(62) A Proposal to Amend Art. 11.6 to Give Autonyms Priority over Their Validly Published Homotypic Synonyms
Author(s): C. Jeffrey
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (Aug., 1998), pp. 767-768
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1223610
Accessed: 01/06/2012 13:20

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon.*

http://www.jstor.org

(62) A proposal to amend Art. 11.6 to give autonyms priority over their validly published homotypic synonyms

C. Jeffrey[1]

Prior to the *Tokyo Code,* little difficulty was experienced in the application of Art. 22 and 26 with respect to autonyms. Once the name of any subordinate taxon not including the type of the name of the higher (principal) taxon had been validly published, an autonym was considered to have been established, and had priority over the name that established it. Whether or not the type of the name of the higher taxon was included in the subordinate taxon did not depend on the relative dates of valid publication of the name of the subordinate taxon and of effective publication of the nomenclatural act typifying the name of the higher taxon. Any name of a subordinate taxon that did include the type of the name of the higher taxon, but did not repeat the epithet of the name of the higher taxon unaltered, was to be considered not to have been validly published, and could therefore be ignored for all purposes of priority, irrespective of the relative dates of establishment of the name and of effective publication of the typifying nomenclatural act.

For example, Kobjakova (in Trudy Prikl. Bot. 23(3): 487. 1930) validly published two subspecific names under *Lagenaria vulgaris* Ser. 1825, subsp. *asiatica* Kobjakova and subsp. *afrikana* Kobjakova, encompassing the entire circumscription of the species, and without any indication that one or other of them included the type of the name of the species. Jeffrey (in Milne-Redhead & Polhill, Fl. Trop. E. Africa, Cucurbitaceae: 51. 1967) lectotypified *Lagenaria vulgaris* (a replacement name for *Cucurbita lagenaria* L. 1753) by specimen No. 1151.1 in the Linnaean Herbarium, London (LINN), referable to *L. vulgaris.* subsp. *afrikana,* thus became the "type subspecies" of *L. vulgaris.* In consequence, the name *L. vulgaris.* subsp. *afrikana* had then to be considered as not validly published. The simultaneous publication of the other subspecific name, *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica,* automatically established *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris.* The correct names for the two subspecies would therefore have been *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris* and *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica,* and *L. vulgaris* subsp. *afrikana* would have been a non-name without nomenclatural status.

In order to prevent the possibility of names being rendered invalidly published retrospectively by a subsequent act of typification, new paragraphs (Art. 22.2 and 26.3) were introduced by the Tokyo Congress and appear in the current edition of the *Code.* These stipulate that names of subordinate taxa that include the type of but do not repeat unaltered the epithet of the name of the higher taxon are to be treated as validly published if, in the case of names of subdivisions of genera, they do not include the original type or all elements eligible as type or the previously designated type; or if, in the case of names of infraspecific taxa, they do not include the holotype or all syntypes or the previously designated type, of the adopted, legitimate name of the genus or species respectively, unless the author clearly indicated that the taxon so named included the type element of the name of the higher taxon.

Consideration of the *Lagenaria* case just mentioned will illustrate the effects of these changes. When, as by Kobjakova, *L. vulgaris* is considered to be the accepted,

[1] Komarov Botanical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, 197376 St Petersburg, Russia.

legitimate name of the species and two subspecies are recognised encompassing the entire circumscription of the species, then one of them must include the type of the name of the species and this must be called *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris* under Art. 26.1 of the current *Code*. This, as shown above, now corresponds to the (validly published) *L. vulgaris* subsp. *afrikana*. The other subspecies then logically cannot include the type of the name of the species and thus, under Art. 26.3, the publication of the name *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica* Kobyakova automatically established the corresponding autonym *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris*. Are the correct names of the two subspecies then *L. vulgaris* subsp. *afrikana* and *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica*, or are they *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris* and *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica?*

When the name *Lagenaria vulgaris* subsp. *africana* was validly published, it was not typified and has yet to be typified. If, on typification, it proves to be heterotypic with respect to *L. vulgaris,* it will become a synonym of *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris* under Art. 26.1 and 11.4. But if it proves to be homotypic with respect to *L. vulgaris,* then the *Code* (Art. 11.6) stipulates only than an autonym is treated as having priority over the name or names of the same date and rank that established it; it says nothing about the priority of autonyms with respect to their homotypic synonyms. Had Kobjakova published only the name *L. vulgaris* subsp. *afrikana* (or only *L. vulgaris* subsp. *asiatica*, likewise untypified), no autonym would have been established by its publication under Art. 26.3, and only by the publication of the name of a heterotypic subspecies name after lectotypification of the specific name by Jeffrey in 1967 would the autonym *L. vulgaris* subsp. *vulgaris* have come into existence.

In order to clarify the situation, an extension of the relevant provision is required to give autonyms priority over their validly published homotypic synonyms, irrespective of whether or not a heterotypic name in the same rank was published simultaneously or later but prior to the date of typification of the name of the higher taxon. The following is therefore proposed.

(62) Add a sentence to the end of Art. 11.6 and an example:

"Likewise, an autonym is treated as having priority over any homotypic synonym and over any heterotypic synonym that denotes a taxon which includes the type of the name of the higher taxon, established as such by the lectotypification, neotypification or conservation of the type of the names concerned, irrespective of whether or not a name in the same rank that does not include the type of the name of the higher taxon was simultaneously or later validly published.

"*Ex. 22bis.* Pangalo (in Trudy Prikl. Bot. 23: 258. 1930) when describing *Cucurbita mixta* Pangalo distinguished two varieties, *C. mixta* var. *cyanoperizona* Pangalo and var. *stenosperma* Pangalo, together encompassing the entire circumscription of the species. Since neither a holotype nor any syntypes were indicated for *C. mixta,* both varietal names were validly published (see Art. 26.2). Merrick & Bates (in Baileya 23: 96, 101. 1989), in the absence of known type material, neotypified *S. mixta* by an element that can be attributed to *C. mixta* var. *stenosperma*. As long as their choice of neotype is followed, the correct name for that variety is *C. mixta* var. *mixta,* not *C. mixta* var. *stenosperma;* and when, as by Merrick & Bates, this variety is treated as a variety of *C. argyrosperma* Huber 1867, its correct name is *C. argyrosperma* var. *mixta* (Pangalo) ined., not *C. argyrosperma* var. *stenosperma* (Pangalo) Merrick & D. M. Bates."