The case for the continued use of the genus name *Mimulus* for all monkeyflowers
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INTRODUCTION

The genus *Mimulus* is a well-studied group of plant species, which has for decades allowed researchers to address a wide array of fundamental questions in biology (Wu & al., 2008; Twyford & al., 2015). Linnaeus named the type of *Mimulus* (*ringens* L.), while Darwin (1876) used *Mimulus* (*luteus* L.) to answer key research questions. The incredible phenotypic diversity of this group has made it the focus of ecological and evolutionary study since the mid-20th century, initiated by the influential work of Clausen, Keck, and Hiesey as well as their students and collaborators (Clausen & Hiesey, 1958; Hiesey & al., 1971, Vickery, 1952, 1978). Research has continued on this group of diverse taxa throughout the 20th and into the 21st century (Bradshaw & al., 1995; Schemske & Bradshaw, 1999; Wu & al., 2008; Twyford & al., 2015; Yuan, 2019), and *Mimulus guttatus* was one of the first non-model plants to be selected for full genome sequencing (Hellsten & al., 2013). *Mimulus* has played a key role in advancing our general understanding of the evolution of pollinator shifts (Brashaw & Schemske, 2003; Cooley & al., 2011; Byers & al., 2014), adaptation (Lowry & Willis, 2010; Kooyers & al., 2015; Peterson & al., 2016; Ferris & Willis, 2018; Troth & al., 2018), speciation (Ramsey & al., 2003; Wright & al., 2013; Sobel & Streisfeld, 2015; Zuellig & Sweigart, 2018), meiotic drive (Fishman & Saunders, 2008), polyploidy (Vallejo-Marín, 2012; Vallejo-Marín & al., 2015), range limits (Angert, 2009; Sexton & al., 2011; Grossenbacher & al., 2014; Sheth & Angert, 2014), circadian rhythms (Greenham & al., 2017), genetic recombination (Hellsten & al., 2013), mating systems (Fenster & Ritland, 1994; Dudash & Carr, 1998; Brandvain & al., 2014) and developmental biology (Moody & al., 1999; Baker & Diggle, 2011; Baker & al., 2012; Yuan, 2019). This combination of a rich history of study coupled with sustained modern research activity is unparalleled among angiosperms. Across many interested parties, the name *Mimulus* therefore takes on tremendous biological significance and is recognizable not only by botanists, but also by zoologists, horticulturalists, naturalists, and members of the biomedical community. Names associated with a taxonomic group of this prominence should have substantial inertia, and disruptive name changes should be avoided. As members of the *Mimulus* community, we advocate retaining the genus name *Mimulus* to describe all monkeyflowers. This is despite recent nomenclature changes that have led to a renaming of most monkeyflower species to other genera.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

In a recent paper, Barker & al. (2012) proposed splitting the genus *Mimulus* into multiple new genera. This proposed change was based upon a molecular phylogenetic analysis that revealed other small genera, comprising a total of 21 species, were potentially located within the *Mimulus* clade (Fig. 1) (Beardsley & Olmstead, 2002; Beardsley & al., 2004; Beardsley & Barker, 2005). The finding that *Mimulus* appears to be a polyphyletic group warranted revision to the genus, as monophyletic groupings are preferred for the designation of genera. Four options were proposed as solutions by Barker & al. (2012): (1) Minimize species name changes by allowing *Mimulus* to remain as a polyphyletic or a biphyletic group; (2) Minimize name changes by grouping all genera into one monophyletic group *Mimulus L*.; (3) Minimize name changes by conserving *Mimulus L* with a different type; (4) Divide *Mimulus* into multiple new genera, resulting in many name changes.

Barker & al. (2012) chose to divide *Mimulus* into three major genera (*Mimulus*, *Erythranthe*, and *Diaplocus*; Option 4),
the solution which required the most name changes (~136 new combinations). They ruled out Option 1, as monophyletic groupings are preferred. They rejected Option 3, as it would have resulted in name changes to eight widespread Mimulus species and would not recognize some genera that the authors designated as distinct. They also stated that they wanted to move forward without waiting for approval of retypification by the next International Botanical Conference in 2017. The justification given for dismissing Option 2 was made based on a desire to conserve the names of a few small Australian genera: “Maximally enlarging Mimulus results in the loss of much useful information in the taxonomic hierarchy that recognizes the Australian-centered genera [...] each of which has apparent apomorphic features that justify treatment at generic rank.” Further, it was argued that the Erythranthe and Diplacus clades represented distinct radiations in western North America and that each deserved to be recognized by being elevated to the genus level.

The nomenclatural suggestions made by Barker & al. (2012) have now been adopted by multiple Floras, including the Plants of the World Online, the Oregon Flora Project (Oregon State University), and the Jepson eFlora, and are under review at the Flora of North America. In addition, online resources such as the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI), Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), UniProt, and iNaturalist now use the names from Barker & al. (2012) in lieu of the older classification. Given the widespread and rapid acceptance of the Barker & al. (2012) circumscription, it may be perplexing as to why so many scientists have continued to use the name Mimulus.

There are three key reasons why the use of Mimulus will likely continue by this group of scientists into the future.

### REASON 1: THE BOTANICAL COMMUNITY NEEDS A STABLE CIRCUMSCRIPTION FOR MONKEYFLOWERS

The primary reason for resisting the adoption of the new nomenclature is that we are reluctant to use different names for the organisms we work on until we are convinced that the nomenclature will be stable for the long-term. Unfortunately, given the limited data to support the name changes, we argue that a conservative position is warranted. In particular, the phylogenetic data available are outdated by modern standards (McKain & al., 2018). Prior to the genomic era, it seemed plausible that sequence data from two genes would be sufficient to approximate the species tree. However, given our modern understanding of the prevalence of gene flow and incomplete lineage sorting (Pease & al., 2016; McKain & al., 2018), it is likely that the species tree for the Phrymaceae will change considerably when more data are added. Prior to revision by Barker & al. (2012), the Phrymaceae consisted primarily of the genus Mimulus, and several small (in some cases monotypic) genera. Grant (1924) originally separated Mimulus into two large subgenera based on morphological placentation traits, Synplacus and Schizoplacus (Fig. 1), and the taxonomic revisions by Barker & al. (2012) elevated these groups to genus level, Erythranthe and Diplacus (Fig. 1). Our current state of knowledge of the Phrymaceae is based on chloroplast sequence data (trnL/F) and nuclear DNA sequence data from the internal and external transcribed spacers DNA (nrDNA; Beardsley & Olmstead, 2002). The chloroplast data suggest that the clade containing M. ringens and the Australian Mimulus is sister to the clade that includes all other groups, including Phryma, Synplacus, Schizoplacus, and a few other small genera (Fig. 1, cpDNA). In contrast, the nrDNA data suggest that Phryma is the outgroup to two large clades (Fig. 1, nrDNA). One of these clades includes M. ringens, the Australian Mimulus, and subgenus Synplacus. The other clade primarily comprises subgenus Schizoplacus. When data from the chloroplast gene were combined with the nrDNA data, the resulting topology of the species tree resembled the results from the chloroplast data alone (Beardsley & Olmstead, 2002; Beardsley & al., 2004, Beardsley & Barker, 2005). This suggests that the chloroplast data were driving the patterns on which Barker’s taxonomy was constructed. Unfortunately, trees built from chloroplast data are unreliable because the chloroplast evolves as a single haplotype (McKain & al., 2018), frequently spreads to distantly related species by introgression (Rieseberg & Soltis, 1991), and often evolves non-neutrally (Wu & Campbell, 2007; Bock & al., 2014). Thus, utmost caution is appropriate with regard to the treatment of chloroplast data for phylogenetic questions. We suggest that a modern phylogenetics approach leveraging sequence data from hundreds of nuclear loci and/or an amplicon-based approach incorporating dozens of markers is necessary to gain a better understanding of the species tree topology for the Phrymaceae, as is common in the field (Uribe-Convers & al., 2016; McKain & al., 2018).

The need for more sequence data is illustrated by the comparison of the phylogeny presented in Beardsley & al. (2004) with the modern 41,528-SNP phylogeny from Stankowski & Streisfeld (2015), which shows discordance in the placement of several monkeyflower species.

It is quite possible that new phylogenetic data will completely upend our current understanding of relationships among species in the Phrymaceae. Thus, our position is that no new nomenclatural changes should be adopted until there is a better understanding of the species tree in this group. It has always been our position that it was premature to rename most of the genus Mimulus based on two discordant gene phylogenies, as was done by Barker & al. (2012). Our concern is that prematurely switching to new names may cause additional confusion in the literature, particularly if more robust systematic data are consistent with retaining the original name or indicate yet another name change. Thus, we are reluctant to adopt a new circumscription until we are more assured of its stability. We are not alone in our desire for stability, which has been pointed out by others, including Orchard & Maslin (2005): “Taxonomists must recognize that nomenclature is not a plaything of taxonomy, molecular phylogeny, cladistics or any other special interest group. It is a working tool (a filing
system for all biologists, professional and amateur, and for the wider community, and to be meaningful it needs to be as stable as possible. A naming system that continually changes is not a naming system at all and will be discarded or disregarded.”

Finally, we are concerned about the stability of the current circumscription by Barker & al. (2012) given that it may not have been sufficiently vetted by peer review. The manuscript was published in *Phytoneuron*, a journal edited by a coauthor on that paper. The editorial policy of *Phytoneuron* states “Submissions will be reviewed for content and style by the editor, based on his own knowledge and expertise. If deemed appropriate or necessary by the editor, review by other botanical peers will be sought. An indication of the Phytoneuron review process (if beyond the Editor) will appear in the Acknowledgements.” The manuscript’s acknowledgements in the published paper contain no information about editorial or peer review, other than acknowledging comments “on a late draft” by two colleagues. Subsequent work by Nesom (2014), published in *Phytoneuron*, is also inconsistent with scientific knowledge of species-level relationships within the section *Simiolus* of *Mimulus*. For example, Nesom divided annual and perennial populations of *M. guttatus* into two separate species, *Erythranthe guttata* and *E. microphylla*, respectively. Justification for this splitting is directly contradicted by population genetic data, which demonstrate free genetic exchange between annual and perennial populations of *M. guttatus* (Oneal & al., 2014; Twyford & Friedman, 2015). Similarly, Tulig & Nesom (2012) recently elevated several taxa within the *M. aurantiacus* complex to species rank based solely on morphological information. Hybrid zones have been well documented for subspecies of *M. aurantiacus* (Thompson, 2005), and subsequent work indicates substantial gene flow across these points of contact between incompletely isolated taxa (Sobel & Streisfeld, 2015; Stankowski & al., 2017). *Mimulus* is arguably one of the most important plant systems in the world for studies of speciation, as we know more about how species form in this group than perhaps any other. Therefore, the lack of alignment between empirical studies of speciation and taxonomic species delimitation seems like an missed opportunity. We thus call for a re-examination and a more rigorous review of this systematic treatment in a traditional peer-reviewed journal.

**REASON 2: WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT THE NAME CHANGES WERE NECESSARY**

The splintering of *Mimulus* into multiple genera has primarily been justified based on genera with distinct morphological features being nested within the same clade as traditional *Mimulus* species. Further, the strongest argument for the new nomenclature is that it has utility in placing genus names on groups that have distinct sets of morphological traits. We very much appreciate the contributions made by those who have identified taxonomically useful traits, which will surely be valuable for future research. However, the desired taxonomic hierarchy for the Phrymaceae could be designated with monophyletic subgenera. The decision to elevate groups to the genus level versus the subgenus level was a subjective nomenclatural decision. The differences in placentation cited by Barker & al. (2012) to justify elevating *Erythranthe* and *Diplacus* to the genus level have long been recognized (Grant, 1924) and thus, do not on their own necessitate breaking up the genus *Mimulus*.

We should also point out that there was uncertainty among the taxonomists who made the suggested name changes on how to proceed with the nomenclature of this group. For example, Nesom (2011) initially renamed the genera *Hemichaena* and *Leucocarpus* to *Mimulus* stating: “*Hemichaena* and *Leucocarpus* are both justifiably accommodated as groups within the bounds of *Mimulus*.” And “In case that it proves desirable to maintain the Australian segregate genera, and to maintain *Phryma* as a distinct genus, the suggestion by Beardsley and Barker (2005) to conserve the name *Mimulus* with a species from within the American lineage is being followed (Nesom and N. Fraga, in prep.).” The following year, a reversal of this course of action was made with the publication of Barker & al. (2012). The contradictions between Nesom (2011) and Barker & al. (2012) clearly illustrate the subjective nature of decisions regarding nomenclature in this group and add to our concerns about the stability of its current circumscription.

**REASON 3: MIMULUS IS WELL RECOGNIZED IN THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY**

The name changes have already impacted a large number of scientists whose research is focused on *Mimulus*. Barker & al. (2012) dismissed the concerns of these scientists and argued that their research is focused on “relatively few species”. The casual dismissal of the interests of the *Mimulus* scientific community by these authors is questionable for four reasons. First, the monkeyflower literature encompasses dozens of different *Mimulus* species across the broader clade (Vickery, 1978; Cooley & al., 2011; Grossenbacher & Whittall, 2011; Grossenbacher & al., 2014; Sobel, 2014; Sheth & Angert, 2014; Sheth & al., 2014; Chase & al., 2017; Kooyers & al., 2017; Peng & al., 2017; Li & al., 2018; Medel & al., 2018; Yuan, 2019). Second, this argument mischaracterizes the size of the research community that studies *Mimulus*. There are now more than 40 labs worldwide that focus their research effort primarily, if not exclusively, on *Mimulus*. Few non-crop genera, beyond *Arabidopsis*, have this level of research activity. Third, the argument ignores the fact that the instability of nomenclature may cause scientists to lose track or overlook critical datasets, especially in large genomic (e.g., NCBI) and biodiversity (e.g., GBIF) databases. Finally, this research community identifies primarily by the name *Mimulus* and has spent considerable time over the last two decades building that community under the name *Mimulus*. The name *Mimulus* is widely recognized by our colleagues within the evolution community, by non-plant
biologists, and by program officers at the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and National Institutes of Health. Instability in the names of these species therefore impedes communication of our discoveries to the broader scientific community and to funding agencies. For these reasons we have continued to use the name *Mimulus*.

**WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?**

Since we still do not have a good sense of the historical relationships of the taxa in this group of plants, we suggest retaining the name *Mimulus* for all monkeyflowers until more phylogenetic data are available. Ideally, a more robust phylogeny will be developed soon, allowing for a new circumscription to be proposed prior to the International Botanical Congress in 2023. Once that phylogeny has been published, we suggest two routes for retaining the name *Mimulus* across as broad a swath of monkeyflowers as possible based on alternative phylogenetic topologies:

**Suggestion 1.** — If *Phryma* is found to be sister to all monkeyflowers, as in the nrDNA tree (Fig. 1), we propose that all species within the monophyletic clade containing monkeyflowers be renamed as *Mimulus* (Option 2 of Barker & al., 2012). Grouping all of the species into one genus, *Mimulus*, would maximize name stability, which would be especially useful if new data suggest different phylogenetic relationships within the larger clade. While Option 4 of Barker & al. (2012) resulted in the renaming of at least 136 species, Option 2 results in the introduction of only 13 new name combinations. Further, as noted by Nesom (2011) and Barker & al. (2012), most of these species from *Elacholoma, Hemichaena, Leucocarpus, Thyridia*, and *Uvedalia* already have names in *Mimulus*.

**Suggestion 2.** — If *Phryma* is found to be nested within the clade containing monkeyflowers, as in the *trnL/F* tree (Fig. 1), we also propose that the entire clade be renamed to *Mimulus*. However, if it is determined that renaming *Phryma* to *Mimulus* is untenable, we suggest that the name *Mimulus* be conserved across a much larger swath of the clade by changing the type to a species within subgenus *Synplacus* (Option 3 of Barker & al., 2012). We propose that *Mimulus guttatus* be designated as the new type for *Mimulus*, as it is widely studied by scientists and geographically widespread across western North America. *Mimulus guttatus* occurs within the center of diversity of monkeyflowers, in contrast to *Mimulus ringens*, whose type status is largely a historical artifact due to the east-to-west direction of exploration of North America by Europeans. The conservation of the name *Mimulus* by changing the type would likely bring *Leucocarpus* and *Hemichaena* into *Mimulus*. However, *M. ringens* and the Australian monkeyflowers would likely need to be given a different genus name. Further, a new phylogeny may confirm the results of the nrDNA data and show that *M. guttatus* and *M. ringens* are actually more closely related to each other than they are to subgenus *Schizoplacus*. This would potentially entail elevating *Schizoplacus* to the genus level. However, if *Schizoplacus* is found to be sister to *Synplacus*, we suggest that both subgenera be named *Mimulus* following retypification. There is precedent for conservative name changes accomplished via designation of a new type specimen to maintain a genus name for a larger clade of species, as has been done with the genus *Acacia* (Orchard & Maslin, 2005; McNeill & Turland, 2011). The justifications for conserving *Acacia* with a new type are very similar to the justifications for conserving *Mimulus*.

**Outlook.** — We have provided several reasons above for why we have continued to use *Mimulus* to describe all monkeyflowers. Until modern genomic data can help resolve the considerable uncertainties described above, we will continue to use the name *Mimulus* in publications, presentations, and communication with the general public. In addition, we strongly advocate that *Mimulus* be used in databases and Floras until the circumscription of this group is more stable.
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