

(321) A proposal relating to infraspecific names (Article 24)

Werner Greuter,^{1,2} Nicholas J. Turland¹ & John H. Wiersema³

¹ Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Königin-Luise-Str. 6–8, 14195 Berlin, Germany

² Herbarium Mediterraneum, c/o Orto Botanico, Via Lincoln 2/A, 90133 Palermo, Italy

³ United States Department of Agriculture/Agricultural Research Service, National Germplasm Resources Laboratory, Bldg. 003, Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC-West), Beltsville, Maryland 20705-2350, U.S.A.

Author for correspondence: Werner Greuter, w.greuter@bgbm.org

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.12705/654.36>

(321) Reword Art. 24.3 (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough), and add two Examples:

“24.3. Infraspecific names with final epithets such as *genuinus*, *originalis*, *originarius*, *typicus*, *verus*, and *veridicus*, **or with the prefix *eu-*, when purporting to indicate the taxon containing the type of the name of the next higher-ranked taxon, are not validly published unless they ~~are autonyms (Art. 26)~~ **have the same final epithet as the name of the corresponding higher-ranked taxon (see Art. 26.2 and Rec. 26A.1 & 3).**”**

“*Ex. 2bis.* “*Hieracium piliferum* var. *genuinum*” (Rouy, Fl. France 9: 270. 1905) was based on “*H. armerioides* var. *genuinum*” of Arvet-Touvet (*Hieracium* Alp. Franç.: 37. 1888), an invalid designation under Art. 26.2. As circumscribed by Rouy, the taxon does not include the type of *H. piliferum*, but it does include the type of the name of the next higher-ranked taxon, *H. piliferum* subsp. *armerioides* (Arv.-Touv.) Rouy. Therefore, “*H. piliferum* var. *genuinum*” is not a validly published name of a new variety.”

“*Ex. 2ter.* “*Narcissus bulbocodium* var. *eu-praecox*” and “*N. bulbocodium* var. *eu-albidus*” were not validly published by Emberger & Maire (in Jahandiez & Maire, Cat. Pl. Maroc: 961. 1941) as they were placed, respectively, in *N. bulbocodium* subsp. *praecox* Gattef. & Maire (in Bull. Soc. Hist. Nat. Afrique N. 28: 540. 1937) and *N. bulbocodium* subsp. *albidus* (Emb. & Maire) Maire (in Jahandiez & Maire, Cat. Pl. Maroc: 138. 1931) and their epithet purports inclusion of the type of the higher-ranked name in the subordinate variety.”

A left-over from the time when infraspecific taxa had autonyms, Art. 24.3 does partly duplicate the provisions of Art. 26.2 – but not entirely. Both Examples here suggested aim at illustrating the complementary aspect of the two provisions, which the current Examples fail to do (indeed, Art. 24 Ex. 3 would be better placed under Art. 26.2).

Whereas Art. 24.3 is thus still meaningful, its present wording is flawed. Infraspecific names with the same final epithet as the name of the next higher-ranking taxon are widely used, and their use is indeed recommended explicitly (Rec. 26A). Yet they are apparently, no doubt unintentionally, proscribed by Art. 24.3, as their epithet indeed “indicates the taxon containing the type of the name of the next higher-ranked taxon”. A phrase at the end of the Article replacing the reference to autonyms is here proposed to repair this apparent anomaly.

We also propose to mention the prefix *eu-* in addition to the examples of potentially inadmissible epithets given in the Article. Such addition is in essence editorial: *eu-*, placed before the final epithet in the name of the next higher-ranking taxon, does indicate a taxon containing the type of that name. There are two good reasons to make this fact explicit. The first is that the *Eu-* prefix is explicitly disallowed at the ranks of subdivision of a genus (Art. 21.3), so that its not being mentioned for infraspecific names might be wrongly construed to imply that there the *eu-* prefix is allowed. The second reason is more subtle. For subdivisions of genera, there is no provision, equivalent to Art. 24.3, disallowing epithets that indicate inclusion of the type of the name of the next higher-ranking taxon other than

the genus itself. In fact, Art. 21.3 deals merely with a special case of what is covered more fully in Art. 22.2 (and the two Articles might well be editorially combined). It is therefore useful to clarify that the proscription of *eu-* prefixed infraspecific epithets falls under the wider coverage of Art. 24.3, not under Art. 26.2 (the infraspecific equivalent

of Art. 22.2). Be it understood, however, that epithets with the prefix *eu-* are not disallowed in all cases: only when the prefix precedes the epithet in the name of the next higher taxon does it indicate that the latter's type is included.
