

PROPOSALS TO AMEND THE CODE

Edited by Nicholas J. Turland & John H. Wiersema

(023–024) Proposals to add a new Article and some Examples under Article 5

Francisco María Vázquez

HABITAT group, Department of Forest Production and Grassland, CICYTEX-La Orden, Ctra. Madrid-Lisbon, Km 372, 06187 Guadajira, Badajoz, Spain; frvazquez50@hotmail.com

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/635.21>

Examples of monstrosities are relatively frequent in nature, and for taxonomy can be problematic, leading to incorrect identification on many occasions. Monstrous specimens have been used to describe new taxa at the rank of genus: *Uropedium* Lindl., Orch. Linden.: 28. 1846, nom. rej. against *Phragmipedium* Rolfe in Orchid Rev. 4: 331. 1896, nom. cons. (Dressler & Williams in Taxon 24: 691–692. 1975); at the rank of species: *Asplenium ramosum* L., Sp. Pl.: 1082. 1753, nom. utique rej. (Zimmer & Greuter in Taxon 43: 303–304. 1994); or at infraspecific ranks: *Actinostemon polymorphus* Müll. Arg. f. *biattenuatus* Müll. Arg. in Linnaea 32: 109. 1863 (basynonym of *A. concolor* (Spreng.) Müll. Arg. lus. *biattenuatus* (Müll. Arg.) Müll. Arg. in Candolle, Prodr. 15(2): 1194. 1866). Until 1975 the names linked to monstrous specimens were rejected, this rejection supported by different articles from the Vienna *International Rules of Botanical Nomenclature* (1906: Art. 51), until the Seattle *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (1972: Art. 71). However, monstrosities are no longer mentioned within the *Code*, nor does a rank for a monstrosity exist (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 154. 2012).

This situation is problematic. Although some authors (Reveal in Taxon 40: 505–508. 1991) possessed tools to resolve monstrosity characters, other authors have sought conservation (Burt in Taxon 30: 361. 1981) or outright rejection (Compton & al. in Taxon 53: 574–575. 2004) of names linked to monstrous types. The main problems with the current treatment of the *Code* are: (a) a lack of recognition for the rank of monstrosity, and (b) no delineation of what constitutes a monstrosity. In addition, various competing proposals for treating monstrosities have appeared in the botanical literature: (i) using “l.,” “lus.” or “lusus” for “*lusus naturae*” (*Carex hudsonii* A. Benn. lusus *leucorhyncha* H. Lév. & L.C. Lamb. in Bull. Acad. Int. Géogr. Bot. 21: 266. 1911); (ii) using “monst.” or “monstr.” for monstrosity (*Jasione montana* L. monstr. *pedicellata* De Langhe in Bull. Soc. Roy. Bot. Belgique 106: 71. 1973); (iii) naming them at an infraspecific rank (*Lygodium circinatum* Sw. var. *monstruosum* Alderw., Malayan Ferns:

111. 1908); or (iv) in accordance with a previous teratology proposal (“ter.”) (Grumman in Taxon 3: 124. 1954).

The current proposal is justified by the necessity of recognition, normalization, segregation and standardization of monstrosities in the *Code*. It is proposed to insert a new Article in “Chapter I. Taxa and their ranks” with two new Examples.

(023) Insert a new Art. 5.2:

“5.2. Isolated individuals with aberrant characteristics not caused by an invading foreign organism, and with limited or no sexual and asexual reproduction, which have been formerly designated as *lusus naturae*, monstrosities, or teratological taxa; or have been misidentified but named as genera, species, subspecies, varieties or formae, are to be named under the infraspecific rank *lusus naturae* (lus.)”

(024) Add two new Examples after new Art. 5.2:

“Ex. 1. The correct name of *Himantoglossum hircinum* monstr. *johannae* Degen (in Magyar Bot. Lapok 11: 308. 1913) is *H. hircinum* lus. *johannae* Degen.”

“Ex. 2. The lectotype of the name *Rhus hirta* (L.) Sudw. (in Bull. Torrey Bot. Club 19: 81. 1892) is a monstrosity. The infraspecific taxon that includes the type is named *R. hirta* lus. *hirta*, and not *R. hirta* f. *hirta* (Reveal in Taxon 40: 491. 1991). On the other hand, while the lectotype of the name *Cissus verticillata* (L.) Nicolson & C.E. Jarvis was considered a “monstrosity”, this was caused by the smut *Myco-syrinx cissi* (Poiret) G. Beck, so the infraspecific taxon that includes the type is named *C. verticillata* f. *verticillata* (Nicolson & Jarvis in Taxon 33: 726–727. 1984).”

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank John Wiersema for his help in the corrections, suggestions and English review and Carlos Vila-Viçosa for his comments on the original manuscript.