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There is no doubt that the dispute over the type of Acacia Mill. (see, e.g., Moore & al. in Taxon 60: [this issue.] 2011, this issue) will be among the most controversial topics discussed at the Nomenclature Section of the XVIII International Botanical Congress in Melbourne. I fear that this issue will not be resolved whether the current type of Acacia (A. penninervis Sieber ex DC.), as listed in the Vienna Code (McNeill & al. in Regnum Veg. 146. 2006), is confirmed or whether the first designated type (A. scorpoides (L.) W.F. Wight) is restored. Either result would be a victory for one side and a defeat for the other. If that were to happen, especially if a vote deciding the issue were passed by only a narrow margin, negative feelings could result, potentially lasting for years, damaging relationships within our botanical community and projecting a poor image of us to the wider world. Such a situation could be avoided if an unusual solution could be found to the seemingly intractable Acacia problem, as requested by Linder & Crisp (in Taxon 60: 570–571. 2011); a solution that could attract support from both sides of the dispute as well as from those who have no strong opinion on the issue but wish to see the matter resolved. Some might regard the proposal by Brummitt (in Taxon 59: 1925–1926. 2010 [Art. 51 Prop. A]) as one such solution, while others might not; its pros and cons have been discussed by the Rapporteurs in the Synopsis of Proposals (McNeill & Turland in Taxon 60: 273–274. 2010 [Art. 51 Prop. A]). The present proposal is offered as an additional option for the Nomenclature Section in Melbourne to debate.

The potential solution proposed here is suggested as a compromise. It would permit the name Acacia to be used only for the genus in its broad sense, i.e., including species from Africa, the Americas, Asia, and Australasia. When more narrow genera are defined, what is currently called Vachellia Wight & Arn. (Acacia before the Vienna Congress) would be called Austroacacia Mill., while the genus currently called Acacia (Racosperma Mart. before the Vienna Congress) would be called Austroacacia Mill., thereby allowing continued use of the widely used and highly valued name Acacia—albeit with a prefix—in both its pre-Vienna and post-Vienna applications.

Insert a new Article and Note in Art. 14, a new Recommendation 14B, and make adjustments to Art. 32.1, 33.1 and 34.2:

“14.n. The name Acacia Mill. (1754) is treated as having been simultaneously published as three names: Acacia Mill., Austroacacia Mill., and Protoacacia Mill., each of which is conserved with a conserved type (see App. III). A combination (autonyms excepted) published under Acacia before 1 January 2011 is treated as having been simultaneously published under all three generic names, Austroacacia and Protoacacia both have priority over Acacia, except when a genus is circumscribed to include the types of all three names, in which case Acacia has priority over the other two names.”

“Note n. Combinations established automatically under Art. 14.n may in turn establish autonyms under Art. 22.3 and 26.3. A combination published under Austroacacia or Protoacacia after 1 January 2011 is not established automatically under Art. 14.n and must therefore meet the requirements of Art. 32.1 for valid publication.”

“14B.1. When a combination published under Acacia before 1 January 2011 is treated as a synonym together with the two corresponding combinations automatically established under Austroacacia and Protoacacia (see Art. 14.n), only the combination under Acacia should be cited.”

In Art. 32.1 and 33.1 change “(autonyms excepted)” to “(autonyms and names established under Art. 14.n excepted)”. In Art. 34.2 insert “(but see Art. 14.n)” after “validly published” at the end of the first sentence.

Include associated entries in App. III:

Typus: Acacia penninervis Sieber ex DC. (typ. cons.).

Typus: Austroacacia penninervis Sieber ex DC. (Acacia penninervis Sieber ex DC.) (typ. cons.).

Typus: Protoacacia nilotica (L.) Delile (Mimosa nilotica L., Acacia nilotica (L.) Delile) (typ. cons.).

The proposed new rule for Art. 14 creates the generic names Austroacacia and Protoacacia by treating Acacia as having been simultaneously published as all three names. Almost all the needed combinations are already validly published under Acacia, so these are similarly treated as having been published under all three generic names so as to avoid the need individually to publish some 1400 new combinations under Austroacacia and Protoacacia. The date threshold of 1 January 2011 is included to separate clearly the periods during which combinations are established automatically under Austroacacia and Protoacacia (before 1 January 2011) and individually published (after that date, or in practice after the Melbourne Congress). Without this clear threshold, confusion as to the status of the names could occur in years to come.

The automatically established combinations under Austroacacia and Protoacacia are available for use as adopted names, and are operative in questions of homonymy, but, as the new Recommendation advises, only the corresponding combinations under Acacia should be cited as synonyms. For example, the combination Acacia farnesiana (L.) Willd. (1806) is treated as having been published together with both Austroacacia farnesiana (L.) Willd. and Protoacacia...
When the name Protoacacia farnesiana is adopted, Mimosa farnesiana L. is the basionym, Acacia farnesiana and Austroacacia farnesiana are both homotypic synonyms, of which only the former should be cited. A hypothetical Austroacacia farnesiana published as a new name based on a different type would be a later homonym and therefore illegitimate under Art. 53.1 (just as would a heterotypic Protoacacia farnesiana or Acacia farnesiana). In another example, if the name Senegalia senegal (L.) Britton is adopted, Acacia senegal (L.) Willd., Austroacacia senegal (L.) Willd., and Protoacacia senegal (L.) Willd. are all homotypic synonyms, but only the first of these should be cited.

A combination published under Austroacacia or Protoacacia after 1 January 2011 is not established automatically under Art. 14.1n. This means that, after this date, corresponding combinations under Acacia, Austroacacia, and Protoacacia must be separate nomenclatural acts each meeting the requirements of Art. 32.1 for valid publication.

Priority is determined according to Art. 11, with a special exception included in the new Art. 14.1n to establish priority between the three conserved generic names. When a genus is circumscribed to include the type of either Austroacacia or Protoacacia, but not the types of both, the correct names of all subordinate taxa in that genus are combinations under either Austroacacia or Protoacacia, respectively, which is the earliest name for such a genus and has priority over Acacia. When a genus is circumscribed to include the types of all three generic names, the correct names of all subordinate taxa in that genus may be combinations under Acacia, because only then does Acacia have priority over the other two names. Note the wording, “may” be combinations under Acacia; theoretically, if the genus were circumscribed to include the type of a still earlier name, e.g., Mimosa L. (1753), the correct names would be combinations under that generic name. Priority below the rank of genus would not be complicated by the new rule because each trio of combinations has identical priority and therefore operates like a single name.

The automatically established names are ruled as validly published even though they were never actually published in printed matter, which means they were not effectively published. In this respect, they behave like autonyms. Because valid publication requires effective publication, it is necessary to expand “(autonyms excepted)” in Art. 32.1 and 33.1 to “(autonyms and names established under Art. 14.1n excepted)”.

An exception is also required in Art. 34.2, which precludes valid publication of so-called alternative names on or after 1 January 1953 (two or more different names based on the same type proposed simultaneously for the same taxon by the same author), hence inserting the reference “(but see Art. 14.1n)” in Art. 34.2.

Acacia, Austroacacia, and Protoacacia are conserved with conserved types; the latter two names also have conserved orthography because they were originally published as “Acacia”. It is suggested here that the conserved type of Acacia be its type as determined by the Code, i.e., currently A. penninervis, but potentially A. scorpioides (a taxonomic synonym of A. nilotica) if actions of the Melbourne Congress should result in reversion to the type as determined by the rules, prior to the Vienna Congress. The proposed new rule functions just as well in either case; the type of Acacia has no practical effect in terms of Australasian vs. non-Australasian taxa because the name Acacia is correct only when applied to the genus sensu lato (which is anyway taxonomically untenable).
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