



On the use of high-level taxonomic names

S. BLAIR HEDGES

Department of Biology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802 USA. E-mail: sbh1@psu.edu

Asher & Helgen (2010) recently proposed some rules for naming animal taxa above the family level—names that are currently unregulated. They suggested that strict priority be used as a criterion for high-level names and that such priority be based on group content rather than the procedure used for low-level taxa, anchored to constituent taxa. Authorship of a high-level name thus may vary in a complex way depending on content. While it is true that taxonomic codes are always in need of improvement, the lack of regulation of high-level names has not caused major problems. Originality, priority, stability, and other common sense considerations usually come to play in a process that can be described as community consensus. Their proposed system would lead to less stability because names would lack both permanent anchors (e.g., types) and permanent authors, and would be based on something (group content) susceptible to change with time. Furthermore, name selection may frequently conflict with common usage, leading to confusion and instability. An example of the problems with these rules is their preferred name for the order containing tenrecs and golden moles, Tenrecoidea, which has a long history of different meanings (content). Instead, the most commonly used name, Afrosoricida, is also preferred because it does not have that confusing history and has a more typical suffix (-a) for a mammalian order.

It is often not appreciated that much of taxonomy, across all levels, is determined by community consensus rather than strict rules. For example, the decision to recognize a collection of individuals or populations as a species is frequently debated. Likewise, both the recognition (or not) of a supraspecific taxon and the level applied (e.g., genus, tribe, family) is usually subjective because there are many ways to divide up a phylogenetic tree and apportion taxa. And long debate often occurs before a new taxon is accepted and used by most of the community, or rejected and considered a synonym of a more inclusive taxon. In formal taxonomy, the Law of Priority and application of types helps to establish which name should be used if more than one exists, but these rules do not apply to high-level taxonomy. Above the family group level in eukaryotes and class level in prokaryotes, the arbiter for acceptance of a name is usually the consensus of the community.

Asher & Helgen (2010) introduce two criteria for determining the most appropriate high-level name. They propose it should be "the first, published name for a monophyletic group with unique content" and "based on terms deemed familiar and logical to as many students as possible." Thus the person who coined a name is not necessarily considered the author. According to Asher & Helgen, the current estimate of group content—which can change as time progresses—is matched with the earliest use of the name which recognized the same or similar content.

For example, under these rules, a researcher this year may build a tree that joins five families, and apply an earlier ordinal name to the group. Even though the order was originally named in 1863 by one person, another person who published in 1961 might get credit because the content they assumed in that publication was closer to the content recognized today. However, a family could be added next year by another researcher, making the group closer in content to the version of the taxon recognized in 1932 by yet another person, changing the authorship of the same taxon yet again. A slight change in content might also require switching from one widely used taxon name to a name confounded with many different meanings. Moreover, this system favors such names—ones that have been mixed and matched many times in the past—because those names are most likely to match, even by chance, the current group content.

The notion of general priority—use of the first name proposed for particular group—is already part of the community consensus process because it involves common sense. There are famous exceptions, such as the renaming of Archaeobacteria and Eubacteria (Woese & Fox, 1977) to Archaea and Bacteria (Woese *et al.*, 1990), but otherwise general priority is commonly used for high-level names. Asher & Helgen's (2010) first criterion goes a step further and proposes strict priority. However, without a system—such as the type system—to anchor a name to a constituent taxon, there is no objective way to stabilize the name. Also none of the other necessary regulation is operating for high-level names (e.g., rules for publication, dates, diagnoses, etc.). Without that other regulation, high-level names are not strictly comparable

and cannot be treated exactly as low-level names. Therefore the use of synonymies by Asher & Helgen (2010) is not supported, and things such as common usage take a greater role in stability.

Asher & Helgen (2010) list their preferred high-level names along with those they reject. Many of these names have been debated in the past. However, I wish to focus here on one name that is given unusual emphasis by those authors: the ordinal name that encompasses tenrecs (Tenrecidae) and golden moles (Chrysochloridae). Asher & Helgen (2010) acknowledge that Afrosoricida Stanhope *et al.* (1998) has gained in usage among mammalogists, but argue that their proposed rules favor the earlier name Tenrecoidea, attributing the authorship of the latter name to McDowell (1958). Although McDowell used Tenrecoidea as a superfamily for Tenrecidae + Chrysochloridae, the name was used earlier by Simpson (1931) in a much different way: to group the Tenrecidae, Solenodontidae (West Indian giant shrews), and some fossil taxa from North America. Tenrecomorpha has a similarly confusing history, and Zalambdodonta Gill (1883) would not be appropriate either because it has included West Indian solenodontids.

Asher & Helgen (2010) suggested that Stanhope *et al.* (1998), in their naming of Afrosoricida, possibly were "simply unaware of McDowell's Tenrecoidea." However, as an author of Afrosoricida I can state that we were aware of McDowell's Tenrecoidea, Simpson's Tenrecoidea, and the confusion surrounding available names, discussed above. Another concern was that Tenrecoidea, with its superfamily suffix, would be inappropriate to use as an order. We were also aware of possible confusion with the genus *Afrosorex*, which fortunately is now reduced since it has been synonymized with *Crocidura*. Bronner and Jenkins (2005) provided similar reasoning for considering Tenrecoidea and Tenrecomorpha to be problematic names, advocating instead the use of Afrosoricida for the order comprising tenrecs and golden moles.

Asher & Helgen (2010) mention the eminent mammal taxonomist George Gaylord Simpson throughout as the source for guidance in which high-level names should be used and which ones should be rejected. This is somewhat misleading because Simpson's use of high-level names was in line with conventional practice whereas Asher & Helgen have proposed a radical departure from convention. Simpson's emphasis on general principles of priority (as opposed to strict priority, which is not possible), stability, and common usage are the same principles that have been used by taxonomists through the years and are part of the natural process of community consensus.

References

- Asher, R. & Helgen, K. (2010) Nomenclature and placental mammal phylogeny. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, 10, 102.
- Bronner, G. & Jenkins, P. (2005) Order Afrosoricida. In: D. Wilson & D. Reeder (Eds), *Mammal Species of the World*. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland, pp. 70–81.
- Gill, T. (1883) On the classification of the insectivorous mammals. *Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington*, 5, 118–120.
- McDowell, S. (1958) The Greater Antillean insectivores. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, 115, 115–213.
- Simpson, G. (1931) A new classification of mammals. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, 59, 259–293.
- Stanhope, M. J., Waddell, V. G., Madsen, O., de Jong, W., Hedges, S. B., Cleven, G., *et al.* (1998) Molecular evidence for multiple origins of Insectivora and for a new order of endemic African insectivore mammals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (U.S.A.)*, 95, 9967–9972.
- Woese, C. R. & Fox, G. E. (1977) Phylogenetic structure of the prokaryotic domain: the primary kingdoms. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 74, 5088–5090.
- Woese, C. R., Kandler, O. & Wheelis, M. L. (1990) Towards a natural system of organisms: proposal for the domains Archaea, Bacteria, and Eucarya. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (U.S.A.)*, 87, 4576–4579.