

Discussion Concerning Key Terms in Systematic and Applied Mycology

Ivan V. Zmitrovich,^{a,*} Vladimir V. Perelygin,^b Andrey K. Sytin,^a & Kiran Ranadive^c

^aLaboratory of Systematics and Geography of Fungi, Komarov Botanical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg 197376, Russia; ^bSaint Petersburg Chemical Pharmaceutical University, St. Petersburg 197376, Russia; ^cAnnasaheb Magar Mahavidyalaya Hadapsar, Pune 28, India

*Address all correspondence to: Ivan V. Zmitrovich, Laboratory of Systematics and Geography of Fungi, Komarov Botanical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2 Professor Popov St., St. Petersburg 197376, Russia; Tel./Fax: +7 951 6635746, E-mail: iv_zmitrovich@mail.ru

ABSTRACT: The recently introduced term “Funga” is discussed in relation to its use in systematic and applied mycology. Arguments for and against the use of this term are considered. The modern system of fungi and fungus-like organisms is analyzed in connection with the problems of terminology. Several terminologically problematic groups (e.g., DRIP, Opisthosporidia, slime mold lineages, Oomycota, and labyrinthulids) are also discussed. Two alternatives to use of the term Funga are comprehensively analyzed. At the same time, several Funga-derived terms are outlined. In order for a new term to become mainstream, it is necessary to use this term when creating a classical multivolume monograph elaboration of fungal taxa in various countries.

KEY WORDS: biodiversity, eukaryote supergroups, fauna, flora, funga, mycobiota, mycoflora, terminology

ABBREVIATIONS: DRIP, *Dermocystidium* + rosette agent + *Ichthyophonus* + *Psorospermium*; TSAR, telonemids + straminipiles + alveolates + rhizarians

I. INTRODUCTION

The present notice is intended to continue a discussion started on *IMA Fungus* pages with opening papers by Hawksworth¹ and Kuhar et al.,² who dedicated the proposal for wide use of the term “Funga.” They did this in order to substitute the term Mycobiota for Funga in fields where the term Flora (mycoflora) was previously used—that is, in a traditional field of biodiversity inventory and its biogeographic analysis as well as all of the applied fields. This problem is especially meaningful for fundamental works relevant in the long term, such as the creation of multivolume “Floras.”

A new direction set by Knudsen and Vesterholt,³ who introduced the term Funga, was enthusiastically followed by some authors.⁴ However, it is clear that the implementation of this proposal would face difficulties due to some avoidance of this term by authors for various reasons. Below, we will consider some possible reasons of this nature.

II. FUNGA: PRO ET CONTRA

The main arguments in favor of the term Funga are listed below:

- Fungi are traditionally considered as a separate kingdom of eukaryotes and require a separate general biological and related terminological approach.
- Fungi, plants, and animals are the most diverse groups of multicellular organisms and, if the terms Flora and Fauna traditionally correspond to species assemblages of the former, then fungal species assemblages require some equally short term that carries a conceptual significance.
- The term Mycobiota is not entirely successful for its composite characteristics, while “biota” is usually understood as the upper limit of the division in the synecological aspect but not in the