

NOTES ON EUROPEAN POLYPORES—I

M. A. DONK
Rijksherbarium, Leiden

In an attempt to bring the nomenclature of several European polypores up to date *Datronia* gen. nov. is published to obtain a correct name for *Antrodia* P. Karst. sensu Murrill; and several new specific combinations are made, viz. with *Datronia* (2), *Antrodia* P. Karst. emend. (6), *Rigidoporus* Murrill (3), *Oxyporus* (Bourd. & G.) Donk (1), *Phellinus* Quél. (1). In a few cases annotations are attached to names in current use or to recombinations. *Cartilosoma* Kotl. & Pouz. is reduced to the synonymy of *Antrodia*.

The few unconnected notes assembled in this paper are an attempt to bring the nomenclature of several European polypores up to date. In a few cases I had already pointed out the necessity for adjustment several years ago in publications; in other instances I practised the use of certain new names in correspondence or in the field. I have been asked to publish these new names and it was difficult not to comply. It must be understood that the following notes do not pretend to be exhaustive. As far as possible taxonomic discussions have been avoided: these are reserved for future occasions.

***Datronia* Donk, gen. nov.**

MISAPPLICATION.—*Antrodia* P. Karst. sensu Murrill in Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 32: 345. 1905.

Polyporaceae. Fructificatio epixyla, annua, peltata et appressa substrato citoque affixa (resupinata), margine determinato, effuso-reflexa, vel sessilis, saepius confluens. Pileus velutinoso-tomentoso, zonato. Hymenophorum tubulatum, unistratum, poris minutis vel mediis, saepe valde irregularibus. Contextus tenuis, dilute brunneus, sat coriaceus, tomento strato tenui nigrescente separatus. Hyphae contextus aut tenuiter tunicatae, hyalinae, fibulatae, aut crasse tunicatae, aseptatae, parietibus hypharum amplissimarum dilute coloratis, aliae tenuiores interdum repetito ramosae; parietes hypharum tomenti crassi, distincte colorati. Sporae cylindricae, mediae (8-11 μ longae), hyalinae; parietes tenues, laeves. — Typus: species representata No. 962.206-141 ("Netherlands, Zuid-Holland, Vogelenzangse Bos, leg. M. A. Donk 11,401") sub nomine "*Trametes mollis* (Sommerf.) Fr."

This generic description is an abbreviated one, since for the present it is my intention only to publish validly the new generic name. The genus itself has been accepted by several contemporary authors. The following specific recombinations are proposed:

Datronia mollis (Sommerf.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Daedalea mollis* Sommerf., Suppl. Fl. lapp. 271. 1826: Fr., Elench. 1: 71. 1828, non *Daedalea mollis* (Pers.) Fr., Obs. mycol. 1: 107. 1815 (devalidated name), non *Daedalea mollis* Velen. 1922.

Datronia epilobii (P. Karst.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Trametes epilobii* P. Karst. in Notis. Sällsk. Fauna Fl. fenn. Förh. 9: 361. 1868.

SYNONYMS.—*Polyporus planus* Peck in Rep. New York St. Mus. 31: 37. 1879, non *Polyporus planus* Wallr., Fl. crypt. Germ. 2: 602. 1833. — *Polystictus planus* (Peck) Cooke in Grevillea 14: 84. 1886. — *Coriolus planellus* Murrill in Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 32: 649. 1906. — *Fide* Romell (1911: 24) = *Polyporus stereoides* Fr. [sensu Romell]; *fide* Bresadola (1920: 68) = "*Trametes Kmetii* Bres."

Trametes stereoides var. *kmetii* Bres. in Atti R. Accad. Agiati III 3: 92. 1897. — *Trametes kmetii* (Bres.) Bres. in Annl. mycol. 18: 68. 1920. — *Fide* Romell (1911: 24) = *Polyporus stereoides* Fr. [sensu Romell].

MISAPPLICATION.—*Polyporus stereoides* Fr. sensu Romell in Ark. Bot. 11 (3): 23. 1911. — *Fide* Romell, l.c. & Lloyd (1916b: 14) = *Trametes stereoides* var. *kmetii* Bres.

This species is now often called *Polyporus stereoides* Fr. per Fr. or *Antrodia stereoides* (Fr. per Fr.) Bond. & Sing. in agreement with a suggestion by Romell (1911: 23):

"This plant should probably be considered as the true and original *Pol. stereoides* of Fries. The name is well adapted as the habit very much resembles a *Stereum*. It agrees exactly with a specimen from Femsjö in the herb. of Fries so named. The label is written by Rob. Fries, and Elias Fries probably suggested the name or at least approved it, so that the specimen can be held authentic. If this specimen were the only one, the question might be considered settled in spite of the statement »ad truncos abiegnos» which may be correct, though more probably is a mistake since nobody else, so far as I know, has found this plant on conifers but only on deciduous trees.¹ There is, however, also another authentic specimen (with a label written by El. Fries himself) but this belongs to *Pol. cervinus* Pers. (*Daedalea mollis* Somm., *Trametes mollis* Fr.), a species which is really closely allied, though in my opinion specifically distinct . . ."

The fact that Fries himself depicted *Trametes mollis* ≡ *Datronia mollis* under the name *Polyporus stereoides* (Fries, 1884: 86 pl. 187 f. 3), in addition to the existence of a specimen labelled by Fries himself as *Polyporus stereoides*, apparently induced Bresadola (1897: 32) and a few other authors to apply the name *Polyporus stereoides* to the species that here is called *Datronia mollis*. The interpretation that Romell preferred is of a later date and would be acceptable only if it were better founded than Bresadola's. This is not the case: there are sufficient elements in the original description to cause strong doubt about the suggested identity of the fungus: compare, "... pileo . . . zonato griseo, poris . . . difformibus albis . . . Proximus *P. abietino*. . . zonis depressis . . . Ad truncos abiegnos. . . ." Moreover, the specimen that Romell invoked in support of his conception cannot be called really 'authentic' without misgivings. For all these reasons I feel obliged to reject the name *P. stereoides* as a nomen dubium. It may be recalled that Overholts (1953: 377) also preferred another name for this species: he called it *Polyporus planellus* (Murrill) Overh.

The species that Romell called *Polyporus stereoides* received at least three priorable

¹ Overholts (1953: 378) reported of *Polyporus planellus*, "one collection noted on *Thuja*".

specific names; in chronological order these are *Trametes epilobii* P. Karst. 1868 (*vide* Lowe 1956: 122), *Polystictus planus* (Peck) Cooke 1886 (\equiv *Coriolus planellus* Murrill 1906), and *Trametes kmetii* (Bres.) Bres. 1920. The earliest of these is used above as basionym for the correct name.

ANTRODIA P. Karst.

Antrodia P. Karst. in Meddn Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn. 5: 40 "1880" (reprint dated 1879). — Lectotype (cf. Donk in Persoonia 1: 186. 1960): *Trametes serpens* (Fr. per Fr.) Fr.

Coriolellus Murrill in Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 32: 481. 1905. — Holotype: *Trametes sepium* Berk. *Cartilosoma* Kotl. & Pouz. in Česká Mykol. 12: 101, 103. 1958. — Holotype: *Trametes subsinuosa* Bres.

GENERIC DESCRIPTION.—See Sarkar in Canad. J. Bot. 37: 1258. 1959.

Several years ago Donk (1960: 186–187) concluded that the type species of *Antrodia* P. Karst. 1879 could not be *Trametes mollis* (Sommerf.) Fr. When Karsten emended the genus he referred this species back to *Daedalea* Pers. per Fr. and retained *Trametes serpens* in it as the only Finnish representative, which was selected as type. This species is now placed in *Coriolellus* Murrill 1905 by some authors who favour more natural genera in the Polyporaceae. If such a generic taxon is to be upheld its correct name should be *Antrodia*. Moreover, as long as *T. mollis* is excluded from *Antrodia*, the genus that now bears this generic name must be renamed. Since *Antrodia* P. Karst. sensu Murrill appears to be worth retaining as a distinct genus, it is rechristened above as *Datronia* Donk.

Coriolellus Murrill was introduced for some thin, "semi-resupinate" species of *Trametes*, with *Trametes sepium* Berk. as type. This genus was taken up by Bondartsev & Singer (1941: 60) and some later authors, but it was too vaguely characterized and too heterogeneous to be even of much practical use, until Sarkar (1959) provided a sharper definition and emended it. Sufficient new information has accumulated to conclude that the precise limits of *Coriolellus* = *Antrodia* will have to be extended, but for the moment it must be admitted that the limits of the genus have not yet been sufficiently explored and that the exact scope of the genus, therefore, is not yet known. Until more is known about several of the species not treated by Sarkar and that apparently should be included, I propose new names only for the ascertained core and one or two additions.

Antrodia albida (Fr. per Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Daedalea albida* Fr., Obs. mycol. 1: 107. 1815 ("albilla") per Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 338. Jan. 1, 1821, non *Daedalea albida* Purton 1821, non *Daedalea albida* Schw. 1822.

Antrodia heteromorpha (Fr. per Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Daedalea heteromorpha* Fr., Obs. mycol. 1: 108. 1815 per Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 340. 1821.

Antrodia malicola (B. & C.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Trametes malicola* B. & C. in J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philadelphia II 3: 209. 1856.

Antrodia ramentacea (B. & Br.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Polyporus ramentaceus* B. & Br. in Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. V 3: 210. 1879. — This was identified by

Reid & Austwick (1963: 310) with *Cartilosoma subsinuosa* (Bres.) Kotl. & Pouz. 1958 ≡ *Corirolellus subsinuosus* (Bres.) Bond. & Sing. 1941 ≡ *Trametes subsinuosa* Bres. 1903.

Corirolellus salicinus (Bres.) Bond. 1953. — *Trametes salicina* Bres. in *Annls mycol.* **19**: 40. 1920. — There are apparently two species named '*Trametes salicina* Bres.' One of these was published in 1920 (see above). Its syntypes came from three regions: "in regione tridentina . . . in Bohemia (Bubak) et Suecia (Romell)." The other species is *Trametes salicina* Bres. ("in litteris") *apud* Egeland in *Nyt Mag. Naturv.* **52**: 166. 1914 in which only two collections from Norway are mentioned. The precise relation and typification of these two names needs further study.

Trametes sepium Berk. in *Lond. J. Bot.* **6**: 322. 1847.—European mycologists now follow Bresadola (1908: 40), who reduced *Trametes sepium* to *Trametes albida* (Fr. per Fr.) Fr.; in later work he was less explicit when he stated that although *T. sepium* was perhaps merely a straw-coloured form of *T. albida* (Bresadola, 1932: *pl.* 1022; "videtur forma straminea") he depicted both. Lloyd (1916a: 5) did not agree because he considered *T. albida* a too imperfectly known species: ". . . I can see no resemblance whatever to Fries' figure, and this is all that is known of *Daedalea albida*." This may be one of the reasons why American authors still ignore Bresadola's identification and cling to the name *T. sepium*, or one of its recombinations. There is little force in Lloyd's argument because it would seem that he confused *T. albida* and *T. serpens*; Fries's description of the former is rather detailed for that time, but he published no figure of it in 1815. He did publish a protologue figure of the latter. Mycologists are reminded of the existence of at least two earlier names given to the American fungus: viz. *Polyporus favescens* Schw. 1832, *fide* Lloyd (1913: 9) and Overholts (1923: 214); and *Polyporus rhododendri* Schw. 1832, *fide* Overholts (1923: 221).

Antrodia serialis (Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Polyporus serialis* Fr., *Syst. mycol.* **1**: 370. 1821.

Antrodia serpens (Fr. per Fr.) P. Karst. in *Meddn Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn.* **5**: 40 "1880" (reprint dated 1879). — *Polyporus serpens* Fr., *Obs. mycol.* **2**: 265 *pl.* 6 *f.* 2. 1818 *per* Fr., *Syst. mycol.* **1**: 340. 1821.

Antrodia sinuosa (Fr.) P. Karst. in *Meddn Soc. Fauna Fl. fenn.* **6**: 10. 1881. — *Polyporus sinuosus* Fr., *Syst. mycol.* **1**: 381. 1821. — This species has occasionally been identified with *Polyporus vaporarius* "Fr.", for instance by Lundell (1936: 23 No. 248). The species Lundell had in mind is *Poria vaporarius* Pers. sensu Fr. (1821: 382; as *Polyporus*) & Romell (1911: 25), a misapplied name, as was recognized by Persoon, who renamed Fries's fungus *Polyporus incertus* Pers. 1825; while Romell (1926: 24) renamed it *Poria friesii* Romell and *Poria silvestris* Romell, both provisional names, of which the latter was validly published as *Poria silvestris* (Romell) ex Baxter 1932. Even if one were inclined to go so far as to accept a 'new' species *Polyporus vaporarius* 'Fr. (non Pers.)' it should be recalled that it was "*Poria vaporaria* Fr. S.M." that was first reduced to the synonymy of *Poria sinuosa* (Fr.) Cooke, the basionym of which (*Polyporus sinuosus*) was simultaneously published; this reduction was made by Bourdot & Galzin (1925: 232; as a subspecies).

Antrodia variiformis (Peck) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Polyporus variiformis* Peck in *Rep. New York St. Mus.* **42**: 122. 1889.

RIGIDOPORUS Murrill

Rigidoporus Murrill in Bull. Torrey bot. Cl. 32: 478. 1905. — Holotype: *Polyporus micromegas* Mont. [sensu Murrill].

Up till now this genus has been used for more or less distinctly pileate species, although some of these may form strictly resupinate fruitbodies. The generic limits will need to be extended also to include some so-called 'resupinate' species which for some time have been treated in a distinct genus—under the misapplied names *Podoporia* and *Physisporinus*.

Physisporinus P. Karst. 1889 is based on an as yet undetermined species which was identified as *Poria vitrea* Pers. According to the key to the genera of Polyporaceae, Karsten (1889: 286) differentiated the genus from *Physisporus* by the "Fruktlagret skildt från hymenoforet" (fruit-layer separated from basal layer). The generic name was taken up in Pilát (1939: 247) as the correct name for *Podoporia* P. Karst. sensu Donk, certainly in error (Donk, 1960: 256).

Podoporia P. Karst. 1892 ("Pileus resupinatus membranaceus, laeticolor, substrato tuberculo centrali, stipitiforimi adfixus. . . .") was based on *Podoporia confluens* P. Karst., which offers another unsolved problem: this species also is not yet definitely identified. The generic name was taken up by Donk (1933: 158) who misapplied it because (following von Höhnelt, 1909: 442) he identified the type species with *Poria sanguinolenta*. The genus in this faulty emendation has been accepted by several mycologists, either under the name *Podoporia* or under the equally misapplied name *Physisporinus* P. Karst. by Pilát, as has been mentioned above.

The following resupinate European species are transferred to *Rigidoporus*.

Rigidoporus nigrescens (Bres.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Poria nigrescens* Bres. in Atti R. Accad. Agiata III 3: 83. 1897.

Rigidoporus sanguinolentus (A. & S. per Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Boletus sanguinolentus* A. & S., Consp. Fung. nisk. 257. 1805 (devaluated name) ≡ *Polyporus sanguinolentus* (A. & S.) per Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 383. 1821.

Rigidoporus vitreus (Pers. per Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Poria vitrea* Pers. in Annln Bot. (ed. Usteri) 15: 14. 1795 & Obs. mycol. 1: 15. 1796 (devaluated name) ≡ *Polyporus vitreus* (Pers.) per Fr., Syst. mycol. 1: 381. 1821.

The species I have in mind is now identified with either *Poria vitrea* "Fr." or *P. undata*.

Persoon's phrase runs: "inaequaliter lateque effusa, aquoso-pallida [-albida in 1801], undulata, subinterrupta; poris obliquis." This and the additional information supplied ("... super truncos nonnunquam ad spithamam effusa, interrupta, hinc inde etiam subtuberculosa; substantia subcartilaginea; superficie aquosa, quasi hyalina") in my opinion leaves little doubt about the identity of the fungus. When Fries revalidated the name his phrase ran: "effusus, carnosus, undulatus, albidus, subhyalinus, poris minimis" while his descriptive note started thus, "Late & inaequaliter effusus . . ."

Bresadola (1903: 78) considered the fungi described by Persoon and Fries to be

different and he identified Fries's conception with *Poria undata* (Pers.) Cooke. He added: "*Poria vitrea* Pers. forte distincta, at ego frustra hucusque identitatem comprobare potui." Donk (1933: 159) accepted this verdict and called Fries's fungus "*P[odoporia] vitrea* (Fr., non Pers.!) Donk." I have since gone into this matter once more. The first conclusion is that Persoon's protologue could very well have been based on the same fungus that Bresadola called *Poria undata*. The second is that there is such a close agreement between Persoon's and Fries's descriptions that it can easily be defended that Fries (who did not exclude Persoon's fungus) had the same species in mind; he thought Persoon's phrase sufficiently to the point to incorporate it almost completely in his own account. Hence, the type (in the absence of a Friesian specimen) should be, rather, that of Persoon. The third conclusion is that Persoon left no type. Compare the remark by Bresadola (1897: 85) in connection with *Poria vitrea* Pers. sensu Bres. (since long reduced to *Poria vulgaris* sensu Bres. = *Poria byssina* "Pers." sensu Romell), "*Exemplaria authentica Poriae vitrea non vidi neque in herbario persooniano ne que in herbario friesiano.*" As far as I have been able to reconstruct the course of events Bresadola studied a specimen that was labelled thus, "*Poria vitrea?*" (written by Persoon); this specimen he annotated, "*Non typus Personii! = Polyporus chioneus Fr. var. resupinatus.*"

Later Fries (1828: 119) broadened the description considerably. Other authors applied the name *Poria vitrea* to some other species. Of these, Karsten's interpretation mentioned above has as yet not been identified. All these divergent interpretations dropped out of current use: there is little reason left to consider the name *Poria vitrea* a nomen ambiguum. It might be considered a nomen dubium, but judging from both Persoon's and Fries's descriptions it is, in my opinion, sufficiently evident what species they had in mind.

OXYPORUS (Bourd. & G.) Donk

Oxyporus (Bourd. & G.) Donk, Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll. 2: 202. 1933. — Monotype: *Polyporus connatus* Weinm.

Oxyporus latemarginatus (Dur. & Mont. ex Mont.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Polyporus latemarginatus* Dur. & Mont. ("Fl. Alg. ined.") ex Mont., Syll. Crypt. 163. 1856. — *Fide* Lowe (1963: 455) this is an earlier name for *Poria ambigua* Bres.

Chaetoporus philadelphia Parmasto in Notul. syst. Sect. crypt. Inst. Komar. 12: 237 fs. 1, 4, plate f. 2. 1959. — This may be another species of *Oxyporus*. It should be compared with *Poria millavensis* (Bourd. & G.) Overh.

PHELLINUS Quél.

Phellinus Quél., Ench. Fung. 172. 1886. — Lectotype (cf. Donk in Persoonia 1: 253. 1960): *Polyporus rubriporus* Quél.

Phellinus viticola (Schw. apud Fr.) Donk, *comb. nov.*; basionym, *Polyporus viticola* Schw. ("in litt.") apud Fr., Elench. 1: 115. 1828.

If not conspecific this species is in any case closely allied to *Phellinus isabellinus*. (Fr.) Bourd. & G.

Boletus superficialis Schw. 1822 is considered by Overholts and Lowe to be the same species as *Polyporus viticola* and this name would have had to be taken up as basionym for the correct name had Fries not reduced it in the starting-point book (1828: 115) to the synonymy of *Polyporus viticola* (as variety).

REFERENCES

The following references have been cited in the text by their dates printed in italics.

- BRESADOLA, G. (1897) in *Atti R. Accad. Agiati* III 3. — (1903) in *Annls mycol.* 1. — (1908) in *Annls mycol.* 6. — (1920) in *Annls mycol.* 18. — (1932), *Icon. mycol.* 21.
- BONDARTSEV, A. S. & R. SINGER (1941) in *Annls mycol.* 39.
- BOURDOT, H. & A. GALZIN (1925) in *Bull. Soc. mycol. Fr.* 41.
- DONK, M. A. (1933), *Rev. niederl. Homob.-Aphyll.* 2. — (1960) in *Persoonia* 1.
- FRIES, E. M. (1821), *Syst. mycol.* 1. — (1828), *Elench.* 1. — (1884), *Ic. sel. Hym.* 2.
- HÖHNEL, F. X. R. VON (1909) in *Sber. Akad. Wiss. Wien (Math.-naturw. Kl., Abt. I)* 118.
- KARSTEN, P. A. (1889) in *Bidr. Känn. Finl. Nat. Folk* 48.
- LLOYD, C. G. (1913), *Mycol. Writ.* 4 (Lett. 50). — (1916a), *Mycol. Writ.* 5 (Lett. 62). — (1916b), *Mycol. Writ.* 5 (Lett. 63).
- LOWE, J. L. (1956) in *Mycologia* 48. — (1963) in *Mycologia* 55.
- LUNDELL, S. (1936) in *Lund. & Nannf., Fungi sel. suec. Fasc.* 5-6.
- OVERHOLTS, L. O. (1923) in *Mycologia* 15. — (1953), *Polyporac. U.S., Alaska & Can.*
- Reid, D. A. & P. K. C. AUSTWICK (1963) in *Glasgow Nat.* 18.
- ROMELL, L. (1911) in *Ark. Bot.* 11 (3). — (1926) in *Svensk bot. Tidskr.* 20.
- SARKAR, A. (1959) in *Canad. J. Bot.* 37: 1251-1270.