Discinella meuriesii, an orthographic mistake for Discinella menziesii overlooked since 1917
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Summary: The name Discinella "meuriesii" is an incorrect spelling of Discinella menziesii. This misspelling has been overlooked or misunderstood by databases.
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Resumen: El nombre Discinella "meuriesii" es un error tipográfico de Discinella menziesii. Este error producido hace casi cien años, ha pasado desapercibido hasta la actualidad, siendo mal interpretado en las bases de datos generales de hongos.

Palabras clave: Helotiales, Discinella menziesii, Discinella meuriesii, nomenclatura, ortografía.

Introduction

In 1885, Jean Louis Émile Boudier created the genus Discinella Boud. In his work, he placed the genus in "§II. Inoperculés, Ve Tribu. Calycina Helotiaceae" (Fr.) Boud. (= Calycina Nees ex Gray) and a terrestrial group [Discinella and Melachroia Boud. (= Pododaphicum Niessl.)]. Discinella is described with one species, D. boudieri (Quél.) Boud., characterized by large-guttulate ascosporas and a filamentous outer structure, with the basionym Phialea boudieri Quél. Nowadays, Discinella is a widespread genus of discomycetes placed in Helotiales Rehm. (Helotiales), with ca. 12 species (Kirk et al., 2008).

Two different orthographies concerning to the same species, Discinella menziesii, were published by Boudier in two papers (1913 and 1917): D. menziesi (Boud.) Boud., in A.L. Sm. & Ramsb. (= Calycella menziesi Boud.), and D. meuriesi Boud., both incorrectly terminated by "-i", which has been treated as an error and corrected subsequently by the Latin generic form "-ii" (as D. menziesii, D. meuriesii, Art. 60.12 ICN; McNeill et al., 2012), because such names need to be latinized as "-ius". It must be noted, however, that the type species, D. boudieri, is correctly spelled, because names ending with "-er" are latinized as "-erus" and have the generic form "-eri" (those ending with a vowel also have as generic "-i", according with 60C.1 ICN; McNeill et al., 2012).

The descriptions of Discinella menziesii and D. meuriesii are not fully identical but they comprise the same morphological and ecological characteristics: (1) growing on argillaceous soil among mosses; (2) white-pink, subsessile turbinate apothecia 5–12 mm in diameter, with an undulating entire margin; (3) simple or apically branched paraphyses, up to 2–3 μm wide in D. menziesii vs. 2 μm in D. meuriesii; (4) inoperculate, 8-spored asci, 100–110 × 8–9 μm in D. menziesii vs. 100–120 × 7–8 μm in D. meuriesii; (5) non-septate, hyaline, oblong-fusiform ascosporas with 2–3 big oil guttules surrounded by smaller ones, 15–17 × 4–5 μm in D. menziesii vs. 15–16 × 3.5–5 μm in D. meuriesii (Boudier, 1913, 1917; Smith & Ramsbottom, 1914). Though no obvious difference between D. menziesii and D. meuriesii can be seen from Boudier’s descriptions, both names appear as distinct species in current databases such as MycoBank (MB numbers 414745 and 189171, 2014), and moreover the orthography was recently modified in Index Fungorum (June 2014) according to our suggestion, but incorrectly the species was considered to belong in Pezizella Fockel, as Pezizella menziesii (Boud.) Sacc., actually a genus considered to be a synonym of Calycina Nees ex Gray (Kirk et al., 2008; Index Fungorum, 2014).

Correct orthography

Calycella menziesii Boud. was described and illustrated by Boudier (1913), and the name of the species was given in honor to Boudier’s friend James Menzies. The taxon was later combined in Discinella as D. menziesii (Boud.) Boud. in Smith & Ramsbottom (1914). A footnote in this paper shows how Boudier had expressed his error concerning the generic placement: “A ce sujet, je vous dirai que j´ai reconnu que cette espèce ne devait pas être placée dans le genre Calycella mais bien dans les Discinella. La taille et la station épigée a prouvé. Je ne sais comment j’ai fait cette erreur dans ma description; un ‘lapsus memoriae’ sans doute”. Smith & Ramsbottom (op. cit.) indicated a further collection of this beautiful fungus, found by D. Garnett, growing among mosses in Silchester (Hampshire), a different locality of the original material, which had been collected in Perth (Scotland).

In 1917, the name Discinella “meuriesii” appeared in the Bulletin de la Société mycologique de France, where Boudier recalls the same error as already reported in Smith & Ramsbottom (1914). Unfortunately, in this publication several typographical mistakes occurred, particularly the change from Discinella menziesii to Discinella meuriesii, where the letters nz of menziesii were replaced by ur of meuriesii. Also the name of his friend Menzies was misspelled as Meuzier and, in the plate of the document, the taxon appeared as “Discinella meuziesi”, by changing the letter n of meuriesii by the letter u of meuriesii. This misspelling was referred by Buckley (1919), but the erroneous epithet appeared two times more since then, as Pezizella meuriesii in Saccardo (1928) and as Discinella meuziersii in Guérit (1934).

To sum up: (1) in 1917, Boudier explained the mistake made in 1913 “Calycella vs. Discinella”; (2) both descriptions alludes to the same species (Boudier, 1913); (3) the locality where D. menziesii and D. meuriesii were collected is the same (Perth, Scotland), the locality where James Menzies lived; (4) the morphology, biometry and drawings of both “taxa” are very similar; and (5) all the above mentioned typographical mistakes found in Bouder (1917) are derived from the same word “Menzies”, which could have been derived from a wrong interpretation of the hand written original text, more easily understood taken into account his age of ~90 years. We then come to the conclusion that both names refer to the same species and, based on the article 60.1, Ex. 2 (ICN; McNeill et al., 2012), we retain the original spelling of the specific epithet “menziesii” while the erroneous specific epithet “meuriesii” is to be considered as an unintended error, which might have occurred when the printer transferred the handwritten manuscript.
Nomenclatural conclusions

≡ Discinella menziesii (Boud.) Boud., Bull. Soc. mycol. Fr., 33: 17 (1917) [as ‘meuriesi’], superfluous comb.
≡ Pezizella menziesi (Boud.) Sacc., Syll. fung., 24(2): 1190 (1928) [as ‘meuriesi’].

** According to Art. 46.2 ICN, the authorship of the combination is attributed to Boudier.
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