



---

Automatic Tautonyms: Zoological vs. Botanical Code

Author(s): Luella K. Weresub

Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 19, No. 5 (Oct., 1970), pp. 787-788

Published by: [International Association for Plant Taxonomy \(IAPT\)](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1219293>

Accessed: 13/04/2014 08:23

---

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>

## AUTOMATIC TAUTONYMS: ZOOLOGICAL VS. BOTANICAL CODE \*

Luella K. Weresub

At the Nomenclatural Sessions in Seattle, someone recommended that we look at the Zoological Code for a lesson in clarity and simplicity. Prejudiced as I am in favour of the Botanical Code as an example (in part) of beautiful logic, I nevertheless did study the Zoological Code.

And there I found automatic tautonyms treated much as Dr. K. A. Pirozynski had advocated at pre-congress discussions at our Institute and Professor Lanjouw had recommended when he spoke at Seattle on this subject. Under consideration were Morton's (1968) proposal A to Art. 26 (Stafleu & Voss 1969: 21–22), and the Brummitt & Chater (1968) proposals G to Art. 19, E to Art. 22, and C to Art. 25 (Stafleu & Voss 1969: 17, 19, 21). The Nomenclature Session at Seattle finally settled on a version of Morton's proposal, more or less to the effect that "Such automatically created tautonyms are not to be taken into consideration for the purposes of priority, nor are they transferable. The same principle applies to automatically created tautonyms at any level."

Now let us see how this matter is dealt with in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (1964). Its Art. 36 states: "All categories in the family-group are of co-ordinate status in nomenclature... [so that]... a name established for a taxon in any category in the group, and based on a given type-genus, is thereupon available with its original date and author for a taxon based on the same type-genus in each of the other categories, with appropriate change of suffix. Example. — The proposal of *Hesperiidæ* Latreille, 1809... based on *Hesperia* Fabricius, 1793, thereupon makes available, from the year 1809, the superfamily name *Hesperioidea* and the subfamily name *Hesperinae*, even though the former was first used by Comstock, . . . 1904, and the latter by Watson, 1893."

The same stipulation of co-ordinate status is provided in the Zoological Code's Art. 43 for names in "the genus-group" and Art. 46 for names in "the species-group".

If we accepted the concept of co-ordinate status in the Botanical Code, we could deal easily with many of the small problems which we are now trying to solve by introducing unnecessary complications into the Code.

Here is how co-ordinate status would simplify matters for us. Taking the example given by Morton (1968): If *Campanula gieseckiana* subsp. *gieseckiana* and subsp. *groenlandica* Boc were to be united as a subspecies of *C. rotundifolia* L., the proper subspecific epithet would be *gieseckiana*, which, as the epithet of the type subspecies of *C. gieseckiana*, would have been automatically established at the time of the valid publication of the name of the species, and would bear priority as of that date.

Taking an example given by Brummitt & Chater (1968): When *Utricularia stellaris* L. fil. is considered a variety of *U. inflexa* Forssk., the fact that there exists a *U. stellaris* var. *coromandeliana* A. DC. would be of no importance, for the type varietal epithet would be taken as already validly published simultaneously with the specific name. As a variety of *U. inflexa*, the taxon would have to be called *U. inflexa* var. *stellaris* (L. fil.) P. Taylor 1964.

\* Contribution No. 765, Plant Research Institute, Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, Canada.

And if we extended the concept of co-ordinate status further, nomenclature would be further simplified. We could eliminate the unnecessary contortions of such cases as are cited by Wood & Webster (1968) in their Prop. A to Art. 19 (Stafleu & Voss 1969: 16): "However, the correct name of the tribe containing the type genus of subfamily *Cichorioideae* Kitamura (*Cichorium* L.) is *Lactuceae* Cass., not *Cichorieae*, while that of the subtribe containing *Cichorium* is *Hyoseridinae* Less., not *Cichoriinae*." If *Lactuceae* Cass. was the first name published segregating this group of genera from others in the *Asteraceae*, publication of the tribe would automatically establish a subfamily and subtribe named for the type genus *Lactuca*. On the other hand, if the first genus chosen for typification of the name of a taxon at one of the higher levels was *Cichorium*, then all names in the series would be automatically based on that generic name. If, then, it were decided that the subfamily *Cichorioideae* deserved family status, there would be no need to change the series of names below it.

This, however, seems to be far too easy. We botanists cherish labyrinthine convolutions of thought and claim the right to burden the future with tortuous mazes. Instead of choosing the simple and direct approach, we have voted into our code such provisions as Morton's Prop. A to Art. 26, rephrased at Seattle by Fosberg and Ross to outlaw the priority and prevent the transfer of automatically established names or epithets. This means that, in the case of Morton's example above, on transfer of *Campanula gieseckiana* to subspecific status, the subspecies becomes *C. rotundifolia* subsp. *groenlandica* (Boc) instead of subsp. *gieseckiana*; and in the Brummitt & Chater example, this ruling enforces the establishment of *Utricularia inflexa* var. *coromandeliana* (A. DC.) for *U. stellaris*, rather than *U. inflexa* var. *stellaris* (L. fil.).

Furthermore, a number of other intricacies have been voted into the Code in accordance with the Wood & Webster (1968) proposals for Arts. 19, 22 and 26 (Stafleu & Voss 1969: 16, 18, 22), to reinforce the priority of explicitly published over automatically established names, for taxa between family and genus which do not include the genus typifying the correct name of the family, for subgenera and sections which do not include the species typifying the name of the genus, and for infraspecific taxa which do not include the nomenclatural type of the species. This means that, as long as the *Cichorioideae* remain a subfamily of the *Asteraceae*, the series of names below *Cichorioideae* Kitamura must be tribe *Lactuceae* Cass., subtribe *Hyoseridinae* Less., genus *Cichorium* L.; but that, if the subfamily is raised to family status, the series becomes family *Cichoriaceae*, subfamily *Cichorioideae*, tribe *Cichorieae*, subtribe *Cichoriinae*.

Is it too much to ask that we spend the time between now and the next Botanical Congress reconsidering our acceptance of these proposals? The Zoological Code's treatment of the problem is temptingly clear and unpolluted.

#### References

- BRUMMITT, R. K. and A. O. CHATER 1968 — Proposals mainly concerning names of taxa which include the type of the name of the next higher taxon. *Taxon* 17(6): 652–658.
- MORTON, C. V. 1968 — Proposal for an addition to Article 26 of the Code. *Taxon* 17(2): 236–237.
- International Code of Zoological Nomenclature 1964* — International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, London.
- STAFLEU, F. A. and E. G. VOSS 1969 — Synopsis of proposals on botanical nomenclature, Seattle 1969. *Regn. Veg.* 60: 124 pp.
- WOOD, C. E., JR. and G. L. WEBSTER 1968 — Tautonyms and confusion in the International Code. *Taxon* 17(6): 645–651.