a strong yellowish brown (74.syBr) to deep yellowish brown (78.d.yBr) amorphous exudate, lower cells (6.5)8.5–11 × 2–3 µm, basal cells (12.5)14.5–18(20.5) × 1.5–2 µm, simple, unbranched, hyaline, septate, septa strongly staining in CR, basal cells ± equidistantly septate, terminal and lower cells shorter, walls smooth, sparse tiny yellow gray (93.yGray) lipid guttules throughout, from the basal to terminal cells. *Excipulum* composed of two differentiated layers sharply delimited, *ectal excipulum* strongly gelatinized, (111)127–165(192) µm thick at lower flank and base, (32)48–124(132) µm thick at margin and upper flank, constituted of three layers; *innermost layer* of moderately packed *textura intricata* with immersed in a pigmented gel, strong brown (55.s.Br) to dark brown (59.d.Br), with sparse dark greyish yellow (91.d.gy.Y) refractive amorphous lumps; *middle layer* with loosely packed hyaline cells, strongly gelatinized, parallel to each other (sometimes interwoven) and oriented perpendicular to the outer surface, *outermost layer* with shorter, parallel and very tightly packed cells without intercellular spaces, walls pigmented and surrounded by a strong brown (55.s.Br) to dark brown (59.d.Br) amorphous exudate, cortical layer irregular and black (267.Black). *Individual cells* at middle layer of ectal excipulum (5)6.5–9(10) × 2–3.5 µm at margin, (6.5)8.5–12(15.5) × 2–3 µm at lower flank and base, cell walls 0.5–1.5(3.5) µm thick. *Medullary excipulum* of slightly gelatinized *textura intricata*, tightly packed, cells neither with intercellular spaces nor particular orientation, (10)12.5–16.5(19) × 2–3(3.5) µm. *Anamorph* unknown.

Notes: This species is known from two specimens (of which the holotype was sequenced twice) and is illustrated in Fig. 3. It was probably observed once in Alaska (<https://www.inaturalist.org/observations/41563051>), but no specimen was collected. Little is known about its ecology or possible anamorphic states. Sequence and morphological data are sufficient to separate it from *Sarea* and *Zythia*, and it shows a closer affinity to the latter. Although apparently collected only twice, it is possible (given the rarity with which *Sarea difformis* is found on cupressaceous hosts) that *A. klamathica* is the fungus which was isolated as an endophyte of cupressaceous plants in central Oregon and reported as *S. difformis* (Petrini and Carroll 1981). Due to the lack of detailed data in the report, this supposition can neither be confirmed nor refuted. Culture work with fresh material should be done.

Additional material studied: **USA:** Washington: Whatcom County, Baker Lake, Boulder Creek Campground on Baker Lake Road, 48°42'53"N 121°41'40"W, 287 m a.s.l., apothecia on resin on bole of *Tsuga heterophylla*, 12 Mar. 2018, M. Haldeman 2748 (herb. Haldeman!).

Atrozythia lignicola (Sigler) J.K. Mitch., Garrido-Ben. & Pfister **comb. nov.**

MycoBank XXXXXX.

Basionym: *Arthrographis lignicola* Sigler in Sigler & Carmichael, *Mycotaxon* **18**(2): 502 (1983).

Type: **Canada:** Alberta: Division No. 13, Westlock, dried culture isolated from conifer wood chips and bark from a logging truck, Feb. 1978, L. Sigler [isol. 14 Feb. 1978] (UAMH 4095 – holotype, MBT 16421; UAMH 4095 = ATCC 52699 = CBS 689.83 = IFM 52650 = IMI 282334 – ex-type cultures).

Description: *Teleomorph* unknown. *Anamorph* fully described in the protologue (Sigler and Carmichael 1983).

Notes: Although hyphomycetes producing arthroconidia are thus far unknown as anamorphs among members of the *Sareomyces*, sequence data generated independently on four separate occasions from ex-type strains place this species as congeneric with *Atrozythia klamathica* (Murata et al. 2005; Kang et al. 2010; Giraldo et al. 2014; Saar 2018). This relationship with *Sareomyces* has also been suggested in previous phylogenetic analyses (Giraldo et al. 2014). The species has been found both in North America (Sigler and Carmichael 1983; Wang and Zabel 1990; Lumley et al. 2001) and in Europe (Metzler 1997; Arhipova et al. 2011), identified as *Arthrographis pinicola* in the last publication. No teleomorphic state is known, and as with its congener, *A. lignicola* appears to be rarely found and recognized.

Sarea Fr., *Syst. orb. veg.* **1**: 86 (1825), *nom. sanct.* (Fries, *Elench. fung.* **2**: 14 (1828)).

Lectotype species: *Peziza difformis* Fr., *nom. sanct.*, designated by Hawksworth & Sherwood, *Canad. J. Bot.* **59**(3): 358 (1981).

Synonyms: *Coniothyrium* subgen. *Epithyrium* Sacc., *Syll. fung.* **10**: 268 (1892).

Lectotype species: *Coniothyrium resinae* Sacc. & Berl., designated by Sutton, *The Coelomycetes*: 625 (1980).

Epithyrium (Sacc.) Trotter, *Syll. fung.* **25**: 249 (1931).

"*Biatoridina* Schczedr." *nom. inval.* (Art. 40.1), *Bot. Zhurn. (Moscow & Leningrad)* **49**(9): 1315 (1964).

Emended Description: *Teleomorph* apothecial. *Apothecia* black, erumpent from the resin, discoid, roundish to ellipsoid, coriaceous to fleshy, sessile with broad attachment. Hymenium and tissues in section purple or brown, turning blue or without change in KOH. *Asci* clavate, multisporous, dehiscence rostrate, apex hemispherical, thick-walled, ascus apex staining strongly in CR, with an apical chamber and thin apical wall, chamber later disappearing and apical tip thickening, projecting into the ascus, becoming dome-like, inner wall not or faintly amyloid, outer wall intensely amyloid and covered with an amyloid gel, base short-stipitate

with a crozier. *Ascospores* globose to subglobose, hyaline, inamyloid, aseptate, wall slightly thick and with one lipid guttule. *Paraphyses* embedded in gel, cylindrical, uninflated to slightly clavate, straight or slightly bent at the apex, terminal cell covered by a dark brownish amorphous exudate, lower cells and basal cells hyaline and containing tiny yellowish lipid guttules; branched, usually bifurcate, septa strongly staining in CR, basal cells ± equidistantly septate, but lower and terminal cells shorter, walls smooth. *Excipulum* at margin and upper (-lower) flank composed of two well-delimited layers, ectal and medullary excipulum at lower flank to base not always differentiated, tissues strongly gelatinized. Ectal excipulum with loosely packed cells running parallel to each other and surrounded by hyaline or brownish gel, frequently bifurcated and oriented perpendicular to the outer surface, cortical layer of shorter, parallel and very tightly packed cells covered by a dark brown to black amorphous exudate. Medullary excipulum of moderately packed *textura intricata*, cells gelatinized, gel dark brown, becoming lighter in the subhymenium. *Anamorph* pycnidial; see descriptions of *Epithyrium* (Sacc.) Sacc. & Trotter and *Epithyrium resinae* (Sacc. & Berl.) Trotter in Sutton (1980: 625–626) and *Sarea difformis* (Fr.) Fr. in Hawksworth & Sherwood (1981: 361–362).

Notes: The genus *Sarea* here is restricted to the group of species resembling the type, *S. difformis*. The two remaining species detected are morphologically indistinct but see notes under *Sarea coeloplata*.

No obvious morphological differences were detected among the (infrequently encountered) anamorphic stage of sequenced *Sarea* specimens; as a result, we retain all previously synonymized anamorph names as synonyms of the type species.

Sarea difformis (Fr.) Fr., *Elench. fung.* **2**: 14 (1828).

Synonyms: *Peziza difformis* Fr., *Syst. Mycol.* **2**(1): 151 (1822), *nom. sanct.* (Fries, *l.c.*).

Type. Germany: Bavaria: im Wald bei Sugenheim, an Fichten [*Picea* sp.] auf ausgeflossenem Harze, 1871, *H. Rehm, Ascomyceten* 577 (K – neotype, examined and designated by Hawksworth & Sherwood, *Canad. J. Bot.* **59**(3): 366 (1981), MBT 389945; FH 00995483! & FH 01093951! – isoneotypes).

Patellaria difformis (Fr.) Schwein., *Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., n s.* **4**(2): 236 (1832) [1834].

"*Lecidea difformis* (Fr.) Nyl.", *nom. inval.* (Art. 36.1), *Observ. Peziz. Fenn.*: 68 (1868).

Tromera difformis (Fr.) Arnold, *Flora* **57**(6): 85 (1874).

Lecidea difformis (Fr.) Nyl. ex Vain., *nom. illegit.* (Art. 53.1), *Meddeland. Soc. Fauna Fl. Fenn.* **2**: 65 (1878).

Biatorrella difformis (Fr.) Vain., *Meddeland. Soc. Fauna Fl. Fenn.* **10**: 143 (1883).

Biatora difformis (Fr.) Willey in Tuckerman, *Syn. N. Amer. Lich.* **2**: 130 (1888).

"*Biatorrella difformis* (Fr.) H. Olivier" later isonym (Art. 6.3), *Mem. Real Acad. Ci. Barcelona, [n.s.]* **11**(15): 264 (1914).

Biatorina difformis (Fr.) Kirschst., *Ann. Mycol.* **36**(5/6): 378 (1938).

"*Tromera sarcogynoides* A. Massal." nom. inval. (Art. 35.1), *Flora* **41**(31): 507 (1858).

"*Tromera myriospora* var. *sarcogynoides* (A. Massal.) Kremp." nom. inval. (Art. 35.1), *Denkschr. Königl.-Baier. Bot. Ges. Regensburg* **4**(2): 228 (1859).

"*Tromera myriospora* f. *sarcogynoides* (A. Massal.) Anzi" nom. inval. (Art. 35.1), *Lichenes Rariores Langobardi Exsiccati* **7**: 267B (1862).

Lecidea resinae f. *minor-denigrata* Nyl., *Lich. Lapp. Orient.*: 185 (1866).

Coniothyrium resinae Sacc. & Berl., *Atti Reale Ist. Veneto Sci. Lett. Arti, serie 6* **3**(4): 739 (1885) [1884–1885].

Holotype: **Italy**: *Veneto*: horto Patavino, in resina dejecta uda, *D. Saccardo* (PAD, in Herb. Saccardo – holotype, examined by Hawksworth, *Persoonia* **9**(2): 194 (1977), MBT 389947).

Clisosporium resinae (Sacc. & Berl.) Kuntze, *Revis. gen. pl.* **3**(3): 458 (1898).

Lichenonium resinae (Sacc. & Berl.) Petr. & Syd., *Repert. Spec. Nov. Regni Veg. Beih.* **42**(3): 436 (1927).

Epithyrium resinae (Sacc. & Berl.) Trotter, *Syll. fung.* **25**: 250 (1931).

"*Biatoridina pinastri* Schczedr." nom. inval. (Art. 40.1), *Bot. Zhurn. (Moscow & Leningrad)* **49**(9): 1315 (1964).

Emended Description: *Apothecia* discoid, roundish to ellipsoid, scattered or gregarious, erumpent from the resin, consistency coriaceous and apothecia slightly to moderately contracted when dry, expanding and fleshy when moist, 0.2–1.3 mm diam., up to 0.5 mm high, sessile, entirely black (267.Black). *Disc and receptacle* rough; margin distinct, slightly raised when immature or dry but not protruding from the hymenium after rehydration, 0.5–1 mm thick, rough or radially cracked, concolorous with hymenium and receptacle. *Hymenium* and tissues in section light purple (222.l.P) to deep purple (219.deepP), pigments turning brilliant blue (177.brill.B) to deep blue (179.deepB) in KOH. *Asci* (34)46.5–53.5(78) × (9.5)12.5–14.5(18.5) µm, clavate, multispored, mature asci 10–30 µm below the hymenial surface prior to spore discharge, ascus dehiscence rostrate, inner wall material expanding, protruding c. 9–15 µm, reaching the hymenial surface at spore discharge; apex hemispherical, thick-walled, strongly staining in CR, apex with an apical chamber, apical wall 2-3.5 µm thick, chamber later disappearing and apical tip thickening, becoming 7–11 µm thick, projecting into the ascus, becoming dome-like, inner wall not or faintly amyloid, outer wall intensely amyloid; lateral walls 0.5–1.5 µm thick, asci covered with an amyloid gel layer; base short-stipitate and arising from a crozier. *Ascospores* (1.7)2.1–2.3(3) µm diam, globose to subglobose, hyaline, inamyloid, aseptate, wall slightly thick and with one eccentric medium gray (265.med.Gy) lipid guttule. *Paraphyses* embedded in gel, cylindrical, uninflated to slightly clavate, straight or slightly curved at the apex, terminal cell (4)6–7.5(11.5) × 1.5–2.5(3) µm, covered with a deep brown (59.d.Br) to brown black (65.brBlack) amorphous exudate, lower cells (4.5)7.5–8.5(11.5) × 1.5–2.5 µm, basal cells (6.5)9–10(12) × 1.5–2.5 µm, bifurcate in lower cells, hyaline, septate, septa strongly staining in CR, basal cells ± equidistantly septate, but lower and terminal cells shorter, walls smooth, sparse tiny yellow gray (93.yGray) lipid guttules in all cells. *Excipulum* at margin and upper (-lower) flank composed of two well differentiated layers, lower flank to base

not always differentiated into two types of tissues. *Ectal excipulum* strongly gelatinized, (41)57–67(92) μm thick at lower flank and base, (28)49–60(86) μm thick at margin and upper flank, cells loosely packed and surrounded by a light grayish brown (60.l.gy.Br) to medium brown (58.m.Br) gel, running parallel each other (sometimes interwoven), frequently bifurcated and oriented perpendicular to the outer surface, cortical layer with shorter, parallel and very tightly packed cells without intercellular spaces, walls strongly pigmented and surrounded by a dark brown (59.d.Br) to brown black (65.br.Black) amorphous exudate. *Ectal cells* (6.5)10–12.5(18.5) \times 1.5–3 μm at upper flank and margin, (7)11–13.5(25.5) \times 1–2.5 μm at lower flank and base, cell walls 0.5–1.5(2) thick. *Medullary excipulum* of textura intricata, cells moderately packed and gelatinized, gel dark brown (59.d.Br.) to brown black (65.br.Black), becoming lighter in the subhymenium, cells (6.5)10–12(20.5) \times (1.5)2.5–4 μm .

Notes: The concept of *Sarea difformis* is here restricted to those specimens presenting a purple pigment in the hymenium which turns blue when a strong base is applied, a character clearly visible in one isoneotype (FH 00995483!) and illustrated in Fig. 1. The other isoneotype housed in FH (FH 01093951!) is quite poor, with only 2–3 intact apothecia. As a result, only a macromorphological examination was conducted of this specimen.

Additional material studied. **Canada:** *British Columbia:* Calvert Island, 51°39'18.0"N 128°08'16.8"W, resinicolous, 18 Jun. 2018, R.T. McMullin 19801 (CANL 132189!); *Nova Scotia:* Halifax County, Old Annapolis Road Nature Reserve, 44°45'03.9"N 63°56'33.5"W, resinicolous, 25 Jun. 2017, R.T. McMullin 17350 (CANL!); *Ontario:* Nipissing District, Algonquin Provincial Park, 45°54'08.5"N 77°53'13.1"W, *Picea* sp., 1 Sep. 2013, R.T. McMullin 12673 (CANL 132522!); *Prince Edward Island:* Kings County, Dromore Wildlife Management Area, 46°18'30.3"N 62°49'47.8"W, *Picea* resin, 7 Oct. 2014, R.T. McMullin 14881 (CANL 129879!); Queens County, Mount Stewart Wildlife Management Area, 46°22'55.9"N 62°51'40.0"W, *Picea* resin, 1 Oct. 2014, R.T. McMullin 14453 (CANL!); – **Czechia:** *Central Bohemia:* Brdy Hills, Nepomuk, 49°40'02"N 13°49'05"E, 765 m a.s.l., on resin of *Picea abies*, 15 Aug. 2018, J. Malíček & J. Vondrák 12001 (herb. Malíček!); *Plzen:* Srby, 49°31'21"N 13°34'25"E, 550 m a.s.l., on resin of *Picea abies*, 25 Oct. 2018, J. Malíček & J. Vondrák 12161 (herb. Malíček!); – **Norway:** *Hedmark:* Furuberget Quarry, 60°49'01.11"N 11°02'23.53"E, on resin of fallen *Pinus sylvestris* attacked by *Cronartium flaccidum* or *Peridermium pini*, 14 Sep. 2017, P. Vetlesen PV-D836 (FH XXXXXXXX!); – **USA:** *Arkansas:* Faulkner County, Cove Creek Natural Area, 35°17'24"N 92°28'48"W, on *Pinus* resin, 7 Oct. 2010, J.C. Lendemer, D. Ladd & C.A. Morse 26230 (NY 01218605!); *California:* Del Norte County, Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park, 41°48'44.3"N 124°06'32.3"W, 57 m a.s.l., on *Tsuga heterophylla* resin, 13 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0072 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Redwoods National Park, 41°32'05.6"N 124°04'16.0"W, 10 m a.s.l., on *Picea sitchensis* resin, 14 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0074.1 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Plumas County, Plumas National Forest, 39°42'31.9"N 121°11'40.3"W, 1056 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus lambertiana* resin, 8 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0065.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *Georgia:* Douglas County, Sweetwater Creek State Park, 33°45'12.86"N 84°37'44.54"W, on *Pinus cf. taeda* resin, 21 Jul. 2017, J.K. Mitchell & M. Barrios JM0010.1 (FH XXXXXXXX!); White County, Unicoi State Park, 34°42'43.00"N 83°43'49.60"W, on *Pinus* sp. resin, 16 Jul. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0009.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *Indiana:* Monroe County, Morgan-Monroe State Forest, 39°18'16"N 86°23'24"W, 259 m a.s.l., on *Pinus strobus* resin, 13 Apr. 2017, J.C. Lendemer 51265 (NY 02795595!); *ibid.*, 39°17'56"N 86°23'37"W, 232 m a.s.l., on *Pinus strobus* resin, 13 Apr. 2017, J.C. Lendemer 51272 (NY 02795588!); *Maine:*

Washington County, Eagle Hill Institute, 44°27'35.03"N 67°55'53.01"W, 5 m a.s.l., on *Picea rubens* resin, 22 May 2017, *E. Kneiper* JMEK (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°27'23.36"N 67°55'44.11"W, 51 m a.s.l., on *Pinus banksiana* resin, 28 May 2017, *J.M. Karakehian* 17052821F (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°27'36.01"N 67°55'46.92"W, on *Picea cf. glauca* resin, 3 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0007 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°27'34.8"N 67°55'58.6"W, resinicolous on *Picea*, 7 Jun. 2018, *R.T. McMullin* 19157 (CANL!); *Massachusetts*: Middlesex County, Concord, Estabrook Woods, 42°28'59.96"N 71°21'24.97"W, on *Pinus strobus* resin, 19 September 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0015 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Suffolk County, Boston, Arnold Arboretum, 42°17'55.53"N 71°07'31.63"W, on *Pinus strobus* 'Contorta' resin, 13 May 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0001 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 42°17'55.34"N 71°07'33.38"W, on *Pinus tabuliformis* 16576N resin, 27 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0011 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Worcester County, Petersham, Harvard Forest, 42°32'15.03"N 72°10'58.94"W, on *Picea mariana* resin, 13 May 2018, *J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada*, JM0082 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *Minnesota*: Isanti County, Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve, 45°25'15.39"N 93°11'48.88"W, 292 m a.s.l., on *Pinus strobus* resin, 11 Aug. 2019, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0108 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *New Hampshire*: Coos County, White Mountains National Forest, Tuckerman Ravine Trail, 44°15'41.45"N 71°16'02.38"W, 882 m a.s.l., on *Abies balsamea* resin, 16 Jun. 2018, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0091 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°15'49.75"N 71°16'40.29"W, 1049 m a.s.l., on *Picea rubens* resin, 16 Jun. 2018, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0092 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *North Carolina*: Swain County, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, 35°32'25–33'17"N 83°29'36"-44"W, 1768–1859 m a.s.l., 10 Oct. 2011, *E.A. Tripp & J.C. Lendemer* 2261 (NY 01685454!); *Tennessee*: Sevier County, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Boulevard Trail, 35°38'03"N 83°24'50"W, 1814 m a.s.l., 7 Aug. 2012, *E.A. Tripp & J.C. Lendemer* 3446 (NY 01685081!); *ibid.*, Bullhead Trail, 35°39'36"-40'32"N 83°27'02"-29'08"W, on *Picea* sap, 9 Oct. 2011, *J.C. Lendemer, E.A. Tripp & E. Darling* 30379 (NY 01237252!); *ibid.*, Sugarland Mountain Trail, resinicolous on *Picea*, 26 Oct. 2017, *R.T. McMullin* 19017 (NY 03303142!); *Vermont*: Washington County, Calais, Chickering Bog Natural Area, 44°19'26.30"N 72°28'39.20"W, on *Picea* sp. resin, 21 Oct. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada* JM0031 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°19'31.30"N 72°28'48.30"W, on *Larix laricina* resin, 21 Oct. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada* JM0032 (FH XXXXXXXX!).

Sarea coeloplata (Norman) J.K. Mitch., Garrido-Ben. & Quijada **comb. nov.**

MycoBank XXXXXXXX.

Basionym: *Biatorrella coeloplata* Norman, *Öfvers. Kongl. Vetensk.-Akad. Förh.* **41**(8): 32 (1884).

Type. **Norway**: *Buskerud*: prope Drammen ad Gulskoven [= Gulskogen], *J.M. Norman* (TROM L-565247! – lectotype, hic designatus, MBT XXXXXX; MICH 62597! – isoelectotype).

Synonyms: ? *Tympanis abietis* P. Crouan & H. Crouan, *Fl. Finistère*: 43 (1867).

Type. **France**: *Finistère*, sur la partie rugueuse de l'écorce d'un sapin [*Abies* sp.] abattu, à la base des ergots, *P.M. Crouan & H.M. Crouan* (CO, in Herb. Crouan – holotype, examined by Le Gal, *Rev. Mycol. (Paris)* **18**(2): 131 (1953), MBT 389946).

? *Retinocyclus abietis* (P. Crouan & H. Crouan) J. W. Groves & D. E. Wells, *Mycologia* **48**(6): 869 (1957) [1956].

Biatorrella coeloplata f. carbonata Norman, *Öfvers. Kongl. Vetensk.-Akad. Förh.* **41**(8): 32 (1884).

Type: Norway: Buskerud: prope Drammen ad Gulskoven [= Gulskogen], J.M. Norman (TROM L-565247! – lectotype, hic designatus, MBT XXXXXX).

Emended Description: Apothecia macroscopically like *Sarea difformis*, sometimes larger, up to 1.5 mm in diameter. Hymenium and excipulum in section light grayish brown (60.l.gy.Br) to dark grayish brown (62.d.gy.Br) and not changing to blue in KOH. *Asci* (30.5)42.5–45.5(62.5) × (11.5)16–17.5(22.5) μm, *ascospores* 1.7–2.5 μm diam, morphology indistinguishable from *S. difformis*. *Paraphyses* cylindrical, uninflated to slightly clavate, straight or slightly bent in upper cells, terminal cell (4)5.5–6(8.5) × 1–3 μm, covered by a grayish brown (61.gy.Br) to deep brown (59.d.Br) amorphous exudate, terminal cell of lower cells (4)5.5–6.5(9.5) × 1–3 μm, terminal cell of basal cells (4.5)7–8.5(11.5) × 1–2.5 μm, branched, usually dichotomously and with connections close to terminal cell, but also below, in lower cells and basal cells; all other morphological features like *S. difformis*. *Ectal and medullary excipulum* morphology like *S. difformis*, but differing in color, light grayish brown (60.l.gy.Br) to dark grayish brown (62.d.gy.Br), ectal excipulum (23.5)51.5–60(78) μm thick at lower flank and base, (12.5)34–44.5(71) μm thick at margin and upper flank, mostly with strong differentiation in the color of ectal and medullary cells, being hyaline and surrounding by a colorless gel unlike *S. difformis* which is brownish. *Ectal cells* (5)7–10.5(20) × 2–3.5 μm at upper flank and margin, (5)7–9(12.5) × 1.5–3.5 μm at lower flank and base, cell walls 0.5–1(1.5) μm thick. *Medullary cells* (3.5)8–11.5(19.5) × 1.5–3.5 μm.

Notes: A specimen collected by Norman at the type locality and stored under the name *Biatorrella coeloplata* in TROM is here designated the lectotype. Norman (1884) described a form, *Biatorrella coeloplata f. carbonata*, for older apothecia; we use a single specimen to lectotypify this form as well as the species. Since it is clear that even Norman considered the two forms merely different developmental stages of the same fungus, we see no reason to consider this form a separate taxon.

The type of *Tympanis abietis* was not available for examination from CO. Its true affinities are unclear, but Le Gal's (1953) statement "L'hyménium est plongé dans une matière brunâtre qui en agglutine les éléments" in her description of the holotype likely place it in one of the two clades we assign to *S. coeloplata s. lat.*; morphological re-examination of the type should be conducted to verify its placement.

The description above applies to both *Sarea coeloplata 1* and *Sarea coeloplata 2* as presented in our phylogenetic analyses. We have been unable to separate the two morphologically, and thus we cannot assign the examined type to one clade or the other. We have observed morphological variations among collections (illustrated in Fig. 1) and are confident that the difficulty of characterizing the members of these two clades may be overcome by careful analyses involving DNA analysis and morphological examination of single apothecia. This will avoid the problem of mixed collections. For more information, see our discussion of mixed collections below.

Additional material examined: Canada: Newfoundland and Labrador. Newfoundland, Divison No. 5, Mount Ignoble top, 48°59'55.5"N 57°45'08.7"W, 283 m a.s.l., on *Picea mariana* resin, 26 May 2018, *A. Voitk* 18.05.26.AV04 (XXXX!); *ibid.*, *A. Voitk* 18.05.26.AV05 (XXXX!); *Prince Edward Island: Kings County,*

Southampton Wildlife Management Area, 46°21'01.9"N 62°34'10.6"W, *Picea resin*, 3 Oct. 2014, *R.T. McMullin* 14963 (CANL!); Prince County, Greenpark Provincial Park, 46°35'33.6"N 63°53'33.7"W, *Picea resin*, 30 Sep. 2014, *R.T. McMullin* 14565 (CANL 129898!); *Yukon*: 60°48'13"N 137°26'03"W, 670 m a.s.l., on conifer exudate [probably *Picea* sp.], 7 Jun. 2011, *J.C. Lendemer* 29136 (NY 01575087!); – **Cape Verde**: *Santo Antão*: Agua das Caldeiras, 17°06'58.91"N 25°04'10.68"W, 1387 m a.s.l., on *Pinus cf. nigra* resin, Aug. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB457 (MA XXXXXXXX!); – **France**: *Sarthe*: Bourg-le-Roi, sur la resine des pins [*Pinus* sp.], Aug. 1907, *E. Monguillon* 2092 (B 600006463!); – **Germany**: *Hessen*: Bergstraße-Odenwald, Oberschönmattenweg, Ellenbachtal, 300 m a.s.l., *Picea-Harz*, 3 May 1953, *O. Behr* 6699 (B 600006464!); *North Rhine-Westphalia*: Münster, zwischen Lütkenbeck u. Angelmotte [und Angelmodde], auf Wurzeln von Tannen [*Abies* or *Pinus* sp.], Jul. 1861 (B 600198626!); – **Norway**: *Buskerud*: prope Drammen ad Gulskoven [= Gulskogen], *J.M. Norman* (TROM L-42692!); *Hedmark*: Furuberget Quarry, 60°49'01.11"N 11°02'23.53"E, on resin of fallen *Pinus sylvestris* attacked by *Cronartium flaccidum* or *Peridermium pini*, 14 Sep. 2017, *P. Vetlesen* PV-D836-B (FH XXXXXXXX!); – **Spain**: *Madrid*: San Lorenzo de el Escorial, Pinar de Abantos, 40°35'38.77"N 4°09'36.11"W, 1200 m a.s.l., on *Pinus pinaster* resin, 5 Jun. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB454 (MA XXXXXXXX!); *Santa Cruz de Tenerife*: Tenerife, Lomo de la Jara, on *Pinus radiata* resin, 23 May 2019, *R.N. Piñero* 19052301 (XXXX!); *Soria*: Abejar, Playa Pita, 41°50'16.42"N 2°46'43.85"W, 1090 m a.s.l., on *Pinus sylvestris* resin, 16 Mar. 2014, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB316 (MA XXXXXXXX!); *Valencia*: Barx, Pla de la Nevereta, 38°59'52.43"N 0°18'15.35"W, 677 m a.s.l., on *Pinus halapensis* resin, 4 Jan. 2018, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB452 (MA XXXXXXXX!); Quatretonda, Pla de Mora, 38°59'58.67"N 0°22'34.71"W, 223 m a.s.l., on *Pinus halapensis* resin, 27 Dec. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB448 (MA XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB451 (MA XXXXXXXX!); – **Switzerland**: *Grisons*: Davos, Davos Lake, 46°49'07.06"N 9°51'25.33"E, 1579 m a.s.l., on *Picea abies* resin, 18 Jun. 2018, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB716 (MA XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB717 (MA XXXXXXXX!); *Wallis*: Unter Wallis, Va. d'Herens, S. of Sion. Arbey, c. 1 km W of Evolène, c. 46°06'36.0"N 7°29'02.1"E, c. 1450 m a.s.l., 26 Jul. 1990, *H. Sipman* 30286 (B 600080177!); – **USA**: *Arkansas*: Faulkner County, Cove Creek Natural Area, 35°17'24"N 92°28'48"W, on *Pinus* resin, 7 Oct. 2010, *J.C. Lendemer, D. Ladd & C.A. Morse* 26230-A (NY 01218604!); *California*: Del Norte County, Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park, 41°49'11.9"N 124°07'02.3"W, 35 m a.s.l., on *Tsuga heterophylla* resin, 13 Dec. 2017, leg. *J.K. Mitchell* JM0071 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 41°48'44.3"N 124°06'32.3"W, 57 m a.s.l., on *Tsuga heterophylla* resin, 13 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0072 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Redwoods National Park, 41°32'05.6"N 124°04'16.0"W, 10 m a.s.l., on *Picea sitchensis* resin, 14 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0073.8 (FH XXXXXXXX!); El Dorado County, Eldorado National Forest, Placerville Ranger District Headquarters, 38°44'15.1"N 120°39'51.0"W, 985 m a.s.l., on *Pinus ponderosa* resin, 6 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0047 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0048 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 38°44'10.1"N 120°39'52.1"W, 1022 m a.s.l., on *Pinus nigra subsp. laricio* resin, 6 Dec. 2017, leg. *J.K. Mitchell* JM0049.1 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Humboldt County, Prairie Creek Redwoods State Park, 41°21'13.5"N 124°01'35.5"W, 32 m a.s.l., on *Picea sitchensis* resin, 14 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0075.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Nevada County, Tahoe National Forest, Supervisor's Office, 39°16'09.6"N 121°01'02.3"W, 784 m a.s.l., on *Pinus ponderosa* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0055 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Plumas County, Plumas National Forest, 39°42'26.7"N 121°11'39.8"W, 1060 m a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii var. menziesii* resin, 8 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0064.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Sierra County, Tahoe National Forest, 39°31'10.1"N 121°00'03.1"W, 668 m a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii var. menziesii* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0060.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*,

39°31'09.3"N 121°00'03.1"W, 668 m a.s.l., on *Pinus ponderosa* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0061.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Siskiyou County, Klamath National Forest, 41°50'04.5"N 123°25'35.0"W, 549 m, a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii* resin, 12 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0070.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Yuba County, Tahoe National Forest, 39°24'08.0"N 121°04'46.2"W, 505 m a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0057.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 39°24'16.8"N 121°04'34.9"W, 524 m a.s.l., on *Pinus ponderosa* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0058.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 39°31'09.8"N 121°00'03.5"W, 668 m a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii* var. *menziesii* resin, 7 Dec. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0059 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Massachusetts: Essex County, Appleton Farms Grass Rides, 42°38'40.80"N 70°52'04.20"W, 21 May 2017, E. Kneiper & J.K. Mitchell JM0003 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Middlesex County, Concord, Estabrook Woods, 42°29'00.26"N 71°21'24.88"W, on *Pinus strobus* resin, 19 Sep. 2017, J.K. Mitchell JM0017 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 42°29'00.19"N 71°21'24.15"W, 67 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus strobus*, 25 Jan. 2020, J.K. Mitchell & D.E.W. Adamec JM0132 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Suffolk County, Arnold Arboretum, 42°17'55.34"N 71°07'33.38"W, on *Pinus tabulaeformis* 16576N resin, 27 Jul. 2017, leg. J.K. Mitchell JM0011 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 42°17'53.71"N 71°07'40.06"W, on *Picea glehnii* 16485-B resin, 8 Oct. 2017, J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada JM0020 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Thompson Island, 42°18'44.69"N 71°00'39.81"W, on *Pinus nigra* resin, 17 May 2017, L.A. Kappler & J.K. Mitchell BHI-F925 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 42°18'44.96"N 71°00'40.93"W, on *Pinus nigra* resin, 17 May 2017, L.A. Kappler & J.K. Mitchell BHI-F926 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Worcester County, Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, 42°28'22.60"N 71°39'11.34"W, 87 m a.s.l., on hardened trunk resin of *Pinus rigida*, 10 Sep. 1998, E. Kneiper K987694 (FH 00405294!); New Hampshire: Hillsborough County, Antrim, Loveren's Mill Cedar Swamp Preserve, 43°14'22.96"N 72°01'28.19"W, 336 m a.s.l., on *Abies balsamea* resin, 10 Sep. 2018, J.K. Mitchell & Luis Quijada JM0104.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Ohio: Morgan County, Burr Oak State Park, 39°31'44.24"N 82°01'38.14"W, on *Pinus strobus* resin, 7 Oct. 2017, T.J. Curtis JM-TJC01 (KE XXXXXXXXX!); Oregon: Lane County, Eugene, Hendricks Park, on *Pseudotsuga* resin, 5 Aug. 1978, M.A. Sherwood (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Wisconsin: Door County, Whitefish Dunes State Park, 44°55'22.8"N 87°11'39.8"W, 190 m a.s.l., on resin of *Thuja occidentalis*, 10 May 2019, A.C. Dirks ACD0147.1 (MICH XXXXXXXXX!); Vermont: Washington County, Calais, Chickering Bog Natural Area, 44°19'48.00"N 72°28'17.60"W, on *Pinus cf. banksiana* resin, 21 Oct. 2017, J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada JM0024 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°19'43.30"N 72°28'17.50"W, on *Pinus cf. banksiana* resin, 21 Oct. 2017, J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada JM0027 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 44°19'28.80"N 72°28'24.40"W, on *Abies balsamea* resin, 21 Oct. 2017, J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada JM0029 (FH XXXXXXXXX!).

Zythia Fr., *Syst. orb. veg.* **1**: 118 (1825).

Lectotype species: *Sphaeria resinae* Fr., designated by Clements & Shear, *Gen. fung.*, Ed. 2: 372 (1931).

Synonyms: "*Tromera* A. Massal." nom. inval. (Art. 38.1) in Arnold, *Flora* **41**(31): 507 (1858).

Tromera A. Massal. ex Körb., *Parerga lichenol.* **5**: 453 (1865).

Holotype species: *Lecidea resinae* Fr.

Retinocyclus Fuckel, *Jahrb. Nassauischen Vereins Naturk.* **25–26**: 332 (1871) [1871-2].

Lectotype species: Lecidea resinae Fr., designated by Hawksworth & Sherwood, *Canad. J. Bot.* **59**(3): 358 (1981).

Pycnidiella Höhn., *Sitzungber. Kaiserl. Akad. Wiss., Wien. Math.-Naturwiss. Cl., Abt. 1* **124**(1–2): 91 (1915).

Lectotype species: Cytospora resinae Ehrenb., designated by Clements & Shear, *Gen. Fung., Ed. 2:* 372 (1931).

Emended Description: *Teleomorph* apothecial. *Apothecia* brilliant orange-yellow (67.brill.OY) to deep orange (51.deepO), erumpent from the resin, discoid to cupulate, roundish or slightly ellipsoid, coriaceous and darker when dry, fleshy and lighter after rehydration, hymenium and receptacle concolorous, margin usually differentiated and protruding slightly beyond the hymenium; sessile with broad attachment, sub-stipitate to prominently stipitate. Hymenium and tissue colors not changing in KOH. *Asci* and *ascospores* exhibiting morphology and reactions as in *Sarea*. *Paraphyses* cylindrical, uninflated to slightly or moderately clavate, straight or bent at the apex, completely surrounded by gel that contains hyaline or grey yellow (90.gy.Y) amorphous lumps, all cells with a high amount of brilliant orange-yellow (67.brill.OY) to vivid orange-yellow (66.v.OY) lipid guttules; terminal cell and 1–2 cells below covered by medium yellow (87.m.Y) rough amorphous exudate; usually branched at apical cells or cells below, rarely unbranched, frequently with anastomoses, septa frequently constricted and equidistantly septate with terminal and lower cells shorter (moniliform). *Excipulum* and *medulla* not well differentiated in section, although two layers can be noted mostly from the margin to the flanks because of the arrangement of cells and amount of pigments. *Ectal excipulum* in lower flank to margin strongly gelatinized, pigmented due to a high amount of brilliant orange-yellow (67.brill.OY) to vivid orange-yellow (66.v.OY) lipid guttules or not pigmented, cells moderately packed and running parallel each other and surrounded by hyaline gel sometimes including hyaline or grey yellow (90.gy.Y) amorphous lumps, cortical layer with shorter, parallel or unoriented, tightly packed cells without intercellular spaces, amorphous rough exudate covering the cortical cells, hyaline or colored between deep orange-yellow (72.d.OY) to brown orange (54.brO), usually more abundant at the margin, sometimes even appearing as glassy processes. Amyloid reaction present mostly in the ectal excipulum at the margin and flanks, or absent. *Medullary excipulum* composed of *textura intricata*, cells changing from ectal excipulum to medulla progressively, hyaline, less spaced and gelatinized; subhymenium somewhat similar or differentiated from medulla because of the presence of pigmented lipid guttules, cells without intercellular spaces and without gel. *Anamorph* pycnidial; see descriptions of *Pycnidiella* Höhn. and *Pycnidiella resinae* (Ehrenb.) Höhn. in Sutton (1980: 544) and *Sarea resinae* (Fr.) Kuntze in Hawksworth & Sherwood (1981: 365).

Notes: The history of typification in the genus *Zythia* is somewhat complicated. This is due both to the sparse protologue and apparent confusion among some authors as to whether or not Fries' *Sphaeria resinae* had been a combination of Ehrenberg's *Cytospora resinae*. This has been discussed at length in a recent publication on the matter (Mitchell and Quijada In Press).

Zythia resinae (Ehrenb.) P. Karst., *Meddeland. Soc. Fauna Fl. Fenn.* **14**: 104 (1887) [1888].

Synonyms: *Cytospora resinae* Ehrenb., *Sylv. mycol. berol.:* 28 (1818).

Type: [Germany: Berlin], Hasenheide & Grunewald, C.G. Ehrenberg (B 700016297 & HAL 3029 F – syntypes, seen by Braun, *Schlechtendalia* **30**: 19 (2016), but see Mitchell & Quijada 2020).

Tubercularia resinae (Ehrenb.) Thüm., *Oesterr. Bot. Z.* **30**(10): 313 (1880).

Knyaria resinae (Ehrenb.) Kuntze, *Revis. gen. pl.* **2**: 856 (1891).

Pycnidiella resinae (Ehrenb.) Höhn., *Sitzungber. Kaiserl. Akad. Wiss., Wien. Math.-Naturwiss. Cl., Abt. 1* **124**(1–2): 91 (1915).

Sphaeria resinae Fr., *Observ. mycol.* **1**: 180 (1815), *nom. sanct.* (Fries, *Syst. mycol.* **2**(2): 453 (1823)).

Type: Sweden, E.M. Fries, *Scleromyceti Sueciae* 37 (UPS F-541757 – lectotype, examined and designated by Hawksworth & Sherwood, *Canad. J. Bot.* **59**(3): 366 (1981), MBT 389948; FH 00964792! – isolectotype).

Nectria resinae (Fr.) Fr., *Summa veg. Scand.* **2**: 388 (1849).

Nectriella resinae (Fr.) Sacc., *Syll. fung.* **2**: 451 (1883).

Dialonectria resinae (Fr.) Cooke, *Grevillea* **12**(64): 109 (1884).

Lecidea resinae Fr., *Observ. mycol.* **1**: 180 (1815).

Type: Sweden, E.M. Fries (H 951143/H-ACH 431 B – lectotype, examined and designated by Hawksworth & Sherwood, *Canad. J. Bot.* **59**(3): 366 (1981), MBT 389944).

Peziza resinae (Fr.) Fr., *Syst. mycol.* **2**(1): 149 (1822), *nom. sanct.* (Fries, l.c.).

"*Lecidea resinae* (Fr.) Nyl." later isonym (Art. 6.3), *Mém. Soc. Imp. Sci. Nat. Cherbourg* **3**: 183 (1855).

Biatorella resinae (Fr.) Th. Fr., *Lich. arct.*: 199 (1860).

"*Biatorella resinae* (Fr.) Mudd" later isonym (Art. 6.3), *Man. Brit. lich.*: 191 (1861).

Biatoridium resinae (Fr.) Uloth, *Ber. Oberhess. Ges. Natur-Heilk.* **11**(4): 95 (1865).

Tromera resinae (Fr.) Körb., *Parerga lichenol.* **5**: 453 (1865).

Pezicula resinae (Fr.) Fuckel, *Jahrb. Nassauischen Vereins Naturk.* **23–24**: 279 (1870) [1869-70].

Biatora resinae (Fr.) Tuck., *Gen. lich.*: 169 (1872).

Sarea resinae (Fr.) Kuntze, *Revis. gen. pl.* **3**(3): 515 (1898).

Peziza myriospora Hepp *nom. illegit.* (Art. 52.1), *Die Flechten Europas* **6**: 332 (1857).

"*Tromera myriospora* (Hepp) Anzi" *nom. inval.* (Art. 35.1), *Cat. lich. Sondr.*: 117 (1860).

Retinocyclus flavus Fuckel nom. illegit. (Art. 52.1), *Jahrb. Nassauischen Vereins Naturk.* **25–26**: 332 (1871) [1871-2].

"*Tromera xanthostigma* A. Massal." nom. inval. (Art. 35.1) in Arnold, *Flora* **41**(31): 507 (1858).

"*Tromera myriospora* var. *xanthostigma* (A. Massal.) Kremp." nom. inval. (Art. 35.1), *Denkschr. Königl.-Baier. Bot. Ges. Regensburg* **4**(2): 228 (1859).

"*Tromera myriospora* f. *xanthostigma* (A. Massal.) Anzi" nom. inval. (Art. 35.1), *Lichenes Rariores Langobardi Exsiccati* **7**: 267A (1862).

Tromera resinae var. *stipitulata* P. Karst., *Acta Soc. Fauna Fl. Fenn.* **2**(6): 154 (1885).

Type: [Finland: Kanta-Häme:] Mustiala, Dec., P.A. Karsten, *Fungi Fenniae Exsiccati* 324 (FH 01093952! – lectotype, hic designatus, MBT XXXXXX).

Biatorella resinae var. *stipitulata* (P. Karst.) Boud., *Hist. classific. discomyc. Europe*: 157 (1907).

Emended Description: See emended description above for *Zythia* and notes below.

Notes: The status of the basionym of *Zythia resinae* is somewhat confused, with authors treating *Cytospora resinae* either as a new name or as a new combination of Fries' *Sphaeria resinae*. Examination of the protologue (Ehrenberg 1818) shows no references, direct or indirect, to Fries' earlier name, and Ehrenberg explicitly includes his species in the index of new species and attributes it to himself ("mihi"); we thus accept this as having been a *species novum*. It is desirable to conserve *Cytospora resinae* with the same type as *Sphaeria resinae* (UPS F-541747) because these names are 1) almost always treated as synonyms, 2) share the same epithet (and thus will demand a replacement name for one if they are taken out of synonymy and included in the same genus), and 3) are likely indistinguishable based on morphological features. This has been proposed in another publication (Mitchell and Quijada In Press).

We do not provide an additional description for *Z. resinae* since at present it is the only accepted species in this genus, and our emended description of the genus serves as a description of this species. It has been noted, however, that collections in our phylogenetic analyses do exhibit morphological variation, some visible in Fig. 2. Examples of this variation were found in the excipular tissues, i.e.: slightly amyloid reaction in the excipulum of specimens in clade 8 (Fig. 2, j2), specimens with sessile apothecia in clades 3, 6 and 9 (Fig. 2, e1, i1, m1) vs. stipitate apothecia in clades 5 and 12 (Fig. 2, h1, k1), specimens with a strongly pigmented cortical layer in clades 2 and 3 (Fig. 2, f2, e2), an almost hyaline ectal excipulum in clades 1, 6 and 12 (Fig. 2, g2, i2, k2), ectal excipulum with high content of pigments in clades 9 and 13 (Fig. 2, m2, l2) and margin with glassy processes in clade 12 (Fig. 2, k2) (clade names are from Fig. S1). We also found examples of variation in the hymenium, i.e.: the presence of an additional amyloid thick gel layer in specimens in clade 3 (Fig. 2, e5), and paraphyses simple and not branched in the apical or lower cells in clades 6, 8 and 9 (Fig. 2, i9, j9, m9) vs. bifurcate or branched at apical cell in clades 2, 3, 6 and 12 (Fig. 2, f9, e9, l9, k9). We have not separated species within what is almost certainly a species complex because of

questions of the prevalence of mixed collections and our inability to examine type material of *Lecidea resinae*. For additional information, see our discussion of mixed collections below.

Additional material examined: **Cape Verde:** *Santiago:* São Miguel, Serra Malagueta, 15°10'46.99"N 23°40'21.11"W, 1029 m a.s.l., on *Pinus canariensis* resin, 29 Jul. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB456 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); – **China:** *Heilongjiang:* Jixi, Hulin, Dōngfāng hóng, on *Pinus koraiensis* resin, 4 Sep. 1986, *T. Kobayashi & J.-Z. Zhao* FPH-6930 (TFM!); Mudanjiang, Ning'an, Dōngjīng zhèn, on *Pinus koraiensis* resin, 11 Sep. 1986, *T. Kobayashi & J.-Z. Zhao* FPH-6932 (TFM!); *ibid.*, Jiangshanjiao Experimental Forest Farm, on *Pinus koraiensis* resin, 9 Sep. 1986, *T. Kobayashi* FPH-6926 (TFM!); Qitaihe, Boli, on *Pinus koraiensis* resin, 15 Sep. 1986, *T. Kobayashi & J.-Z. Zhao* FPH-6931 (TFM!); *Yunnan:* Lijiang County, Lijiang, Elephant Mountain, 26°53'18"N 100°14'12"E, 2400 m a.s.l., on resinous trunk of *Pinus* sp., 20 Oct. 2002, *H. Sipman* 49954 (B 600202098!); *ibid.*, 26°53'13"N 100°14'05"E, 2550 m a.s.l., on *Pinus* sp. resin, 20 Oct. 2002, *A. Aptroot* 56089 (DUKE 0133124!); – **Czechia:** *Central Bohemia:* Brdy Hills, 49°44'52"N 13°56'44"E, 650 m a.s.l., on resin of *Larix decidua*, 30 Aug. 2018, *J. Malíček & J. Vondrák* 12020 (herb. Malíček!); *ibid.*, Jince, 49°45'44"N 13°56'21"E, 580 m a.s.l., on resin of *Larix decidua*, 27 Aug. 2018, *J. Malíček & J. Vondrák* 12018 (herb. Malíček!); *ibid.*, Nepomuk, 49°40'06"N 13°49'34"E, 730 m a.s.l., on resin of *Picea abies*, 15 Aug. 2018, *J. Malíček & J. Vondrák* 12005 (herb. Malíček!); *ibid.*, Strasice, 49°43'34"N 13°47'56"E, 610 m a.s.l., on resin of *Larix decidua*, 20 Aug. 2018, *J. Malíček & J. Vondrák* 11998 (herb. Malíček!); *Plzen:* Srby, 49°31'21"N 13°34'25"E, 550 m a.s.l., on resin of *Larix decidua*, 25 Oct. 2018, *J. Malíček & J. Vondrák* 12159 (herb. Malíček!); – **Dominican Republic:** *La Vega Province:* Parque Nacional Juan B. Perez, on resin of *Pinus occidentalis*, 7 Jan. 2002, *S. Cantrell, T. Iturriaga, J. Lodge, D.H. Pfister & M. de la Cruz* DR-56 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); – **Japan:** *Ibaraki Prefecture:* Naka-gun, Hitachiota-shi, Mchiya, on *Pinus* bark and resin, 9 Nov. 2002, *T. Hosoya* THX-134 (TNS-F-41522!); – **Norway:** *Hedmark:* Furuberget Quarry, 60°49'01.11"N 11°02'23.53"E, on resin of fallen *Pinus sylvestris* attacked by *Cronartium flaccidum* or *Peridermium pini*, 14 Sep. 2017, *P. Vetlesen* PV-D836-B (FH XXXXXXXXX!); – **Spain:** *Santa Cruz de Tenerife:* Tenerife, Los Revolcaderos, on *Pinus radiata* resin, 16 Dec. 2017, *R.N. Piñero* 17121601 (XXXX!); *ibid.*, 11 Apr. 2018, *R.N. Piñero* 18041101 (XXXX!); *Soria:* Abejar, Playa Pita, 41°50'16.42"N 2°46'43.85"W, 1090 m a.s.l., on *Pinus sylvestris* resin, 16 Mar. 2014, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB316 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); *Valencia:* Barx, Pla de la Nevereta, 38°59'52.43"N 0°18'15.35"W, 677 m a.s.l., on *Pinus halapensis* resin, 4 Jan. 2018, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB453 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); Quatretonda, 38°57'46.35"N 0°22'31.18"W, 367 m a.s.l., on *Cupressus arizonica* resin, 20 Aug. 2013, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB317 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Pla de Mora, 38°59'58.67"N 0°22'34.71"W, 223 m a.s.l., on *Pinus halapensis* resin, 27 Dec. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB449 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, on *Cupressus sempervirens* resin, 27 Dec. 2017, *I. Garrido-Benavent* IGB450 (MA XXXXXXXXX!); – **USA:** *Arizona:* Coconino County, San Francisco Peaks, 35°21'N 111°41'W, 3450 m a.s.l., on *Pinus aristata* resinous bark, 12 Jun. 1998, *M. Westberg* 851 (LD 1356193!); *California:* Del Norte County, Redwoods National Park, 41°32'05.6"N 124°04'16.0"W, 10 m a.s.l., on *Picea sitchensis* resin, 14 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0074.2 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); Plumas County, Plumas National Forest, 39°42'26.7"N 121°11'39.8"W, 1060 m a.s.l., on *Pseudotsuga menziesii* resin, 8 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0064.1 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 39°42'31.9"N 121°11'40.3"W, 1056 m a.s.l., on *Pinus lambertiana* resin, 8 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0065.1 (FH XXXXXXXXX!); San Diego County, Cleveland National Forest, 32°51'13.1"N 116°34'40.5"W, 1170 m a.s.l., on *Cupressus forbesii* bark and resin, 27 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & M.D.*

Mitchell JM0077 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Siskiyou County, Klamath National Forest, 41°50'03.6"N 123°25'42.1"W, 566 m a.s.l., on *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* resin, 12 Dec. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0068 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Georgia: Douglas County, Sweetwater Creek State Park, 33°45'12.86"N 84°37'44.54"W, on *Pinus cf. taeda* resin, 21 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & M. Barrios* JM0010.2 (FH XXXXXXXX!); White County, Unicoi State Park, 34°42'43.00"N 83°43'49.60"W, on *Pinus* sp. resin, 16 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0009.1 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Idaho: Clearwater County, 2 km NE of Southwick, 46°37'20.42"N 116°27'05.98"W, 785 m a.s.l., on resin on bark of bole of *Pseudotsuga menziesii*, 26 Aug. 2017, *M. Haldeman* 2514 (herb. Haldeman!); Maine: Lincoln County, Southport, Pratts Island, on resin of *Picea*, 19 Feb. 1989, *D.H. Pfister* (FH 00965332!); Washington County, Eagle Hill Institute, 44°27'36.00"N 67°55'49.40"W, on *Picea cf. glauca* resin, 3 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0006 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Milbridge, 44°32'24.10"N 67°52'52.60"W, on *Picea glauca* resin, 6 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0008 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Massachusetts: Barnstable County, Cape Cod National Seashore, Marconi Beach, 41°54'41.37"N 69°58'49.03"W, 9 m a.s.l., on resin of *Chamaecyparis thyoides*, 18 Oct. 2019, *J.K. Mitchell & D.E.W. Adamec* JM0120 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, on *Chamaecyparis thyoides* canker, 15 Oct. 2011, *J.M. Karakehian* 11101502 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Essex County, Appleton Farms Grass Rides, 42°38'30.10"N 70°51'49.30"W, on *Pinus* sp. resin, 21 May 2017, *E. Kneiper & J.K. Mitchell* JM0004 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Middlesex County, Concord, Estabrook Woods, 42°29'00.15"N 71°21'23.47"W, 67 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus strobus*, 25 Jan. 2020, *J.K. Mitchell & D.E.W. Adamec* JM0131 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Norfolk County, Blue Hills Reservation, on resin on bark, 18 Apr. 1993, *D.H. Pfister* (FH 00965333!); *ibid.*, Webb Memorial State Park, 42°15'29.58"N 70°55'22.62"W, 1 m a.s.l., on resin of live *Pinus nigra* tree, 29 Mar. 2017, *A.C. Dirks & J.K. Mitchell* BHI-F779 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Plymouth County, Grape Island, 42°16'15.67"N 70°55'07.43"W, on resin flow of *Pinus strobus* tree, 3 May 2017, *L.A. Kappler & J.K. Mitchell* BHI-F871 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Suffolk County, Arnold Arboretum, 42°17'55.49"N 71°07'33.83"W, on *Pinus sylvestris* 438-57-B resin, 27 Jul. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0012 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, 42°17'54.93"N 71°07'29.95"W, on *Chamaecyparis obtusa* resin, 30 Oct. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada* JM0036 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Worcester County, Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, 42°28'22.60"N 71°39'11.34"W, 87 m a.s.l., on hardened trunk resin of *Pinus rigida*, 10 Sep. 1998, *E. Kneiper* K987694 (FH 00405294!); *ibid.*, Petersham, Harvard Forest, 42°32'09.37"N 72°11'16.15"W, on resin of a live *Pinus strobus* tree, 18 Aug. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0014 (FH XXXXXXXX!); *ibid.*, Princeton, Mass Audubon's Wachusett Meadow Wildlife Sanctuary, 42°27'20.1"N 71°54'18.7"W, 312 m a.s.l., on resin of planted *Juniperus virginiana*, 28 Dec. 2019, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0125 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Michigan: Washtenaw County, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan North Campus, 42°17'43.8"N 83°43'29.9"W, 289 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus sylvestris*, 9 Nov. 2019, *A.C. Dirks* ACD0229 (MICH XXXXXXXX!); Minnesota: Isanti County, Cedar Creek Ecosystem Science Reserve, 45°25'15.39"N 93°11'48.88"W, 292 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus strobus*, 11 Aug. 2019, *J.K. Mitchell* JM0107 (FH XXXXXXXX!); North Carolina: Camden County, North River Game Land, 36°21'24"N 76°13'06"W, 0 m a.s.l., on *Taxodium* exudate, 12 Apr. 2012, *B. P. Hodkinson, J. Allen, R. C. Harris & J. C. Lendemer* 18239 (NY 01886893!); Onslow County, Jacksonville, on *Juniperus scopulorum* 'SkyRocket' resinous wound, 7 Apr. 2006, *J. Morton* (NCSLG 17391!); Oregon: Lane County, Eugene, Hendricks Park, on *Pseudotsuga* resin, 5 Aug. 1978, *M.A. Sherwood* (FH 00965334!); Rhode Island: Washington County, Ell Pond Preserve, 41°30'22.00"N 71°46'46.66"W, on *Chamaecyparis thyoides* resin, 26 Nov. 2017, *J.K. Mitchell & L. Quijada* JM0044 (FH XXXXXXXX!); Washington: Whatcom County, Baker Lake, 48°42'53"N 121°41'40"W, 287 m a.s.l., on resin on bole of 71 cm diameter *Pseudotsuga menziesii*, 12 Mar. 2018, *M. Haldeman* 2747 (herb. Haldeman!); Wisconsin: Dane

County, Mazomanie Bottoms State Natural Area, 43°13'34.7"N 89°48'14.0"W, 225 m a.s.l., on resin of *Pinus* sp., 4 May 2019, A.C. Dirks ACD0083.1 (MICH XXXXXXXXX!); Door County, Whitefish Dunes State Park, 44°55'22.8"N 87°11'39.8"W, 190 m a.s.l., on resin of *Thuja occidentalis*, 10 May 2019, A.C. Dirks ACD0147.3 (MICH XXXXXXXXX!).

Excluded Species and Misapplications:

Lecidea tantilla Nyl., *Lecidea resinae* var. *tantilla* Nyl., & *Lecidea tantilla* Nyl. ex Leight.

The invalid (Art. 35.2) names "*Lecidea tantilla* Nyl." and "*Lecidea resinae* var. *tantilla* Nyl.", which are, paradoxically, cited with the same protologue (Nylander 1857a), have historically been considered synonyms of *Sarea difformis*. Two specimens matching the original description were found in H (H-NYL 19509/H9510278 and H-NYL 21581/H9510242) and examined; both proved to be typical *Strangospora pinicola* (A. Massal.) Körb. The name was accepted and validly published at species level by Leighton in 1871; four of the nine specimens he cites were found in K (K(M)263364!, K(M)263365!, K(M)263366!, and XXXXXXXX) (Leighton 1871). Most of these were *Strangospora pinicola* (A. Massal.) Körb., with only one specimen being *Strangospora moriformis* (Ach.) Stein. Based on these studies, we propose the following synonymies:

Strangospora pinicola (A. Massal.) Körb., *Parerga lichenol.* **2**: 173 (1860) [1865].

Synonyms: "*Lecidea tantilla* Nyl." nom. inval. (Art. 35.2), *Actes Soc. Linn. Bordeaux, sér. 3* **21**: 363 (1857) [1856].

"*Lecidea resinae* var. *tantilla* Nyl." nom. inval. (Art. 35.2), *Actes Soc. Linn. Bordeaux, sér. 3* **21**: 363 (1857) [1856].

Lecidea tantilla Nyl. ex Leight., *Lich. Fl. Gr. Brit., ed. [1]*: 354 (1871).

Type: [United Kingdom: England: West Midlands,] Shropshire, Wilcot[t], 12 May 1871, W.A. Leighton (K(M)263366 – lectotype, hic designatus, MBT XXXXXX).

Biatorella tantilla (Nyl. ex Leight.) H. Olivier, *Mem. Real Acad. Ci. Barcelona, [n.s.]* **11**(5): 8 (264) (1914).

Lecidea resinae sensu auct. brit. & *Biatorella resinae sensu auct. brit.*

The specimen issued as "*Lecidea resinae* Fr." under number 277 of Leighton's *Lichenes Britannici Exsiccati* (FH 00964658!) is *Biatoridium monasteriense* J. Lahm ex Körb., which had not been described at the time of issue (Leighton 1858). Mudd (1861), citing this and other specimens, described *Z. resinae* as having a green thallus, brown apothecia, a thin margin, ellipsoid spores, and having been collected on elms (*Ulmus* sp.). None of these traits characterize any species in *Sareomycetes*. That his conception of *Z. resinae* was incorrect and at least partly based on *B. monasteriense* is confirmed by Magnusson's examination and reidentification of one of Mudd's specimens in the Rehm herbarium (Magnusson 1935). Mudd (1861) also described the new variety *Biatorella resinae* var. *rubicundula*, which has been accepted as being an synonym

of a *Strangospora* species (Fries 1874; Rehm 1889a); unfortunately, type material could not be located at K or BM for examination (Angela Bond & Gothamie Weerakoon, pers. comm.). Many subsequent authors cite specimens cited or issued by Mudd and Leighton (Crombie 1870; Leighton 1872, 1879; Smith 1926), perpetuating this error. We list the following misapplications, specifically citing those which contain in no part the true concept of *Zythia resiniae*:

Biatoridium monasteriense J. Lahm ex Körb., *Parerga lichenol.* **2**: 172 (1860) [1865].

Synonyms: *Lecidea resiniae sensu* Leighton, *Lichenes Britannici Exsiccati* **9**: 277 (1858).

Biatorella resiniae sensu Mudd *p.p.*, *Man. Brit. lich.*: 191 (1861).

Lecidea resiniae sensu Crombie *p.p.*, *Lich. brit.*: 76 (1870).

Lecidea resiniae sensu auct. brit. p.p.

Biatorella resiniae sensu auct. brit. p.p.

Biatora resiniae sensu Hasse, *Lecidea resiniae sensu* Hasse, & *Biatorella resiniae sensu* Hasse

A similar case to the preceding arose in Southern California around the turn of the twentieth century. Hasse reported *Z. resiniae* from the area three times, first in a publication by McClatchie (1897), then in two of his own (Hasse 1898, 1908). He describes the substrate of the specimens as bark, and in the last publication describes the species with black apothecia turning brown when moist, and without margins. These features are all uncharacteristic of species in *Sareomyces*. Examination of a specimen labelled "*Lecidea (Biatora) resiniae* Fr." (= *Zythia resiniae*) sent by Hasse to George Knox Merrill (FH 00964657!) revealed that it was a specimen of *Strangospora moriformis* (Ach.) Stein. Additionally, the collecting information matches that given in his 1898 publication, suggesting that this is the specimen he based that report on. An additional Farlow Herbarium specimen (FH 00480746!) matches the collecting information and description of the 1908 publication and was originally determined by Hasse as "*Biatorella resiniae* (Fr.)" (= *Zythia resiniae*) but later changed by him to "*Biatorella moriformis* (Ach.) Th. Fr." (\equiv *Strangospora moriformis*) with the later identification confirmed by an annotation by Magnusson. These specimens, along with his description, suggest that his concept of *Z. resiniae* was at the time partly or completely based on *S. moriformis*, but that he later realized his error. By 1913, Hasse removed *Zythia resiniae* from his list of Southern California lichens entirely (Hasse 1913). We list the following misapplications:

Strangospora moriformis (Ach.) Stein, in Cohn, *Krypt.-Fl. Schlesien* **2**(2): 176 (1879).

Synonyms: ? *Biatora resiniae sensu* Hasse, in McClatchie, *Proc. S. Calif. Acad. Sci.* **1**: 366 (1897).

Lecidea resiniae sensu Hasse, *Lich. S. Calif.*: 14 (1898).

Biatorella resiniae sensu Hasse, *Bryologist* **11**(3): 56 (1908).

Discussion

Species Diversity

The number of species in *Sarea s.l.* (= *Sareomycetes*) has long been a matter of discussion. Hawksworth and Sherwood (1981) traced the idea of there being only a single species for both black and orange fungi to Johann Hepp's (illegitimate) publication of *Peziza myriospora* in his *Die Flechten Europas* (1857), noting that he designated two forms ("a" being orange and "b" being black). Hepp's designation of these two forms could not be verified by examining either the specimen in the complete, unbound exsiccata (FH 00964656!) or the specimen from the Patouillard Herbarium (FH 00964655!). Each contains a single specimen, and the labels make no mention of color or forms. The labels of the specimens at Kew were also examined (Lee Davies, pers. comm.), as well as the schedae with the same results (Hepp 1857a). It is possible that these "forms" were annotations in the bound, boxed specimens prepared by Hepp (Sayre 1969), but this has yet to be verified. A *Sarea* species dominates in both specimens in FH, and Hepp cited *Peziza resiniae* (Fr.) Fr. (= *Zythia resiniae*) as a synonym of his proposed new name; it is likely that he considered both orange and black fungi to be a single species (Hepp 1857b). Consideration of the orange and black apothecia as representing a single species carried into the 20th century (Nylander 1857b, 1866; Koerber 1865; Leighton 1872; Fink 1935). As stated by Hawksworth and Sherwood (1981), the orange and black fungi, each treated as a single species, rested in separate genera (for *S. resiniae*, *Biatorella*; for *S. difformis*, *Retinocyclus*) for much of the 20th century. Based on morphological similarities, they were then united in a single genus, *Sarea*, where they stood as two separate species, easily differentiated by color (Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981).

The current study employed integrative taxonomy (Goulding and Dayrat 2016; Haelewaters et al. 2018; Lücking et al. 2020) to assess the number of species in *Sareomycetes*. In addition to two species in the new genus *Atrozythia*, one previously undescribed and one not previously recognized as a relative of this group, it was determined that the black and orange fungi deserve to each be treated in separate genera with at least three and one species, respectively. The black fungi are recognized as the core genus *Sarea* and are recovered here as three phylopecies and two morphospecies. *Sarea difformis*, the type species of the genus, is quite distinctive and specimens are easily identifiable based on the purple pigment in the hymenium and (sometimes) stipe that turns blue in application of strong base (e.g. Figure 1, g1-5). The remaining morphospecies and two phylopecies represent *Biatorella coeloplata*, here combined as *Sarea coeloplata*; the type could not be assigned to a single phylopecies due to issues addressed in our discussion of Mixed Collections. The orange fungi are recognized in the genus *Zythia* and are provisionally retained as a single species, *Zythia resiniae*. The results of morphological and molecular analyses indicate that there are likely many species, but due to inability to examine the type specimen of *Lecidea resiniae* and the issues caused by mixed collections, we refrain from naming any new species.

This previously unrecognized diversity was suggested by available data on the *Sareomycetes*. Both *Sarea* and *Zythia* are widely distributed in Europe, North America, Asia, and Africa, with *Z. resiniae* also present in Australasia (Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981; Gadgil and Dick 1999; Beimforde et al. 2020). Records from the Southern Hemisphere almost certainly represent anthropogenic introductions, but the Northern Hemisphere distribution is still broad. Similar broad distributions are known in other taxa, and although not necessarily indicative of cryptic diversity (Pringle et al. 2005; Quijada et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2017; Baral et al.

2018), can suggest it (Zhong and Pfister 2004; Stadler et al. 2014; Lücking et al. 2014, 2017; Skrede et al. 2017; Tanney and Seifert 2019). In addition to the broad geographic range, *Sareomyces* species are found on the resin of a wide variety of host species. *Sarea* species are found on the resin of seven genera in *Pinaceae* and *Z. resiniae* is found on twelve or thirteen genera in *Cupressaceae* and *Pinaceae* (see Table S6). This broad host range is again not necessarily indicative of cryptic diversity (Johnston and Park 2005; Baral et al. 2018), but is suggestive (Herrera et al. 2015; Martinović et al. 2016; Pärtel et al. 2017). Finally, published nuITS sequences assignable to the *Sareomyces* are variable at levels greater than the standard 3% threshold for species delimitation in fungi (Izzo et al. 2005; Ciardo et al. 2006; Balaalid et al. 2013; Geml et al. 2014; Gweon et al. 2015), and greater than even the genus threshold (5.7% difference) suggested for filamentous fungi in a recent study (Vu et al. 2019). While such thresholds are known to not be constant across kingdom Fungi (Nilsson et al. 2008; Kõljalg et al. 2013; Lücking et al. 2020), this was particularly suggestive evidence of cryptic diversity.

Biogeography and Host Specificity

Little to no phylogeographic pattern in the studied *Sareomyces* species is recovered in our analyses. This may be due to the fact that conifers in *Pinaceae* and *Cupressaceae* have been widely introduced around the world for ornamental and commercial purposes (Farjon 2017). We hypothesize that a number of *Sareomyces* strains have been distributed worldwide, travelling on the resin of hosts, or as endophytes. The most obvious example is the introduction of *S. coeloplata* 1 to Antarctica reported in a study of the wood decay fungi on huts dating from the early 20th century (Held et al. 2003; Arenz et al. 2006). This fungus presumably was inhabiting the pinaceous timber brought to build the Discovery Hut on Ross Island (77° S), during the Discovery Expedition (1901–1904). Our haplotype network suggests that the origin of the fungal strain was in Northern or Central Europe, where the countries supplying materials for these expeditions are located. The persistence of this species over the course of a century is perhaps an indication of how easy it would be to accidentally introduce these fungi to a new area. Another clear and relatively recent introduction is that of both *Zythia resiniae* and *S. coeloplata* 1 to Cape Verde (reported in this study). Since no conifers are native to Cape Verde, we can again be sure that this is a case of human introduction (Hansen and Sunding 1993; Arechavaleta Hernández et al. 2005; Farjon 2017); *Pinus* spp. and *Cupressus* spp. have been widely introduced to Cape Verde (Frahm et al. 1996). At least two haplotypes of *Zythia resiniae* and *Sarea coeloplata* 1 from Macaronesia (Cape Verde and the Canary Islands) are identical, or closely related, to haplotypes from the Iberian Peninsula. This makes sense since these archipelagos have close historical relationships with Spain and Portugal. The reports of *Zythia resiniae* from New Zealand almost certainly represent a third instance of anthropogenic introduction. *Pinaceae* and *Cupressaceae* are, the only families known to host fungi in *Sareomyces*; of these families, only two species in *Cupressaceae* are native to New Zealand (De Lange and Rolfe 2010), but all reports of *Zythia* are from *Abies*, *Pinus*, and *Pseudotsuga*, in *Pinaceae* (Gadgil and Dick 1999; Beimforde et al. 2020). A final apparent indicator of ease of transmission through wood projects are a series of seven nuITS sequences uploaded to Genbank and misidentified as "*Hormococcus conorum*" and "*Zythia pinastri*" (NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) 2020a, b, c, d, e, f, g). Since these are part of a project titled "Imported wood products to United States as vectors for potential invasive fungal species," it may be surmised that these were generated from imported wood products. On the other hand, the almost complete lack of genetic structure in the geographic distributions of species and

the extensive geographic distribution in the Northern Hemisphere of some genetic lineages may be also due to long-distance dispersal of minute spores by wind, or even migratory birds, which use coniferous trees as perches in their migration routes (Hallenberg and Kúffer 2001; Muñoz et al. 2004; Wilkinson et al. 2012; Viana et al. 2016). Based on age estimates for the divergence among closely related haplotypes in all *Sareomyces* species, intercontinental dispersal of lineages could have occurred during the Quaternary (< 2.59 Ma), and this could have been concomitant with events of population expansion, as suggested by neutrality test results in the nuITS and nuLSU markers. Larger datasets assembled with a population-genetics scope are needed to evaluate these hypotheses. Nevertheless, there are exceptions to this general pattern, since seven clades in total contain only specimens from a relatively restricted, and sometimes sympatric, ranges: one from the eastern US (*Zythia resiniae* clade 13 in Fig. S1), one from New England (*Zythia resiniae* clade 5 in Fig. S1), one from the Pacific Slope (*Atrozythia klamathica*), and three from Japan (*Zythia resiniae* clades 2, 4, & 7 in Fig. S1). Without broader sampling, particularly in Asia and Africa, and considering all available environmental sequences, it is difficult to determine if these are truly lineages of limited range, or a sampling artifact.

Likewise, there is little overall pattern of host specificity, except perhaps at the host family level. This might be expected, since resin composition is broadly similar within each conifer family (Langenheim 2003; Lambert et al. 2005) but still varies among species (Lambert et al. 2007) and even varies within a single species (Tappert et al. 2011). If there is a pattern of specificity even at family level, it appears not to hold for all species. For example, *Sarea coeloplata* 1 was found growing on *Thuja occidentalis* (ACD0147.1) in addition to a number of species in *Pinaceae*. Similarly, *Zythia resiniae* clade 8 (in Fig. S1) encompasses primarily specimens on *Pinaceae*, but also a specimen found growing on *Cupressus forbesii* (JM0077), and the two known specimens of *Atrozythia klamathica* are from hosts in different families. Although this could be explained by a complete lack of host specificity, an alternative explanation is that different strains/species in *Sareomyces* in some way selectively grow on resin containing or lacking certain components. Production of specific resin components need not mirror evolutionary relationships (Tappert et al. 2011), so what currently appears random may still contain a hidden pattern. Nonetheless, there are clades suggestive of host specificity at the host generic or specific level, even if most clades are found on mixed hosts. *Zythia resiniae* clade 4 (in Fig. S1) contains only samples found associated with *Chamaecyparis obtusa*. *Zythia resiniae* clade 5 (in Fig. S1) and an unnumbered clade appearing only in our three-gene and mtSSU analyses appear to be found only on *Chamaecyparis* spp. and *Cupressus* spp., respectively. Perhaps significantly, each of these clades also shows a fairly restricted geographic pattern, noted above, and each of these clades are among the least well-sampled, supported groups in our phylogeny. Wider, more robust sampling could change the pattern seen. Ultimately, a more detailed understanding of the specific ecology of species in *Sareomyces* is needed to generate and test hypotheses regarding host specificity.

Our dating analyses provide additional insight into host specificity in *Sareomyces* at the temporal scale (Fig. 6). The results of our dating analyses match well with estimates of the diversification of the tree host genera of these fungi. Our estimate of 120.88 Ma (181.35–75.76 Ma, 95% HPD) for the crown node of *Sareomyces* places the origin of this group concurrent with or after the origins of *Cupressaceae* and *Pinaceae* in the Cretaceous Period (Mao et al. 2012; Lu et al. 2014; Leslie et al. 2018), and roughly

concurrent with the origin of the genus *Pinus* in the Jurassic Period (Saladin et al. 2017; Leslie et al. 2018). This suggests that the *Sareomyces* evolved to exploit the new niche of resin provided by *Pinus* or another, now extinct taxon (Smith et al. 2017; Leslie et al. 2018). The origins of the genera *Atrozythia*, *Sarea*, and *Zythia* and subsequent diversification in *Sarea* (specific estimates given in Table S5) also correspond well with a later period of diversification of host genera in *Cupressaceae* and *Pinaceae* of these fungi in the Cenozoic Era (Leslie et al. 2018). This occurred during and following a period of global cooling (Scotese 2016) together with some of the last important geological events, including Cenozoic orogenies, which influenced the worldwide distribution of conifers. Close evolutionary histories among fungi and their hosts are well known in several parasitic and ectomycorrhizal fungal clades (Takamatsu 2013; Sánchez-Ramírez et al. 2017; Looney et al. 2020)

Mixed Collections

An unexpected complicating problem was uncovered during these investigations. Prior to this study, authors have noted that both *Sarea* and *Zythia* species can be found growing on the same piece of resin (Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981; Spier and Aptroot 2000; Yatsyna 2017). This was noted in our study of specimens: *Atrozythia klamathica* was found growing alongside *Zythia resiniae* (JM0068), and *Zythia resiniae* was found growing with *Sarea difformis* (e.g. PV-D863), *Sarea coeloplata* 1 (e.g. ACD0147), and *Sarea coeloplata* 2 (e.g. IGB316). Less obviously, it was discovered that multiple clades of *Zythia resiniae* or species of *Sarea* can be found mixed in a single collection. This was first seen when sequencing multiple loci for specimen BHI-F779. An initial DNA extraction, PCR, and sequencing yielded sequences matching *Zythia resiniae* clade 1; a subsequent round of sequencing from the same collection yielded sequences matching *Zythia resiniae* clade 13. Later, *Sarea difformis* was detected living alongside *Sarea coeloplata* 1 (JM0072) and *Sarea coeloplata* 2 (JM0011). This ability to share substrate with closely related species, while ecologically interesting, poses serious challenges to the identification of morphological synapomorphies and matching them with the corresponding phylogenetic clade. Given the frequency with which we have found mixed collections, it cannot be excluded that some of the specimens we sequenced and examined morphologically contain mixes of *Sarea coeloplata* 1 and *Sarea coeloplata* 2, or mixes of multiple *Zythia resiniae* clades. This could account for the lack of consistent morphology observed during our investigations of these species and informs our decision to not name these clades.

Based on our experience, future investigation of this family should be conducted by extracting DNA, examining micromorphology, and performing culture work from single apothecia. While this can be a challenge, given that apothecia are typically < 1 mm in diameter, we feel that this is the only reliable way of accurately characterizing this group of fungi.

Morphological Observations

Color Changes in Sections

We observed that microtome cut sections of *Zythia resiniae* stored out of light in dried gum arabic solution on glass slides for a period of several months showed a marked degradation of pigment. Only the high concentration of pigments in the ectal excipulum and in the epithecium remained evident. A similar pattern

was observed in sections permanently mounted in glycerin. In addition to color loss, the encrusting layer over the ectal excipulum and the epithecium was found to dissolve, further altering morphological characters of the fungus.

Such changes posed a challenge to morphological examination, since they create artificial morphological patterns that differ from those seen in recent or fresh material, or even in fungarium material. For these reasons, to accurately assess pigment-related and other morphological characters, we recommend that any morphological examination of *Zythia* species be done on newly sectioned material rather than material sectioned by previous investigators and stored on glass slides or mounted.

Ascus Dehiscence

Previous authors have reported the asci of *Sareomycetes* as "not functionally bitunicate" (Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981; Nash et al. 2008) or of the broadly defined "archaeascé" type (Letrouit-Galinou 1973). Our observations indicate that all three genera, and *Atrozythia* in particular, have ascus dehiscence characterized by a rupture of the outer layer at the tip of the ascus and protrusion of an inner wall. The inner wall extends some distance beyond the outer wall, varying among species. This agrees with the electron microscopic examination of a *Sarea* species performed by Bellemère (1994). It is not clear in our observations whether there is any zone of full wall separation between the inner and outer layers; we thus view this as the "rostrate" type of ascus dehiscence (Eriksson 1981; Bellemère 1994a).

Ecology

Are *Sareomycetes* Lichens?

The controversy regarding the ecology of species in *Sarea* and *Zythia* is long-standing; they have often been thought of as lichens. This is reflected in the taxonomy of the synonymous names. This idea goes back to Fries' original publication, in which he placed *Zythia resiniae* in the lichen genus *Lecidea* and included the phrase "*crusta tenuissima membranacea contigua cinerascenti*" apparently describing a lichen thallus (Fries 1815). Hawksworth and Sherwood (1981) also offered evidence that he had corresponded regarding it with his colleague, the eminent lichenologist Erik Acharius. Since Fries' time, various authors have included *Sarea* and *Zythia* species among the lichens (Arnold 1858; Tulasne and Tulasne 1861; von Krempelhuber 1861; Nylander 1866; Vainio 1883; Fink 1935; Tucker and Jordan 1979; Etayo 1996; Purahong et al. 2017). A number of other authors were vaguer. Hepp (1857b) included an unnumbered, mixed specimen of *Zythia resiniae* and a *Sarea* sp. in his exsiccata, *Die Flechten Europas*. His opinion of whether it was a lichen or fungus, however, is obscured by the fact that the specimen was provided as an example of something easily confused with the black-apothecial lichen he included as number 332 ("*Calicium inquinans* γ . *sessile*"). Other authors referred to species in *Sareomycetes* as intermediate between lichens and fungi, sometimes placing them in named groups (e.g. "Lichenes ambigua," "Lichenes parasitici," "Pseudolichenes," "Hybridolichenes," and "Fungilli lichenoides") (Anzi 1860; Fries 1860; Koerber 1865; Ohlert 1870; Lettau 1912). One of the more unusual cases is that of Carlo Cappelletti (1924), who stated that *S. difformis* could be found both lichenized and non-lichenized in different samples. This situation is known in some fungi (Wedin et al. 2004, 2006), but the fact that Cappelletti reported this relationship in several resinicolous fungi casts doubt on his observations. Additionally, the concepts of some authors accepting species in *Sareomycetes* as lichens have

been based on incorrectly identified material; these cases are treated in the "Excluded Names and Misapplications" section of the Taxonomy section above. Other mycologists and lichenologists, including the majority of modern authors, treat species in *Sareomycetes* as non-lichenized (Berkeley and Broome 1866; Cooke 1871; Fuckel 1871; Tuckerman 1872; von Thümen 1880; Karsten 1885; Willey 1888; Rehm 1889b; Saccardo 1889; Masee 1895; von Keißler 1909; Ramsbottom 1913; Nannfeldt 1932; Magnusson 1935; Dennis 1960; Lamb 1963; Poelt and Vězda 1977; Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981; Kobayashi and Zhao 1989; Wirth 1995; Otte et al. 2000; Spier and Aptroot 2000; LaGreca et al. 2005; Kukwa et al. 2008; Nash et al. 2008; Knudsen and Kocourková 2012; Tarasova et al. 2015; McMullin 2015; Kuznetsova et al. 2016; Lendemer and Noell 2018; Morse and Lendemer 2019). We accept them as non-lichenized fungi.

Are Sareomycetes Parasitic?

The occurrence of these fungi on resinous wounds, has inevitably raised the question of whether they are parasitic (Kujala 1950; Groves and Wells 1956; Malençon 1979; Hawksworth 1980; Suto and Kanamori 1990). This question has been investigated by attempting to satisfy Koch's postulates, with varying results. The first of these was conducted by Ayers (1941), who used one of his cultures of *Z. resinae* to attempt to infect *Pinus strobus*; he saw no effect. Researchers in the northwestern USSR used inoculation studies to investigate a disease of pines. They called the fungus they identified as the causal agent "*Biatoridina pinastri*," which they proved was the anamorphic state of a *Sarea* species (Shchedrova 1964, 1965). In a broad study of conifer associated discomycetes, Smerlis (1973) concluded that *Z. resinae* was mildly pathogenic, producing cankers on every pinaceous host tested. An inoculation study conducted in the 1980s to determine the cause of a disease of *Pinus koraiensis* in northeastern China also found no evidence of infection by *Z. resinae* and identified the true causal agent, *Tympanis confusa* (Sūn et al. 1983; Cuī et al. 1984; Xiang et al. 1985; Xiang and Song 1988; Kobayashi et al. 1990). A similar study in Japan on a disease of *Pinus thunbergii* gave the same results; inoculations with *Z. resinae* produced no symptoms, but inoculations with a species of *Ascocalyx* did (Kobayashi and Kusunoki 1985; Kobayashi and Zhao 1989). Additional studies to determine the causal agent of the resinous stem canker of *Chamaecyparis obtusa* determined that *Z. resinae* did not cause symptoms on hosts in *Pinaceae* or *Cupressaceae*, and identified the causal agent as *Cistella japonica* (Hayashi and Kobayashi 1985; Yokozawa et al. 1986, 1989; Suto 1987, 1992, 1997, 1998; Kobayashi et al. 1990). The varying results and generality of these tests leave unresolved the question of pathogenicity of species in *Sareomycetes*; some authors assume pathogenicity and others accept a saprobic lifestyle, as summarized by Beimforde et al. (2020).

Sareomycetes as Endosymbionts of Photosynthetic Organisms

Other aspects of the ecology of species in *Sareomycetes* have been established with more certainty. These fungi have frequently been isolated as endophytes of conifers in *Pinaceae* (Petrini and Fisher 1988; Kowalski and Kehr 1992; Giordano et al. 2009; Koukol et al. 2012; Arhipova et al. 2015; Sanz-Ros et al. 2015; U'Ren and Arnold 2016; Marmolejo Monciváis 2018) and *Cupressaceae* (Petrini and Carroll 1981; Suto and Ougi 1999; Sieber 2007). This pattern is consistent with previous studies that have shown both saprobes

and parasites living within their potential hosts (Fisher and Petrini 1992; Kogel et al. 2006; Oses et al. 2008). Somewhat more unusually, species in *Sareomycetes* have also been isolated as an endophytes of grasses (Sánchez Márquez et al. 2008), mistletoes (Peršoh 2013), and possibly deciduous woody plants (Novas and Carmarán 2008). Apart from the *Pinus*-dwelling mistletoe, which presumably allows the fungus close access to the resin seeping from any wounds created by the mistletoe, the occurrence of these fungi in these various hosts is difficult to explain. A closer look at the Cupressaceous endophytisms reveals a similarly difficult-to-explain pattern: a *Sarea* species was isolated (Petrini and Carroll 1981), but the current work represents the first report of a *Sarea* species fruiting on a cupressaceous host. Several studies have found *Sarea* and *Zythia* species living within thalli of foliose and fruticose lichens in Europe and Asia (Peršoh and Rambold 2012; NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) 2018a, b; Masumoto and Degawa 2019; Yang et al. 2020). One group of researchers has apparently even recovered *Sarea coeloplata* 1 (identified as *Hormococcus conorum*) associated with a marine alga, *Fucus vesiculosus*, in the Venetian Lagoon (NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) 2013). Many questions about the ecology of this family remain.

The Ecology of *Atrozythia* Species

This uncertainty extends to our new genus, *Atrozythia*. Some cellulolytic capacity has been reported for *Atrozythia lignicola* (Sigler and Carmichael 1983), and the fungus has been recovered from both diseased (Sigler and Carmichael 1983) and dead/rotting wood (Sigler and Carmichael 1983; Wang and Zabel 1990; Metzler 1997; Lumley et al. 2001; Arhipova et al. 2011) of *Pinus* and *Picea* (although the possibility of isolation from *Populus tremuloides* by Lumley et al. (2001) cannot be excluded entirely). Additional study is needed to determine if *A. lignicola* is resinicolous, since all other members of *Sareomycetes* seem to be, or if it has some other lifestyle. *Atrozythia klamathica*, known thus far from only two specimens, was found fruiting directly on the resin of *Chamaecyparis lawsoniana* and *Tsuga heterophylla*; it presumably shares a similar ecology with other members of *Sareomycetes*.

Taxonomic Placement

The placement of species in *Sareomycetes* in the fungal tree of life has had a long and confused history, which we attempt to elucidate here with more details than Beimforde et al. (2020). In the late nineteenth century authors grouped species generally among the fleshy discomycetes (Crouan and Crouan 1867; Cooke 1871; Saccardo 1889) and more specifically with the *Dermateaceae* (Karsten 1885; Saccardo 1889) or *Patellariaceae* (Fuckel 1871), or among the lichens in *Lecideaceae*, allied with *Biatora* (Tuckerman 1872; Stein 1879). A number of mycologists between 1889 and 1934 (starting with Rehm) placed species among the *Patellariaceae* (see Table S7). Researchers later placed species variously in *Lecanorales* and *Helotiales*, or declined to place them; for instance, the first (and several subsequent) edition(s) of the Dictionary of the Fungi list *Retinocyclus* as belonging with the lichens or in *Helotiales*, and *Sarea* as being of uncertain placement (Ainsworth and Bisby 1943, 1950). Placement was stabilized in 1981, when Hawksworth and Sherwood, based on morphological similarities with *Agyrium rufum*, placed *Sarea* and *Zythia* in *Agyriaceae* (*Lecanorales*) (Hawksworth and Sherwood 1981). Molecular evidence indicating that *A. rufum* was unrelated to the remainder of *Agyriaceae* (Lumbsch et al. 2007; Lumbsch and Huhndorf 2010) resulted in the move of *Sarea* and *Zythia* to *Trapeliaceae* (Hodkinson and Lendemer 2011). Not all authors followed

these placements. In the course of an electron microscopical study of asci, Bellemère stated that the placement of both *Sarea difformis* and *Zythia resinae* based on ascus ultrastructure was uncertain, and noted that the two species differed in their method of ascus dehiscence (Bellemère 1994b). This study must be considered with some caution, since the substrate of the *Z. resinae* specimen used was said to be stone, indicating that the specimen was likely misidentified. Schultheis, Tholl, Baral and Marson placed *Sarea difformis* under the heading "Ascomycetes Incertae Sedis" (Schultheis et al. 2001). The application of molecular techniques was needed to properly place these taxa.

The history of the multiple publications attempting to elucidate the taxonomic position of these fungi using molecular data is outlined by Beimforde, et al. (2020). Reliance on these publications is likely the reason for uncertain placements or placements in *Leotiomyces* by several subsequent authors (Lumbsch et al. 2007; Kirk et al. 2008; Eriksson 2014; Hüseyin and Selçuk 2014; Miadlikowska et al. 2014; Garrido-Benavent 2015). Recently, use of information from six genes and sampling taxa throughout *Pezizomycotina* resulted in the erection of a new class, *Sareomycetes*, to accommodate *Sarea* and *Zythia* (Beimforde et al. 2020). This placement explains over two centuries of confusion and uncertainty.

Conclusion

Our studies of species in *Sareomycetes* have revealed the existence of three genera, one described as new. *Sarea* is restricted to the group of species traditionally identified as *Sarea difformis*, but shown to be at least three phylopecies, *Sarea difformis* s. str., with a purple hymenial pigment, and two cryptic species lacking such a pigment and identifiable morphologically with the type of *Biatorella coeloplata*, combined here as *Sarea coeloplata*. *Zythia* is resurrected for *Zythia resinae* (= *Sarea resinae*), which is retained provisionally as a single, highly diverse species. *Atrozythia* and the new species *Atrozythia klamathica* are described, and a combination is made for *Arthrographis lignicola*. The family name *Zythiaceae* is resurrected as an earlier name for *Sareaceae*. This family displays few biogeographic patterns and little evidence of host specificity. It is shown to have arisen in the late Jurassic or Cretaceous; subsequent diversification occurred roughly concurrently with the diversification of *Cupressaceae* and *Pinaceae*. Further work on this family is recommended, including: type studies on *Lecidea resinae* and *Tympanis abietis*, use of precise methodologies to study the two phylopecies assignable to *S. coeloplata* and to split the *Zythia resinae* complex, and collection of the data required to do population genetic analyses at least for *Zythia*.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Adherence to national and international regulations

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and material

The datasets supporting the conclusions of this article are available in the TreeBase repository, XXXXXXXXXX.

Competing interests

The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Funding

Funding for this project was primarily granted by the Friends of the Farlow and a Graduate Student Fellowship from the New England Botanical Club. Some sequencing of relevant specimens and collecting trips were funded by the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area Fungal All-Taxa Biodiversity Inventory Project.

Authors' contributions

JKM performed all culturing, molecular work, collection of most fresh specimens, nomenclatural portions, and some morphological examination. LQ performed the remainder of morphological examinations and assisted in collection of some specimens. IGB collected many of the fresh specimens and performed all analyses. DHP provided conceptual guidance and advice for the project. All authors were major contributors in writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the immense help of the librarians at the Harvard University Botany Libraries for their aid in finding and borrowing obscure sources. Yasuo Suto is also thanked for mailing reprints of many of his difficult-to-access papers, which have been given to the Harvard University Botany Libraries. Katherine LoBuglio, Jason Karakehian, and Danny Haelewaters are thanked for their advice and instruction in molecular methods. Kanchi Gandhi is also thanked for his advice on nomenclatural issues.

The collections staff of FH are also thanked for their aid in searching the collections, permission for sampling, and processing loans from other institutions; the collections staff of these institutions are also thanked for sending material and allowing sampling, where appropriate. Additionally, all collectors are thanked for their contributions of specimens. The Nature Conservancies of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Vermont, Clearwater Creek State Park, the Arnold Arboretum, all National Forests in California, Redwoods National Park, and Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park are thanked for issuing collecting permits. The Mycological Society of America is thanked for arranging permitting for the forays at their annual meetings. The Friends of the Farlow and The New England Botanical Club are thanked for their financial support, and the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area is thanked for both permission to collect and funding for sequencing some specimens associated with the All-Taxa Biodiversity Inventory being conducted there. Without them, the geographic sampling we obtained would have been impossible.

The first author also thanks his partner, Daniel Adamec, for his continued support, particularly during the Covid-19 pandemic, without which this work would not have been possible.

The third author acknowledges the Harvard University Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology and the Farlow Fellowship for providing postdoctoral funding while he has worked on this project.

References

1. Ainsworth GC, Bisby GR (1943) A Dictionary of the Fungi, 1st edn. The Imperial Mycological Institute, Kew, Surrey
2. Ainsworth GC, Bisby GR (1950) A Dictionary of the Fungi, 3rd edn. The Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew, Surrey
3. Altschul S (1997) Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res* 25:3389–3402. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/25.17.3389>
4. Anzi M (1860) *Catalogus Lichenum Quos in Provincia Sondriensi et Circa Novum-Comum Collegit et in Ordinem Systematicum Digessit. Ex Officina Caroli Franchi Bibliopolae, Novi-Comi*
5. Arechavaleta Hernández M, Zurita Pérez N, Marrero Gómez M del C, Martín Esquivel JL (eds) (2005) *Lista preliminar de especies silvestres de Cabo Verde (Hongos, Plantas y Animales Terrestres)*. 2005. Consejería de Medio Ambiente y Ordenación Territorial, Gobierno de Canarias, La Laguna
6. Arenz BE, Held BW, Jurgens JA, et al (2006) Fungal diversity in soils and historic wood from the Ross Sea Region of Antarctica. *Soil Biol Biochem* 38:3057–3064. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2006.01.016>
7. Arhipova N, Gaitnieks T, Donis J, et al (2011) Butt rot incidence, causal fungi, and related yield loss in *Picea abies* stands of Latvia. *Can J For Res* 41:2337–2345. <https://doi.org/10.1139/x11-141>
8. Arhipova N, Jansons A, Zaluma A, et al (2015) Bark stripping of *Pinus contorta* caused by moose and deer: wounding patterns, discoloration of wood, and associated fungi. *Can J For Res* 45:1434–1438. <https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfr-2015-0119>
9. Arnold FCG (1858) Die Lichenen des fränkischen Jura (Fortsetzung). *Flora* 41:500–508
10. Ayers TT (1941) *Biatorrella resinae*. The Perfect Stage of *Zythia resinae*. *Mycologia* 33:130. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3754744>
11. Baral HO, Weber E, Marson G, Quijada L (2018) A new connection between wood saprobism and beetle endosymbiosis: the rarely reported saprobic discomycete *Tromeropsis* is congeneric with the symbiotic yeast *Symbiotaphrina* (Symbiotaphrinales, Xylonomycetes) and two asexual morphs misplaced in *Hyphozyma*. *Mycol Prog* 17:215–254. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-017-1340-y>
12. Beimforde C, Feldberg K, Nylinder S, et al (2014) Estimating the Phanerozoic history of the Ascomycota lineages: Combining fossil and molecular data. *Mol Phylogenetics Evol* 78:386–398. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.04.024>
13. Beimforde C, Mitchell JK, Rikkinen J, Schmidt AR (2020) Sareomycetes cl. nov.: A new proposal for placement of the resinicolous genus *Sarea* (Ascomycota, Pezizomycotina). *Fungal Syst Evol* 6:25–37. <https://doi.org/10.3114/fuse.2020.06.02>

14. Bellemère A (1994a) Asci and ascospores in ascomycete systematics. In: Hawksworth DL (ed) *Ascomycete systematics: problems and perspectives in the nineties*. Plenum Press, New York, pp 111–126
15. Bellemère A (1994b) Documents et commentaires sur l'ultrastructure des asques polysporés des *Acarospora*, de quelques genres de la famille des *Acarosporaceae* et de genres similaires. *Bull Soc Linn Provence* 45:355–388
16. Berkeley MJ, Broome CE (1866) Notices of British Fungi. *Ann Mag Nat Hist Ser III* 18:121–129
17. Blaalid R, Kumar S, Nilsson RH, et al (2013) ITS1 versus ITS2 as DNA metabarcodes for fungi. *Mol Ecol Resour* 13:218–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1755-0998.12065>
18. Bridges JR (1987) Effects of Terpenoid Compounds on Growth of Symbiotic Fungi Associated with the Southern Pine Beetle. *Phytopathology* 77:83–85. <https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-77-83>
19. Bunny F, Tippet J (1988) Inhibitory Effects of *Pinus radiata* and *P. pinaster* Resin on Growth of Four *Phytophthora* Species. *Australas Plant Pathol* 17:14–16. <https://doi.org/10.1071/APP9880014>
20. Cappelletti C (1924) Studi su la vegetazione resinicola. *Ann Bot (Rome)* 16:253–297
21. Castresana J (2000) Selection of Conserved Blocks from Multiple Alignments for Their Use in Phylogenetic Analysis. *Mol Biol Evol* 17:540–552. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a026334>
22. Chou CKS, Zabkiewicz JA (1976) Toxicity of monoterpenes from *Pinus radiata* cortical oleoresin to *Diplodia pinea* spores. *Eur J For Pathol* 6:354–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.1976.tb00549.x>
23. Ciardo DE, Schar G, Bottger EC, et al (2006) Internal Transcribed Spacer Sequencing versus Biochemical Profiling for Identification of Medically Important Yeasts. *J Clin Microbiol* 44:77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.44.1.77-84.2006>
24. Clement M, Snell Q, Walker P, et al (2002) TCS: estimating gene genealogies. In: *Proceedings 16th International Parallel Distributed Processing Symposium*. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, p 184
25. Cobb FW Jr, Krstic M, Zavarin E, Barber HW Jr (1968) Inhibitory Effects of Volatile Oleoresin Components on *Fomes annosus* and Four *Ceratocystis* Species. *Phytopathology* 58:1327–1335
26. Cooke MC (1871) *Handbook of British Fungi, With full Descriptions of all the Species, and Illustrations of the Genera*. Macmillan and Co., London
27. Crombie JM (1870) *Lichenes Britannici: seu lichenum in Anglia, Scotia, et Hibernia Vigentium, enumeratio cum eorum stationibus et distributione*. L. Reeve, Londini
28. Crouan HM, Crouan PL (1867) *Florule du Finistère. Contenant les descriptions de 360 espèces nouvelles de sporagames, de nombreuses observations et une synonymie des plantes cellulaires et vasculaires qui croissent spontanément dans ce département*. Friedrich Klincksieck, Paris
29. Cui B, Gé L, Xú X (1984) Hóng sōng kuìyáng bìng de fángzhì shìyàn. *For Sci Technol* 1984:30. <https://doi.org/10.13456/j.cnki.lykt.1984.03.014>

30. De Groot RC (1972) Growth of Wood-Inhabiting Fungi in Saturated Atmospheres of Monoterpenoids. *Mycologia* 64:863–870. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3757941>
31. De Lange PJ, Rolfe JR (2010) New Zealand indigenous vascular plant checklist 2010. New Zealand Plant Conservation Network, Wellington, N.Z.
32. Dennis RWG (1960) British cup fungi and their allies: an introduction to the Ascomycetes. Printed for the Ray Society, London
33. Drummond AJ, Suchard MA, Xie D, Rambaut A (2012) Bayesian Phylogenetics with BEAUti and the BEAST 1.7. *Mol Phylogenetics Evol* 29:1969–1973. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss075>
34. Ehrenberg CG (1818) *Sylvae Mycologicae Berolinenses*. Formis Theophili Brusckcke, Berolini
35. Eriksson OE (1981) The families of bitunicate ascomycetes. Council for Nordic Publications in Botany, Copenhagen
36. Eriksson OE (2014) Checklist of the non-lichenized ascomycetes of Sweden. Uppsala Universitet, Uppsala
37. Etayo J (1996) Contribution to the lichen flora of the Canary Islands. II. Epiphytic lichens from La Palma. *Osterr Z Pilzkd* 5:149–159
38. Farjon A (2017) A handbook of the world's conifers, Second, revised edition. Brill, Leiden; Boston
39. Fink B (1935) The lichen flora of the United States. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor
40. Fisher PJ, Petrini O (1992) Fungal saprobes and pathogens as endophytes of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *New Phytol* 120:137–143
41. Frahm J-P, Lindlar A, Sollman P, Fischer E (1996) Bryophytes from the Cape Verde Islands. *Trop Bryol* 12:123–153
42. Fries EM (1815) *Observationes Mycologicae*. Sumptibus Gerhardi Bonnier, Havniae
43. Fries EM (1822) *Systema mycologicum: sistens fungorum ordines, genera et species, huc usque cognitae, quas ad normam methodi naturalis determinavit, disposuit atque descripsit Elias Fries*. Volumen II. Sectio I. Ex Officina Berlingiana, Lundæ
44. Fries EM (1823) *Systema mycologicum: sistens fungorum ordines, genera et species, huc usque cognitae, quas ad normam methodi naturalis determinavit, disposuit atque descripsit Elias Fries*. Volumen II. [Sectio II.]. Ex Officina Berlingiana, Lundæ
45. Fries N (1973) The growth-promoting activity of terpenoids on wood-decomposing fungi. *Eur J For Pathol* 3:169–180. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.1973.tb00391.x>
46. Fries TM (1874) *Lichenographia scandinavica sive dispositio lichenum in Dania, Suecia, Norvegia, Fennia, Lapponia rossica hactenus collectorum*. Ed. Berling., Uppsala
47. Fries TM (1860) *Lichenes arctoi Europae Groenlandiaeque hactenus cogniti*. C. A. Leffler, Uppsala
48. Fuckel KWGL (1871) *Symbolae Mycologicae: Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Rheinischen Pilze*. Nachtrag 1. *Jahrb Nassau Ver Naturkd* 25–26:287–346
49. Gadgil PD, Dick M (1999) Fungi Silvicolae Novaeselandiae: 1. *N Z J For Sci* 29:428–439
50. Gardes M, Bruns TD (1993) ITS primers with enhanced specificity for basidiomycetes - application to the identification of mycorrhizae and rusts. *Mol Ecol* 2:113–118. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365->

51. Garrido-Benavent I (2015) Contribución al conocimiento del género *Sarea* Fr. (Ascomycota, Incertae Sedis) en la Península Ibérica. *Errotari* 12:42–51
52. Geml J, Gravendeel B, van der Gaag KJ, et al (2014) The Contribution of DNA Metabarcoding to Fungal Conservation: Diversity Assessment, Habitat Partitioning and Mapping Red-Listed Fungi in Protected Coastal *Salix repens* Communities in the Netherlands. *PLOS ONE* 9:e99852. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0099852>
53. Gibbs JN (1972) Tolerance of *Fomes annosus* isolates to pine oleoresins and pinosylvins. *Eur J For Pathol* 2:147–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.1972.tb00356.x>
54. Giordano L, Gonthier P, Varese GC, et al (2009) Mycobiota inhabiting sapwood of healthy and declining Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) trees in the Alps. *Fungal Divers* 38:69–83
55. Giraldo A, Gené J, Sutton DA, et al (2014) Phylogenetic circumscription of *Arthrographis* (Eremomycetaceae, Dothideomycetes). *Persoonia* 32:102–114. <https://doi.org/10.3767/003158514X680207>
56. Goulding TC, Dayrat B (2016) Integrative taxonomy: ten years of practice and looking into the future. *Arch Zool Mus Lomonosov Mosc State Univ* 54:116–133
57. Groves JW, Wells DE (1956) The Genus *Retinocyclus*. *Mycologia* 48:865. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3755713>
58. Grummer JA, Bryson RW, Reeder TW (2014) Species Delimitation Using Bayes Factors: Simulations and Application to the *Sceloporus scalaris* Species Group (Squamata: Phrynosomatidae). *Syst Biol* 63:119–133. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syt069>
59. Gweon HS, Oliver A, Taylor J, et al (2015) PIPITS: an automated pipeline for analyses of fungal internal transcribed spacer sequences from the Illumina sequencing platform. *Methods Ecol Evol* 6:973–980. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12399>
60. Haelewaters D, De Kesel A, Pfister DH (2018) Integrative taxonomy reveals hidden species within a common fungal parasite of ladybirds. *Sci Rep* 8:15966. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-34319-5>
61. Hallenberg N, Kúffer N (2001) Long-distance spore dispersal in wood-inhabiting Basidiomycetes. *Nord J Bot* 21:431–436. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1756-1051.2001.tb00793.x>
62. Hansen A, Sunding P (1993) *Flora of Macaronesia: checklist of vascular plants, 4., rev. ed.* Botanical Garden and Museum, Univ. of Oslo, Oslo
63. Hart JH, Wardell JF, Hemingway RW (1975) Formation of Oleoresin and Lignans in Sapwood of White Spruce in Response to Wounding. *Phytopathology* 65:412–417
64. Hartmann E, Renz B, Jung JA (1981) Untersuchungen über Bakterien- und Pilzhemmstoffe in höheren Pflanzen: Isolierung, Identifizierung und Wirkungsspektrum von zwei Harzsäuren aus Fichtenrinden. *Phytopathol Z* 101:31–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0434.1981.tb03318.x>
65. Hasse HE (1898) *Lichens of Southern California*, 2nd edn. B. R. Baumgardt & Co., Los Angeles
66. Hasse HE (1908) *Lichens Collected in the Tehachepi Mountains, California, June, 1907.* *Bryologist* 11:55. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3238216>

67. Hasse HE (1913) The Lichen Flora of Southern California. *Contrib U S Natl Herb* 17:1–132
68. Hawksworth DL (1980) C.M.I. descriptions of pathogenic fungi and bacteria no. 677. *Sarea resinae*. Commonwealth Mycological Institute, Kew
69. Hawksworth DL, Sherwood MA (1981) A reassessment of three widespread resinicolous discomycetes. *Can J Bot* 59:357–372. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b81-049>
70. Hayashi H, Kobayashi T (1985) Etiological studies of resinous diseases of hinoki, *Chamaecyparis obtusa* (II) Pathogenicity of certain fungi, isolated from resinous lesions, to various conifers. *Nihon ringakkai taikai happyō ronbun-shū* 96:479–480
71. Hedin M, Carlson D, Coyle F (2015) Sky island diversification meets the multispecies coalescent-divergence in the spruce-fir moss spider (*Microhexura montivaga*, Araneae, Mygalomorphae) on the highest peaks of southern Appalachia. *Mol Ecol* 24:3467–3484. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.13248>
72. Held BW, Blanchette RA, Jurgens JA, et al (2003) Deterioration and Conservation Issues Associated with Antarctica's Historic Huts. In: Koestler RJ, Koestler VH, Charola AE, Nieto-Fernandez FE (eds) *Art, Biology, and Conservation: Biodeterioration of Works of Art*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, pp 370–389
73. Heled J, Drummond AJ (2010) Bayesian Inference of Species Trees from Multilocus Data. *Mol Biol Evol* 27:570–580. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msp274>
74. Hemingway RW, Greaves H (1973) Biodegradation of resin acid sodium salts. *Tappi* 56:189–192
75. Hepp JAP (1857a) Abbildungen und Beschreibung der Sporen zum V. VI. VII. und VIII. Band der Flechten Europas in getrockneten mikroskopisch untersuchten Exemplaren. [Meyer und Zeller], Zürich
76. Hepp JAP (1857b) Die Flechten Europas in Getrockneten Mikroskopisch Untersuchen Exemplaren mit Beschreibung und Abbildung ihrer Sporen. Meyer und Zeller, Zürich
77. Herrera CS, Rossman AY, Samuels GJ, et al (2015) Systematics of the *Cosmospora villoscula* species complex. *Mycologia* 107:532–557. <https://doi.org/10.3852/14-122>
78. Hintikka V (1970) Selective effect of terpenes on wood-decomposing Hymenomycetes. *Karstenia* 11:28–32. <https://doi.org/10.29203/ka.1970.67>
79. Hodkinson BP, Lendemer JC (2011) The orders of Ostropomycetidae (Lecanoromycetes, Ascomycota): Recognition of Sarrameanales and Trapeliales with a request to retain Pertusariales over Agyriales. *Phytologia* 93:407–412
80. Hüseyin E, Selçuk F (2014) Coelomycetous Fungi in Several Forest Ecosystems of Black Sea Provinces of Turkey. *Agric For* 60:19–32
81. Inter-Society Color Council (1976) ISCC-NBS Color-name charts illustrated with centroid colors. National Bureau of Standards, Washington, DC
82. Izzo A, Agbowo J, Bruns TD (2005) Detection of plot-level changes in ectomycorrhizal communities across years in an old-growth mixed-conifer forest. *New Phytol* 166:619–630. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2005.01354.x>
83. Johnston PR, Park D (2005) *Chlorociboria* (Fungi, Helotiales) in New Zealand. *N Z J Bot* 43:679–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0028825X.2005.9512985>

84. Jukes TH, Cantor CR (1969) Evolution of protein molecules. In: Munro HN (ed) Mammalian protein metabolism, III. Academic Press, New York, pp 21–132
85. Kang H-J, Sigler L, Lee J, et al (2010) *Xylogone ganodermophthora* sp. nov., an ascomycetous pathogen causing yellow rot on cultivated mushroom *Ganoderma lucidum* in Korea. *Mycologia* 102:1167–1184. <https://doi.org/10.3852/09-304>
86. Karsten PA (1885) Revisio Monographica Atque Synopsis Ascomycetum in Fennia Hucusque Detectorum. *Acta Soc Fauna Flora Fenn* 2:[1]-174
87. Kass RE, Raftery AE (1995) Bayes factors. *J Am Stat Assoc* 90:773–795
88. Katoh K (2002) MAFFT: a novel method for rapid multiple sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. *Nucleic Acids Res* 30:3059–3066. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkf436>
89. Katoh K, Standley DM (2013) MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software Version 7: Improvements in Performance and Usability. *Mol Biol Evol* 30:772–780. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mst010>
90. Kirk PM, Cannon PF, Minter DW, Stalpers JA (eds) (2008) *Ainsworth & Bisby's Dictionary of the Fungi*, 10th edn. CABI, Wallingford, Oxon, UK
91. Knudsen K, Kocourková J (2012) The annotated checklist of lichens, lichenicolous and allied fungi of Channel Islands National Park. *Opusc Philolichenum* 11:145–302
92. Kobayashi T, Hayashi H, Kubono T, et al (1990) Etiological and Pathological Studies on the Resinous Stem canker of Hinoki cypress, *Chamaecyparis obtusa* Sieb. et Zucc. I. Detection, identification and pathogenicity of the causal fungus. *Bull For Prod Res Inst* 357:51–93
93. Kobayashi T, Kusunoki M (1985) Kuromatsu jukan no rōshi-sei gan shi ~yu-shō no byōin. *Ann Phytopathol Soc Jpn* 51:323. <https://doi.org/10.3186/jjphytopath.51.318>
94. Kobayashi T, Zhao J-Z (1989) Notes on diseases of woody plants and their causal fungi in Heilongjiang province, China, 1. *Trans Mycol Soc Jpn* 30:277–293
95. Koerber GW (1865) *Parerga lichenologica: Ergänzungen zum Systema lichenum Germaniae*. Eduard Trewendt, Breslau
96. Kogel K-H, Franken P, Hückelhoven R (2006) Endophyte or parasite – what decides? *Curr Opin Plant Biol* 9:358–363. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pbi.2006.05.001>
97. Kõljalg U, Nilsson RH, Abarenkov K, et al (2013) Towards a unified paradigm for sequence-based identification of fungi. *Mol Ecol* 22:5271–5277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12481>
98. Koukol O, Kolařík M, Kolářová Z, Baldrian P (2012) Diversity of foliar endophytes in wind-fallen *Picea abies* trees. *Fungal Divers* 54:69–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-011-0112-2>
99. Kowalski T, Kehr RD (1992) Endophytic fungal colonization of branch bases in several forest tree species. *Sydowia* 44:137–168
100. Krupa S, Nylund J-E (1972) Studies on Ectomycorrhizae of Pine.: III. Growth Inhibition of two Root Pathogenic Fungi by Volatile Organic Constituents of Ectomycorrhizal Root Systems of *Pinus sylvestris* L. *Eur J For Pathol* 2:88–94. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.1972.tb00347.x>
101. Kujala V (1950) Über die Kleinpilze der Koniferen in Finnland. *Ascomycetes, Fungi Imperfecti, Uredinales*. *Metsät Tutkimusl Julk* 38:1–121

102. Kukwa M, Schiefelbein U, Czarnota P, et al (2008) Notes on some noteworthy lichens and allied fungi found in the Białowieża Primeval Forest in Poland. *Bryonora* 41:1–11
103. Kuznetsova ES, Kataeva OA, Himelbrant DE, Motiejūnaitė J (2016) Lichens and allied fungi of the Ragusha River Protected Area (Leningrad Region, Russia). *Folia Cryptogam Estonica* 53:71. <https://doi.org/10.12697/fce.2016.53.09>
104. LaGreca S, Lay E, Greene D, et al (2005) The lichens and bryophytes of the Boston Harbor Islands. *Northeast Nat* 12:77–98
105. Lamb IM (1963) *Index nominum lichenum: inter annos 1932 et 1960 divulgatorum*. The Ronald Press Company, New York
106. Lambert JB, Kozminski MA, Fahlstrom CA, Santiago-Blay JA (2007) Proton Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Characterization of Resins from the Family Pinaceae. *J Nat Prod* 70:188–195. <https://doi.org/10.1021/np060486i>
107. Lambert JB, Wu Y, Santiago-Blay JA (2005) Taxonomic and Chemical Relationships Revealed by Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Spectra of Plant Exudates. *J Nat Prod* 68:635–648
108. Lanfear R, Calcott B, Ho SYW, Guindon S (2012) PartitionFinder: Combined Selection of Partitioning Schemes and Substitution Models for Phylogenetic Analyses. *Mol Biol Evol* 29:1695–1701. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/mss020>
109. Langenheim JH (2003) *Plant resins: chemistry, evolution, ecology, and ethnobotany*. Timber Press, Portland, OR
110. Lartillot N, Philippe H (2006) Computing Bayes Factors Using Thermodynamic Integration. *Syst Biol* 55:195–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10635150500433722>
111. Leavitt SD, Esslinger TL, Divakar PK, Lumbsch H (2012) Miocene and Pliocene dominated diversification of the lichen-forming fungal genus *Melanohalea* (Parmeliaceae, Ascomycota) and Pleistocene population expansions. *BMC Evol Biol* 12:176. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2148-12-176>
112. Leigh JW, Bryant D (2015) POPART: full-feature software for haplotype network construction. *Methods Ecol Evol* 6:1110–1116. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12410>
113. Leighton WA (1871) *The Lichen-Flora of Great Britain, Ireland and the Channel Islands*. Printed for the Author, Shrewsbury [Eng.]
114. Leighton WA (1858) *Lichenes Britannici Exsiccati*. Pamplin, London
115. Leighton WA (1872) *Lichenological Memorabilia*.-No. 2. *The Lichens of Bettws-y-Coed, North Wales*. *Grevillea* 1:57–60
116. Leighton WA (1879) *The lichen-flora of Great Britain, Ireland, and the Channel Islands*, 3rd edn. Printed for the Author, Shrewsbury [Eng.]
117. Lendemer JC, Noell N (2018) *Delmarva lichens: an illustrated manual*. Torrey Botanical Society, Bronx, N.Y.
118. Leslie AB, Beaulieu J, Holman G, et al (2018) An overview of extant conifer evolution from the perspective of the fossil record. *Am J Bot* 105:1531–1544. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajb2.1143>
119. Letrouit-Galinou M-A (1973) Les Asques des Lichens et le type archaeascé. *Bryologist* 76:30–47

120. Lettau G (1912) Beiträge zur lichenenflora von Ost- und Westpreussen. In: Festschrift zum 50 jährigen bestehen des Preussischen botanischen vereins e.v. 1862-1912. Hartungsche Buchdruckerei, Königsberg, pp 17–91
121. Librado P, Rozas J (2009) DnaSP v5: a software for comprehensive analysis of DNA polymorphism data. *Bioinformatics* 25:1451–1452. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp187>
122. Liu D, Wang H, Park JS, Hur J-S (2017) The Genus *Chlorociboria*, Blue-Green Micromycetes in South Korea. *Mycobiology* 45:57–63. <https://doi.org/10.5941/MYCO.2017.45.2.57>
123. Liu YJ, Whelen S, Hall BD (1999) Phylogenetic relationships among ascomycetes: evidence from an RNA polymerase II subunit. *Mol Biol Evol* 16:1799–1808. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.molbev.a026092>
124. Looney BP, Adamčík S, Matheny PB (2020) Coalescent-based delimitation and species-tree estimations reveal Appalachian origin and Neogene diversification in *Russula* subsection *Roseinae*. *Mol Phylogenetics Evol* 147:106787. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2020.106787>
125. Lu Y, Ran J-H, Guo D-M, et al (2014) Phylogeny and Divergence Times of Gymnosperms Inferred from Single-Copy Nuclear Genes. *PLOS ONE* 9:e107679. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0107679>
126. Lücking R, Aime MC, Robbertse B, et al (2020) Unambiguous identification of fungi: where do we stand and how accurate and precise is fungal DNA barcoding? *IMA Fungus* 11:14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43008-020-00033-z>
127. Lücking R, Dal-Forno M, Sikaroodi M, et al (2014) A single macrolichen constitutes hundreds of unrecognized species. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 111:11091–11096. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1403517111>
128. Lücking R, Moncada B, McCune B, et al (2017) *Pseudocyphellaria crocata* (Ascomycota: Lobariaceae) in the Americas is revealed to be thirteen species, and none of them is *P. crocata*. *Bryologist* 120:441. <https://doi.org/10.1639/0007-2745-120.4.14>
129. Lücking R, Nelsen MP (2018) Ediacarans, Protolichens, and Lichen-Derived *Penicillium*. In: *Transformative Paleobotany*. Elsevier, pp 551–590
130. Lumbsch HT, Huhndorf SM (2010) Myconet Volume 14. Part One. Outline of Ascomycota—2009. Part Two. Notes on Ascomycete Systematics. Nos. 4751–5113. *Fieldiana Life Earth Sci* 1:1–64. <https://doi.org/10.3158/1557.1>
131. Lumbsch HT, Schmitt I, Mangold A, Wedin M (2007) Ascus types are phylogenetically misleading in Trapeliaceae and Agyriaceae (Ostropomycetidae, Ascomycota). *Mycol Res* 111:1133–1141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mycres.2007.06.016>
132. Lumley TC, Gignac LD, Currah RS (2001) Microfungus communities of white spruce and trembling aspen logs at different stages of decay in disturbed and undisturbed sites in the boreal mixedwood region of Alberta. *Can J Bot* 79:76–92. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b00-135>
133. Lutzoni F, Nowak MD, Alfaro ME, et al (2018) Contemporaneous radiations of fungi and plants linked to symbiosis. *Nat Commun* 9:5451. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-018-07849-9>
134. Magnusson AH (1935) Acarosporaceae und Thelocarpaceae. Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft m.b.H., Leipzig

135. Malençon G (1979) Nouvelles Contributions a la Flore Mycologique du Maroc - II. Bull Trimest Soc Mycol Fr 95:119–137
136. Mao K, Milne RI, Zhang L, et al (2012) Distribution of living Cupressaceae reflects the breakup of Pangea. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 109:7793–7798. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1114319109>
137. Marmolejo Monciváis JG (2018) Distribución vertical de hongos en hojas de tres especies de pinos en Nuevo León, México. Rev Mex Cienc For 9:379–399. <https://doi.org/10.29298/rmcf.v9i50.253>
138. Martinović T, Koukol O, Hirose D (2016) Distinct phylogeographic structure recognized within *Desmazierella acicola*. Mycologia 108:20–30. <https://doi.org/10.3852/14-291>
139. Mason-Gamer RJ, Kellogg EA (1996) Testing for Phylogenetic Conflict Among Molecular Data Sets in the Tribe Triticeae (Gramineae). Syst Biol 45:524–545. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/45.4.524>
140. Masee G (1895) British fungus-flora: a classified text-book of mycology. George Bell & Sons, London
141. Masumoto H, Degawa Y (2019) The effect of surface sterilization and the type of sterilizer on the genus composition of lichen-inhabiting fungi with notes on some frequently isolated genera. Mycoscience 60:331–342. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.myc.2019.07.004>
142. McClatchie AJ (1897) Seedless plants of southern California. Protophytes – Pteridophytes. Proc South Calif Acad Sci 1:337–395
143. McMullin RT (2015) The Lichens of Prince Edward Island, Canada: A Second Checklist, with Species Ranked for Conservation Status. Rhodora 117:454–484. <https://doi.org/10.3119/15-12>
144. Metzler B (1997) Quantitative assessment of fungal colonization in Norway spruce after green pruning. Eur J For Pathol 27:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0329.1997.tb00848.x>
145. Miadlikowska J, Kauff F, Högnabba F, et al (2014) A multigene phylogenetic synthesis for the class Lecanoromycetes (Ascomycota): 1307 fungi representing 1139 infrageneric taxa, 317 genera and 66 families. Mol Phylogenetics Evol 79:132–168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2014.04.003>
146. Miller MA, Pfeiffer W, Schwartz T (2010) Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees. In: 2010 Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE). IEEE, New Orleans, LA, USA, pp 1–8
147. Mitchell JK, Quijada L (In Press) Proposal to conserve the name *Cytospora resinae* (*Zythia resinae*) with a conserved type (*Ascomycota*). Taxon In Press:
148. Morse CA, Lendemer JC (2019) A new *Biatoridium* from eastern North America, with comments on the disposition of species of *Biatorella* sensu Magnusson. Bryologist 122:1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1639/0007-2745-122.1.001>
149. Mudd W (1861) A manual of British lichens: containing descriptions of all the species and varieties, and five plates, with figures of the spores of one hundred and thirty species, illustrative of the genera. Harrison Penney, Darlington
150. Muñoz J, Felicísimo ÁM, Cabezas F, et al (2004) Wind as a Long-Distance Dispersal Vehicle in the Southern Hemisphere. Science 304:1144–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1095210>
151. Murata Y, Sano A, Kamei K, Nishimura K (2005) [The first isolation of *Arthrographis kalrae* (Tewari et Macpherson) Sigler et Carmichel 1976 from the oral cavity of a canine in Japan]. Nihon'ishinkingakkai

sōkai puroguramu shōroku-shū 49:162. <https://doi.org/10.11534/jsmm.49.0.162.0>

152. Nannfeldt JA (1932) Studien über die morphologie und systematik der nicht-lichenisierten inoperculaten discomyceten. *Nov Acta Reg Soc Sci Ups Ser IV* 8:1–368
153. Nash TH, Gries C, Bungartz F (eds) (2008) Lichen flora of the greater Sonoran Desert region Volume III (Balance of the microlichens, and the lichenicolous fungi). Lichens Unlimited, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz
154. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020a) Accession No. MN547391.1, *Zythia pinastri* isolate 31 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547392.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
155. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020b) Accession No. MN547392.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 33 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547392.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
156. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020c) Accession No. MN547393.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 34 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547393.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
157. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020d) Accession No. MN547394.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 35 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547394.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
158. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020e) Accession No. MN547395.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 36 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547395.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
159. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020f) Accession No. MN547396.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 37 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547396.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
160. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2020g) Accession No. MN547397.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate 38 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene,

- partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MN547397.1>. Accessed 13 May 2020
161. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2018a) Accession No. MH425275.1, *Sarea resiniae* voucher Hao & Guo & Han 150105 small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MH425275.1>. Accessed 20 Sep 2019
162. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2018b) Accession No. MH425297.1, *Sarea resiniae* voucher Hao & Guo & Han 160704a small subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and large subunit ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/MH425297.1>. Accessed 20 Sep 2019
163. NCBI, NLM, Bethesda (MD) (2013) Accession No. KF993412.1, *Hormococcus conorum* isolate PAV-M 1.092 18S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence; internal transcribed spacer 1, 5.8S ribosomal RNA gene, and internal transcribed spacer 2, complete sequence; and 28S ribosomal RNA gene, partial sequence. In: Nucleotide [Internet]. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nuccore/KF993412.1>. Accessed 20 Sep 2019
164. Nilsson RH, Kristiansson E, Ryberg M, et al (2008) Intraspecific *ITS* Variability in the Kingdom *Fungi* as Expressed in the International Sequence Databases and Its Implications for Molecular Species Identification. *Evol Bioinform* 4:EBO.S653. <https://doi.org/10.4137/EBO.S653>
165. Nilsson RH, Larsson K-H, Taylor AFS, et al (2019) The UNITE database for molecular identification of fungi: handling dark taxa and parallel taxonomic classifications. *Nucleic Acids Res* 47:D259–D264. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky1022>
166. Novas MV, Carmarán CC (2008) Studies on diversity of foliar fungal endophytes of naturalised trees from Argentina, with a description of *Haplotrichum minutissimum* sp. nov. *Flora Morphol Distrib Funct Ecol Plants* 203:610–616. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.flora.2007.09.010>
167. Nylander W (1857a) *Prodromus Lichenographiæ Galliæ et Algeriæ*. *Actes Soc Linn Bordx* 21:249–467
168. Nylander W (1857b) *Die Flechten Europas, von Philipp Hepp*. Fascic. V-VIII. *Flora* 40:538–543
169. Nylander W (1866) *Prodromi Lichenographiæ Scandinaviæ Supplementum. Lichenes Lapponiæ Orientalis. ex typis Simelii haeredum, Helsingforsiae*
170. Ohlert A (1870) *Zusammenstellung der Lichenen der Provinz Preussen*. E. J. Dalkowski, Königsberg
171. Oses R, Valenzuela S, Freer J, et al (2008) Fungal endophytes in xylem of healthy Chilean trees and their possible role in early wood decay. *Fungal Divers* 33:77–86
172. Otte V, Rätzel S, Sipman HJM, Kummer V (2000) Bemerkenswerte Flechtenfunde aus Brandenburg V. *Verh Bot Ver Berl Brandenbg* 133:461–481
173. Paradis E, Claude J, Strimmer K (2004) APE: Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics* 20:289–290. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412>
174. Pärtel K, Baral H-O, Tamm H, Pöldmaa K (2017) Evidence for the polyphyly of *Encoelia* and *Encoelioideae* with reconsideration of respective families in Leotiomycetes. *Fungal Divers* 82:183–219.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-016-0370-0>

175. Pérez-Ortega S, Garrido-Benavent I, Grube M, et al (2016) Hidden diversity of marine borderline lichens and a new order of fungi: Collemopsidiales (Dothideomyceta). *Fungal Divers* 80:285–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-016-0361-1>
176. Peršoh D (2013) Factors shaping community structure of endophytic fungi—evidence from the *Pinus-Viscum*-system. *Fungal Divers* 60:55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-013-0225-x>
177. Peršoh D, Rambold G (2012) Lichen-associated fungi of the *Letharietum vulpinae*. *Mycol Prog* 11:753–760. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-011-0786-6>
178. Persoon CH (1801) Synopsis methodica fungorum: sistens enumerationem omnium huc usque detectarum specierum, cum brevibus descriptionibus nec non synonymis et observationibus selectis. Apud Henricvm Dieterich, Gottingae
179. Petrini O, Carroll G (1981) Endophytic fungi in foliage of some Cupressaceae in Oregon. *Can J Bot* 59:629–636. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b81-089>
180. Petrini O, Fisher PJ (1988) A comparative study of fungal endophytes in xylem and whole stem of *Pinus sylvestris* and *Fagus sylvatica*. *Trans Br Mycol Soc* 91:233–238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536\(88\)80210-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(88)80210-9)
181. Poelt J, Vězda A (1977) *Biatorella* de Not. In: Bestimmungsschlüssel europäischer Flechten: Ergänzungsheft I. J. Cramer, Vaduz, pp 23–27
182. Pringle A, Baker DM, Platt JL, et al (2005) Cryptic Speciation in the Cosmopolitan and Clonal Human Pathogenic Fungus *Aspergillus fumigatus*. *Evolution* 59:1886–1899. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2005.tb01059.x>
183. Prior C (1976) Resistance by Corsican Pine to Attack by *Heterobasidion annosum*. *Ann Bot (Oxford)* 40:261–279. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.aob.a085128>
184. Puillandre N, Lambert A, Brouillet S, Achaz G (2012) ABGD, Automatic Barcode Gap Discovery for primary species delimitation: ABGD, AUTOMATIC BARCODE GAP DISCOVERY. *Mol Ecol* 21:1864–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2011.05239.x>
185. Purahong W, Pietsch KA, Lentendu G, et al (2017) Characterization of Unexplored Deadwood Mycobiome in Highly Diverse Subtropical Forests Using Culture-independent Molecular Technique. *Front Microbiol* 8:574. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmicb.2017.00574>
186. Quijada L, Baral H-O, Beltrán-Tejera E (2016) A revision of the genus *Orbilina* in the Canary Islands. *Phytotaxa* 284:231. <https://doi.org/10.11646/phytotaxa.284.4.1>
187. Ramsbottom J (1913) A list of the British species of Discomycetes arranged according to Boudier's system, with a key to the genera. *Trans Br Mycol Soc* 4:343–381. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536\(12\)80038-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-1536(12)80038-6)
188. Reeb V, Lutzoni F, Roux C (2004) Contribution of RPB2 to multilocus phylogenetic studies of the euascomycetes (Pezizomycotina, Fungi) with special emphasis on the lichen-forming Acarosporaceae and evolution of polyspory. *Mol Phylogenetics Evol* 32:1036–1060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2004.04.012>

189. Rehm H (1889a) Lieferung 32: Patellariaceae-Eupatellariaeae. In: Die Pilze Deutschlands, Oesterreichs und der Schweiz. III. Abtheilung: Ascomyceten: Hysteriaceen und Discomyceten, 2nd edn. Eduard Kummer, Leipzig, pp 291–336
190. Rehm H (1889b) Lieferung 31: Dermateae. In: Die Pilze Deutschlands, Oesterreichs und der Schweiz. III. Abtheilung: Ascomyceten: Hysteriaceen und Discomyceten, 2nd edn. Eduard Kummer, Leipzig, pp 241–272
191. Rehner SA, Samuels GJ (1994) Taxonomy and phylogeny of *Gliocladium* analysed from nuclear large subunit ribosomal DNA sequences. *Mycol Res* 98:625–634. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0953-7562\(09\)80409-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0953-7562(09)80409-7)
192. Rishbeth J (1972) Resistance to fungal pathogens of tree roots. *Proc R Soc Lond Ser B* 181:333–351. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1972.0054>
193. Ronquist F, Teslenko M, van der Mark P, et al (2012) MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian Phylogenetic Inference and Model Choice Across a Large Model Space. *Syst Biol* 61:539–542. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/sys029>
194. Rudinsky JA (1966) Host Selection and Invasion by the Douglas-fir Beetle, *Dendroctonus pseudotsugae* Hopkins, in Coastal Douglas-fir Forests. *Can Entomol* 98:98–111. <https://doi.org/10.4039/Ent9898-1>
195. Saar I (2018) UNITE sequence: ATCC52699|UDB035129. In: UNITE Community. unite.ut.ee/bl_forw.php?id=853415. Accessed 4 Oct 2019
196. Saccardo PA (1889) Sylloge Discomycetum et Phymatosphaeriacearum. In: Saccardo PA (ed) *Sylloge Fungorum Omnium Hucusque Cognitorum*. Typis Seminarii, Patavii, pp 1–859
197. Saladin B, Leslie AB, Wüest RO, et al (2017) Fossils matter: improved estimates of divergence times in *Pinus* reveal older diversification. *BMC Evol Biol* 17:95. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12862-017-0941-z>
198. Samarakoon MC, Hyde KD, Hongsanan S, et al (2019) Divergence time calibrations for ancient lineages of Ascomycota classification based on a modern review of estimations. *Fungal Divers* 96:285–346. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13225-019-00423-8>
199. Sánchez Márquez S, Bills GF, Zabalgoceazcoa I (2008) Diversity and structure of the fungal endophytic assemblages from two sympatric coastal grasses. *Fungal Divers* 33:87–100
200. Sánchez-Ramírez S, Wilson AW, Ryberg M (2017) Overview of Phylogenetic Approaches to Mycorrhizal Biogeography, Diversity and Evolution. In: Tedersoo L (ed) *Biogeography of Mycorrhizal Symbiosis*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp 1–37
201. Sanz-Ros AV, Müller MM, San Martín R, Diez JJ (2015) Fungal endophytic communities on twigs of fast and slow growing Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris* L.) in northern Spain. *Fungal Biol* 119:870–883. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.funbio.2015.06.008>
202. Sayre G (1969) *Cryptogamae exsiccatae: an annotated bibliography of published exsiccatae of algae, lichenes, hepaticae, and musci*. New York Botanical Garden, New York
203. Schultheis B, Tholl M-T, Baral H-O, Marson G (2001) Journées luxembourgeoises de mycologie vernale 2000. *Bull Soc Nat Luxemb* 102:23–43

204. Scotese C (2016) A new global temperature curve for the Phanerozoic. In: Geological Society of America Abstracts with Programs. pp 74–31
205. Seifert KA, Carpenter SE (1987) *Bisporrella resinicola* comb. nov. and its *Eustilbum* anamorph. Can J Bot 65:1262–1267. <https://doi.org/10.1139/b87-176>
206. Seifert KA, Hughes SJ, Boulay H, Louis-Seize G (2007) Taxonomy, nomenclature and phylogeny of three *Cladosporium*-like hyphomycetes, *Sorocybe resinae*, *Seifertia azaleae* and the *Hormoconis* anamorph of *Amorphotheca resinae*. Stud Mycol 58:235–245. <https://doi.org/10.3114/sim.2007.58.09>
207. Selva SB, Tuovila H (2016) Two new resinicolous mycocalicioid fungi from the Acadian Forest: One new to science, the other new to North America. Bryologist 119:417–422. <https://doi.org/10.1639/0007-2745-119.4.417>
208. Shain L (1971) The Response of Sapwood of Norway Spruce to Infection by *Fomes annosus*. Phytopathology 61:301–307. <https://doi.org/10.1094/Phyto-61-301>
209. Shchedrova VI (1964) Vozbuditel' YAzvennogo Raka Sosny Obyknovennoy. Botanicheskiy Zhurnal 49:1314–1317
210. Shchedrova VI (1965) YAzvennyy Rak—Bolezn' Sosnovogo Podrosta Predvaritel'nogo Vozobnovleniya. Izvestiya Vysshikh Uchebnykh Zavedeniy: Lesnoy Zhurnal 3:40–45
211. Sieber TN (2007) Endophytic fungi in forest trees: are they mutualists? Fungal Biol Rev 21:75–89. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fbr.2007.05.004>
212. Sigler L, Carmichael JW (1983) Redisposition of some fungi referred to *Oidium microspermum* and a review of *Arthrographis*. Mycotaxon 18:495–507
213. Skrede I, Carlsen T, Schumacher T (2017) A synopsis of the saddle fungi (*Helvella*: Ascomycota) in Europe – species delimitation, taxonomy and typification. Persoonia 39:201–253. <https://doi.org/10.3767/persoonia.2017.39.09>
214. Smerlis E (1973) Pathogenicity Tests of Some Discomycetes Occurring on Conifers. Can J For Res 3:7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1139/x73-002>
215. Smith AL (1926) A Monograph of the British Lichens. A descriptive Catalogue of the Species in the Department of Botany, British Museum, 2nd edn. The Trustees of the British Museum, London
216. Smith RH (1961) Techniques for Determining the Toxicity of Pine Resin Vapors to *Dendroctonus brevicomis* and *D. jeffreyi*. J Econ Entomol 54:359–365. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jee/54.2.359>
217. Smith SY, Stockey RA, Rothwell GW, Little SA (2017) A new species of *Pityostrobus* (Pinaceae) from the Cretaceous of California: moving towards understanding the Cretaceous radiation of Pinaceae. J Syst Palaeontol 15:69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14772019.2016.1143885>
218. Spier L, Aptroot A (2000) Twee soorten harsbekertjes in Nederland. Coolia 44:115–116
219. Stadler M, Læssøe T, Fournier J, et al (2014) A polyphasic taxonomy of *Daldinia* (Xylariaceae). Stud Mycol 77:1–143. <https://doi.org/10.3114/sim0016>
220. Stamatakis A (2006) RAxML-VI-HPC: maximum likelihood-based phylogenetic analyses with thousands of taxa and mixed models. Bioinformatics 22:2688–2690. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl446>

221. Stamatakis A, Hoover P, Rougemont J (2008) A Rapid Bootstrap Algorithm for the RAxML Web Servers. *Syst Biol* 57:758–771. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10635150802429642>
222. Stein B (1879) *Flechten*. J. U. Kern's Verlag, Breslau
223. Sūn B, Jiě H, Wáng J, et al (1983) Hóng sōng liú zhī bìng de chūbù yánjiū. Sēnlín bìng chóng tōngxùn 1983:4–6
224. Suto Y (1987) Hinoki no rōshi-shō,`jushi dōgarebyō' o nozoku rōshi-shō no hassei seitai to gen'in kyūmei. *For Pests* 36:117–122
225. Suto Y (1992) Inoculation tests with *Cryptosporiopsis abietina* and *Sarea resinae* to *Chamaecyparis obtusa* and *Cryptomeria japonica*. *Nihon ringakkai taikai happyō ronbun-shū* 103:559–560
226. Suto Y (1997) Etiology of the Resinous Stem Canker of *Chamaecyparis obtusa*: *Cistella japonica* as the Causal Agent. *J For Res* 2:59–65. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02348264>
227. Suto Y (1998) Traumatic Resin-Canal Formation Caused by Inoculation with *Cistella japonica* in Secondary Phloem of *Chamaecyparis obtusa*. *J For Res* 3:99–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02760309>
228. Suto Y, Kanamori H (1990) Studies of Damage and Causal Agent of Resinous Stem Canker of *Chamaecyparis obtusa* in Shimane Prefecture, Japan. *Shimane Hayashi Giken-hō* 41:31–50
229. Suto Y, Ougi D (1999) Symptom Development of the Resinous Stem Canker Caused by Inoculation with *Cistella japonica* onto *Chamaecyparis obtusa*. *J For Res* 4:177–182. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02762244>
230. Takamatsu S (2013) Origin and evolution of the powdery mildews (Ascomycota, Erysiphales). *Mycoscience* 54:75–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.myc.2012.08.004>
231. Takamatsu S, Matsuda S (2004) Estimation of molecular clocks for ITS and 28S rDNA in Erysiphales. *Mycoscience* 45:340–344. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10267-004-0187-7>
232. Tamura K, Peterson D, Peterson N, et al (2011) MEGA5: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Using Maximum Likelihood, Evolutionary Distance, and Maximum Parsimony Methods. *Mol Biol Evol* 28:2731–2739. <https://doi.org/10.1093/molbev/msr121>
233. Tanney JB, Seifert KA (2019) *Tryblidiopsis magnesii* sp. nov. from *Picea glauca* in Eastern Canada. *Fungal Syst Evol* 4:13–20. <https://doi.org/10.3114/fuse.2019.04.02>
234. Tappert R, Wolfe AP, McKellar RC, et al (2011) Characterizing Modern and Fossil Gymnosperm Exudates Using Micro-Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy. *Int J Plant Sci* 172:120–138. <https://doi.org/10.1086/657277>
235. Tarasova V, Androsova V, Sonina A, Ahti T (2015) The lichens from the City of Petrozavodsk in the Herbarium of the Botanical Museum, University of Helsinki. *Folia Cryptogam Estonica* 52:41–50. <https://doi.org/10.12697/fce.2015.52.06>
236. Tucker SC, Jordan WP (1979) A Catalog of California Lichens. *Wasmann J Biol* 36:1–105
237. Tuckerman E (1872) *Genera lichenum: an arrangement of the North American lichens*. Edwin Nelson, Amherst [Mass.]

238. Tulasne L-R, Tulasne C (1861) *Selecta Fungorum Carpologia, ea Documenta et Icones Potissimum Exhibens Quae Varia Fructuum et Seminum Genera in Eodem Fungo Simul aut Vicissim Adesse Demonstrent. Imperatoris Jussu, In Imperiali Typographeo Excudebatur, Parisiis*
239. Turland N, Wiersema J, Barrie F, et al (eds) (2018) *International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants*. Koeltz Botanical Books, Glashütten
240. U'Ren JM, Arnold AE (2016) Diversity, taxonomic composition, and functional aspects of fungal communities in living, senesced, and fallen leaves at five sites across North America. *PeerJ* 4:e2768. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2768>
241. Vainio EA (1883) *Adjumenta ad Lichenographiam Lapponiae fennicae atque Fenniae borealis*. II. *Medd Soc Fauna Flora Fenn* 10:1–230
242. Väisälä L (1974) Effects of terpene compounds on the growth of wood-decomposing fungi. *Ann Bot Fenn* 11:275–278
243. van Buijtenen JP, Santamour FS (1972) Resin Crystallization Related to Weevil Resistance in White Pine (*Pinus strobus*). *Can Entomol* 104:215–219. <https://doi.org/10.4039/Ent104215-2>
244. Verrall AF (1938) The Probable Mechanism of the Protective Action of Resin in Fire Wounds on Red Pine. *J For* 36:1231–1233
245. Viana DS, Gangoso L, Bouten W, Figuerola J (2016) Overseas seed dispersal by migratory birds. *Proc R Soc B* 283:20152406. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2015.2406>
246. Vilgalys R, Hester M (1990) Rapid genetic identification and mapping of enzymatically amplified ribosomal DNA from several *Cryptococcus* species. *J Bacteriol* 172:4238–4246. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.172.8.4238-4246.1990>
247. von Keißler K (1909) Beitrag zur Kenntnis der Pilzflora Dalmatiens. *Osterr Bot Z* 59:275–279. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01793179>
248. von Krempelhuber A (1861) Die Lichenen-Flora Bayerns; oder Auzählung der bisher in Bayern (diesseits des Rheins) aufgefundenen Lichenen mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der verticalen Verbreitung dieser Gewächse in den Alpen. *Denkschr Königl-Bayer Bot Ges Regensbg* 4:1–317
249. von Thümen F (1880) *Symbolae ad Floram Mycologicam Austriacam IV*. *Osterr Bot Z* 30:311–314
250. Vu D, Groenewald M, de Vries M, et al (2019) Large-scale generation and analysis of filamentous fungal DNA barcodes boosts coverage for kingdom fungi and reveals thresholds for fungal species and higher taxon delimitation. *Stud Mycol* 92:135–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.simyco.2018.05.001>
251. Wang C-JK, Zabel RA (eds) (1990) *Identification manual for fungi from utility poles in the eastern United States*. American Type Culture Collection, Rockville, MD
252. Wedin M, Döring H, Gilenstam G (2004) Saprotrophy and lichenization as options for the same fungal species on different substrata: environmental plasticity and fungal lifestyles in the *Stictis-Conotrema* complex. *New Phytol* 164:459–465. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01198.x>
253. Wedin M, Döring H, Gilenstam G (2006) *Stictis* s. lat. (*Ostropales, Ascomycota*) in northern Scandinavia, with a key and notes on morphological variation in relation to lifestyle. *Mycol Res* 110:773–789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mycres.2006.04.010>

254. White TJ, Bruns TD, Lee S, Taylor JW (1990) 38 - Amplification and direct sequencing of fungal ribosomal RNA genes for Phylogenetics. In: Innis MA, Gelfand DH, Sninsky JJ, White TJ (eds) PCR Protocols: A Guide to Methods and Applications. Academic Press, Inc., San Diego, pp 315–322
255. Whitney RD, Denyer WBG (1969) Resin as a Barrier to Infection of White Spruce by Heartrotting Fungi. *For Sci* 15:266–267
256. Wilkinson DM, Koumoutsaris S, Mitchell EAD, Bey I (2012) Modelling the effect of size on the aerial dispersal of microorganisms: Modelling the aerial dispersal of microorganisms. *J Biogeogr* 39:89–97. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2699.2011.02569.x>
257. Willey H (1888) Appendix. In: A synopsis of the North American lichens: Part II., Comprising the Lecideacei, and (in part) the Graphidacei. S. E. Cassino, Boston, pp 129–162
258. Wirth V (1995) *Die Flechten Baden-Württembergs*, 2nd edn. Verlag Eugen Ulmer, Stuttgart
259. Xiang C-T, Song R-Q (1988) Research on *Tympanis* in North-Eastern China. *Bull Bot Res* 8:147–152
260. Xiang C-T, Song Y-S, Jiang J-Q, et al (1985) Study on Bleeding Canker of Korean Pine. *J North-East For Univ* 13:28-42+138-139
261. Xie W, Lewis PO, Fan Y, et al (2011) Improving Marginal Likelihood Estimation for Bayesian Phylogenetic Model Selection. *Syst Biol* 60:150–160. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syq085>
262. Yamada T (2001) Defense Mechanisms in the Sapwood of Living Trees against Microbial Infection. *J For Res* 6:127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02767083>
263. Yamamoto H, Asano N, Sawano C, et al (1997) Diterpenes isolated from the resin of the resinous stem canker of Japanese cypress, *Chamaecyparis obtusa*. *Mokuzai Gakkaishi* 43:558–565
264. Yang JH, Kim W, Hur J-S (2020) A-32: Remarkable difference in alpha diversity of isolated fungi on a medium containing lichen host substance. *Kor Soc Mycol Newsl* 32:98
265. Yatsyna AP (2017) Lichens and Closely Related Fungi of the Reserve “Krasny Bor.” *Viesnik Viciebskaha Dziaržaŭnaha Ūniversiteta* 2017:81–89
266. Yokozawa Y, Kaneko S, Kubono T (1989) Hinoki rōshi-shō kanbu kara no bunri kin ni yoru sesshu shiken (2) sesshu-go 5-nen-me made no keika. *Nihon ringakkai Tōhoku shibu kaishi* 41:199–201
267. Yokozawa Y, Kaneko S, Zinno Y (1986) Hinoki rōshi-shō kanbu kara no bunri kin ni yoru sesshu shiken (I) sesshu-go 2-nen-me made no keika. *Nihon ringakkai Tōhoku shibu kaishi* 38:207–208
268. Zhong Z, Pfister DH (2004) Phylogenetic relationships among species of *Leotia* (Leotiales) based on ITS and RPB2 sequences. *Mycol Prog* 3:237–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11557-006-0094-8>
269. Zoller S, Scheidegger C, Sperisen C (1999) PCR Primers for the Amplification of Mitochondrial Small Subunit Ribosomal DNA of Lichen-forming Ascomycetes. *Lichenologist* 31:511–516. <https://doi.org/10.1006/lich.1999.0220>

Figures




Figure 1

Morphological features of *Sarea* spp. a1–d2 Fresh collection and living asci, ascospores and paraphyses of *Sarea coeloplata*. e–o Comparative morphology between *S. difformis* (e, g, i, k, m, n) and *S. coeloplata* (f, h, j, l, o). e–f Dry or rehydrated apothecia on substrate. g–h Median section of apothecium with ectal and medullary excipulum and changes after adding KOH. i–j Mature asci with ascus dehiscence and base with croziers. k–l Paraphyses. m & o Ascospores. n Ascospore shoot in culture and hyphal germination. Reagents: H₂O = b1–3, c, d1–2; g1, h1, h3, n; KOH = g2–5; h2, h4–7, i1, l3, o3; KOH+CR = i2–3, i5–6, j2–7,

k1-3, l1-2, l4, m2, o2, o4; KOH+MLZ = i4, j1, k4, m1, o1. Scale bars: 200 μ m = a1-2, e1-3, f1-4; 50 μ m = g1-5, h1, h5-7, n; 10 μ m = b1-3, c, d1-2, h2-4, i1-6, j1-7, k1-4, l1-4, m1-2, o1; 10 μ m = o2-4. Collections: BHI-F925 = f3, h3-7, j3, l3, o3; IGB454 = f1-2; IGB457 = j5-7, l1, o1; IGB448 = h1-2; JM0007 = e1, i1-2, i4-6, k4, m1-2; JM0009.2 = i3, k1-3; JM0010.1 = g3-5; JM0011 = f4, j1, j4, l4, o4; JM0132 = a1-2, b1-3, c, d1-2, n; JM0072.1 = j2, l2, o2; JM0074.1 = e3; JMEK = e2; PV-D836 = g2; Rehm Ascomyceten 577 (FH 00995483) = g1.



Figure 2

Morphological features of *Zythia resiniae*. a1–d3 Fresh collection and living asci, ascospores and paraphyses. From e to m each letter represents the morphology of one specimen for each different clade (Fig. S1): e1–9 Clade 3, f1–9 Clade 2, g1–9 Clade 1, h1–9 Clade 5, i1–9 Clade 6, j1–9 Clade 8, k1–9 Clade 12, l1–9 Clade 13, m1–9 Clade 9. Numbers after the letter e to m indicate different morphological features: 1. Dry apothecia, 2. Median section of apothecium, 3–4. Excipular cells. 5–7. Asci, 8. Ascospores, and 9. Paraphyses. Reagents: H₂O = b1–4, c, d1–3; KOH = e2–4, e6, e8, f2–4, f6, f9, g2–4, g9, h2–4, h8, i2–4, j3–4, j8, k3–4, l3–4, m3–4, m9; KOH+CR = e7, e9, f7–8, g6–8, h6–7, h9, i6–9, j6–7, j9, k2, k6–9, l6–7, l9, m6–8; KOH+MLZ = e5, f5, g5, h5, i5, j2, j5, k5, l2, l5, l8, m2, m5. Scale bars: 500 μ m = a1–4; e1, f1, g1, h1, i1, j1, k1, l1, m1; 100 μ m = e2, f2, g2, h2, i2, j2, k2, l2, m2; 20 μ m = e3–4, f3–4, g3–4, h3–4, i3–4, j3–4, k3–4, l3–4, m3–4; 10 μ m = b1–4, c, d1, e5–9, f5–9, g5–9, h5–9, i5–9, j5–9, k5–9, l5–9, m5–9; 5 μ m = d2–3. Collections: 17121601 = m1–9; HJMS11998 = i1–9; JM0120 = h1–9; JM0014 = l1–9; JM0131 = a1–4, b1–4, c, d1–3; JM0006 = j1–9; JM0065.1 = k1–9; LD1356193 = e1–9; PV-D836-Ba = g1–9; TNS-F-41522 = f1–9.




Figure 3

Morphological features of *Atrozythia klamathica*. a1–5 Dry apothecia. b1–6 Median section of apothecium with details of excipulum: b4. Ectal excipulum at margin, b5. Medullary excipulum, b6. Ectal excipulum at lower flanks. c1–6 Morphological variation of asci: c1–2. Amyloid walls, c3. multispored mature ascus, c4. Ascus dehiscence, c5. Perforated crozier, c6. Details of ascus walls. d1–4 Paraphyses. e1–2 Ascospores. Reagents: H₂O = b4, b6; KOH = b1, c6, e1; KOH+CR = b2, b5, c3–5, d1, d3–4, e2; KOH+MLZ = b3, c1–2, d2.

Scale bars: 500 μm = a1–5; 200 μm = b1; 100 μm = b2–3; 50 μm = b4, b6, c3–4; 10 μm = b5, c1–2, c5–6, d1–4, e1–2. Collections: JM0068 = a1–2, a5, b1–6, c5–6, d2–4, e1; Haldeman 2748 = a3–4, c1–4, d1, e2.





Figure 4

Three-locus phylogram of Sareomycetes. Phylogram obtained with RAxML based on a three-locus matrix (nuITS, nuLSU and mtSSU) that depicts relationships among lineages within Sareomycetes. The voucher code, the geographic region and the tree host genus on which each specimen occurred are provided. Colored boxes delineate the different taxa (genus, species) considered in the present study; full Latin names are

available in the legend on the upper-left corner. Bold branches denote high nodal support in the RAxML (bootstrap values $\geq 70\%$) and/or Bayesian (PP ≥ 0.95) analyses.

A *Zythia resiniae*



B *Sarea* spp.




Figure 5

Statistical parsimony networks for *Zythia resiniae* and *Sarea* spp. haplotypes. A *Zythia resiniae*. B *Sarea* spp. Haplotypes were colored according to the geographic origin of specimens (a legend is provided for reference). In B, a colored box is used to delimitate each species within *Sarea*. The sizes of the circles in the

networks are proportional to the numbers of individuals bearing the haplotype; black-filled smaller circles indicate missing haplotypes. Mutations are shown as hatch marks.





Figure 6

Dating analyses for Sareomycetes. A Circular time-calibrated MCC tree constructed in BEAST using a six-locus dataset and 169 fungal taxa, including representatives of main Ascomycota lineages and Basidiomycota (outgroup). The class Sareomycetes, comprising Zythia and Sarea in this analysis, is highlighted in red. Numbers on the chronogram perimeter designate different classes in Ascomycota (see

legend on the upper-right corner). B The 95% HPD age intervals obtained in BEAST to frame in time the crowns of Sareomycetes and the three included genera and species; black hexagons represent median ages. Dating results were those obtained using the three-locus dataset and calibrating the crown node of Sareomycetes with a time estimate of 120.88 Ma (181.35–75.76 Ma, 95 % HPD) based on results of our six-locus dating analysis. 95% HPD age intervals for the crowns of different gymnosperm plant families and species are represented in boxes colored with different shades of green (light green, Pinaceae; dark green, Cupressaceae). These were obtained from different studies: I (Mao et al. 2012), II (Lu et al. 2014), III (Saladin et al. 2017, FBDI approach), IV (Saladin et al. 2017, NDbI approach), and V (Leslie et al. 2018). Paleogeographic maps and climatic graph were drawn after Scotese (2016) and the PALEOMAP Project (<http://www.scotese.com/>, last accessed 10 March 2020). Geological time periods in A and B are shaded and abbreviated as: Quaternary (Q), Neogene (N), Paleogene (PG), Cretaceous (K), Jurassic (J), Triassic (TR), Permian (P), Carboniferous (C), Devonian (D), Silurian (S), Ordovician (O), Cambrian (CA), and Proterozoic (PROT); epochs are abbreviated as PL (Pliocene), MI (Miocene), OL (Oligocene), and PA (Paleocene). PETM: Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum (55.8 Ma), EECO: Early Eocene Climatic Optimum (54–46 Ma), MECO: Mid-Eocene Climatic Optimum (42 Ma), EOT: Eocene-Oligocene Transition (40–33 Ma), MMCO: Mid-Miocene Climatic Optimum (15–13 Ma), and LGM: Last Glacial Maximum (21000 years ago).

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [supplement10.tif](#)
- [supplement11.tif](#)
- [supplement12.tif](#)
- [supplement13.tif](#)
- [supplement14.tif](#)
- [supplement15.tif](#)
- [supplement16.tif](#)
- [supplement17.tif](#)
- [supplement18.tif](#)
- [supplement19.tif](#)
- [supplement20.tif](#)
- [supplement21.xlsx](#)
- [supplement22.xlsx](#)
- [supplement23.docx](#)
- [supplement24.docx](#)
- [supplement25.xlsx](#)
- [supplement26.tif](#)

- [supplement27.docx](#)
- [supplement28.xlsx](#)
- [supplement29.docx](#)