

traditional sociobiological binary gender framework, including persons whose gender identity falls between or outside the basic biological male and female identities, persons who experience being male or female at separate times, and persons who do not experience having a gender identity or reject having a gender identity. It is advisable to use people's preferred pronouns and grammatical gender identifiers (in addition to names and terms for gender). For example, some non-binary people use they/their/them/themselves in singular or have explicitly developed neutral pronouns (also sometimes termed neopronouns), such as xe/xyr/xem/xyrself or ze/zir/zem/zirs, rather than he/his/him/himself or she/her/her/herself (Richards & al. in *Int. Rev. Psychiatry* 28: 95–102. 2016; Hekanaho in *Neuphilol. Mitteilungen* 121: 498–509. 2020). The first person in Australia in 2003 and the first person in the United States in 2016 obtained legal recognition of their non-binary gender.

Therefore, I propose to amend Art. 60 Note 4.

(282) Amend Art. 60 Note 4 as follows (new text in bold):

“Note 4. If the gender and/or number of a substantival epithet derived from a personal name is/are inappropriate for the gender and/or

number of the person(s) whom the name commemorates, the termination is to be corrected in conformity with Art. 60.8. **However, the grammatical gender used for a person whom the epithet commemorates may be determined by the preferred gender identity of that person. Also, an epithet honouring a non-binary person in some cases may be created by adding -iorum, -iarum, or another indicator of grammatical plurality.**”

The proposed amendment will not affect the stability of existing nomenclature but will provide for the future an option of forming epithets of scientific names of organisms with due consideration of the gender identities and rights of non-binary people.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Nicholas J. Turland (Botanischer Garten und Botanisches Museum Berlin, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany) and John H. Wiersema (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.) for their useful comments and editing. Sergei L. Mosyakin (M.G. Kholodny Institute of Botany, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine) also provided his comments and advice.

(283) Proposal to amend the use of the termination *-ara* in forming nothogeneric names

Julian M.H. Shaw

Horticultural taxonomy, Royal Horticultural Society, Wisley, Woking, Surrey, GU23 6QB, United Kingdom

Address for correspondence: Julian M.H. Shaw, julianshaw@rhs.org.uk

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12956>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

Article H.6 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in *Regnum Veg.* 159. 2018) provides instructions for the formation of nothogeneric names for intergeneric hybrids. Article H.6.3 and H.6.4, dealing with the formation of nothogeneric names for intergeneric hybrids involving three or more genera, provide for a name to be formed from the name of a person to which is added the termination *-ara*. This is a very workable procedure. However, when the personal name used already ends with *-a*, addition of the termination *-ara* produces a double *a* in the name, as in *×Hayataara* J.M.H. Shaw, named for Bunzō Hayata (1874–1934). There are at least 48 nothogenera in *Orchidaceae* where the personal name used ends with *-a*. None is known from other families.

At times, nothogeneric names based on personal names ending with *-a* have been formed by the addition of a modified termination *-ra* as, for example, *×Iwanagara* Iwanaga & Wreford for Ernest T. Iwanaga, *×Kagawara* Kagawa & Wreford for Hiroshi Kagawa and *×Yamadara* M. Yamada & Wreford for Masao Yamada, whereas *×Perreiraara* Perreira & Wreford for Robert J. Perreira conforms to the present rule. The current proposal is designed to simplify the spelling and pronunciation of nothogeneric names by avoiding the

formation of the double *a* in the name. A precedent exists in Art. 60.8(c) where the adjectival ending *-anus/ana/anum* is reduced to *-nus/na/num* for personal names ending with *-a*.

It would also be instructive to include in each Example provided for Art. H.6.3 and H.6.4. the personal name on which the nothogeneric name is based.

(283) Amend Art. H.6.3 and Art. H.6.4 to form nothogeneric names when a personal name already ends with *-a* by addition of the modified termination *-ra*, and add to Ex. 6 and Ex. 7 (new text in bold):

“H.6.3. The nothogeneric name of an intergeneric hybrid derived from four or more genera is formed from the name of a person to which is added the termination *-ara*, **except when the personal name already ends with *-a* in which case the termination *-ra* is added**; no such name may exceed eight syllables. Such a name is equivalent to a condensed formula.”

“Ex. 6. *×Beallara* Moir (in *Orchid Rev.* 78(929): New Orch. Hybr. [1, 3]. 1970) **commemorating J. Ferguson Beall** (*Brassia* R. Br. *× Cochlioda* Lindl. *× Miltonia* Lindl. *× Odontoglossum* Kunth);

×*Cogniauxara* Garay & H. R. Sweet (see Art. H.8 Ex. 3) **commemorating Célestin A. Cogniaux** (*Arachnis* Blume × *Euanthe* Schltr. × *Renanthera* Lour. × *Vanda* W. Jones ex R. Br.); ×*Hayatara* J. M. H. Shaw (in Sander's List Orchid Hybrids Addendum 2002–2004: xxxv. 2005, 'Hayataara') **commemorating Bunzô Hayata** (*Brassavola* R. Br. × *Cattleya* Lindl. × *Laelia* Lindl. × *Myrmecophila* Rolfe × *Pseudolaelia* Porto & Brade)."

"H.6.4. The nothogeneric name of a trigenic hybrid is either (a) a condensed formula in which the three names adopted for the parental genera are combined into a single word not exceeding eight syllables, using the whole or first part of one, followed by the whole or any part of another, followed by the whole or last part of the third (but not the whole of all three) and, optionally, one or two connecting

vowels, or (b) a name formed like that of a nothogenus derived from four or more genera, i.e. from a personal name to which is added the termination *-ara*, except when the personal name already ends with *-a* in which case the termination *-ra* is added."

"Ex. 7. ×*Sophrulaeliocattleya* Hurst (in J. Roy. Hort. Soc. 21: 468. 1898) (*Cattleya* Lindl. × *Laelia* Lindl. × *Sophronitis* Lindl.); ×*Rodrettiopsis* Moir (in Orchid Rev. 84: ix. 1976) (*Comparettia* Poepp. & Endl. × *Ionopsis* Kunth × *Rodriguezia* Ruiz & Pav.); ×*Holttumara* Holttum (see Art. H.8 Ex. 3) **commemorating Richard E. Holttum** (*Arachnis* Blume × *Renanthera* Lour. × *Vanda* W. Jones ex R. Br.); ×*Kagawara* Kagawa & Wreford (Orchid Rev. 76: New Orch. Hybr. [2, 4]. 1968) **commemorating Hiroshi Kagawa** (*Ascozentrum* J. J. Sm. × *Renanthera* Lour. × *Vanda* R. Br.)."

(284) Proposal to add a Note after Article H.9.1 to clarify that a statement of the names of parent species is sufficient for valid publication of the name of a nothogenus

Jonathan Krieger & Rafaël Govaerts

Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3DS, United Kingdom

Address for correspondence: Jonathan Krieger, j.krieger@kew.org

DOI <https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12957>

First published as part of this issue. See online for details.

A number of nothogenera in the past and in recent years have been published with a statement of the species that make up the cross rather than just the parent genera. A recent example is the name ×*Leontoroides* B. Bock (in Bull. Soc. Bot. Centre-Ouest 42: 274. 2012), which was published as "× *Leontoroides kaiseri* (J. Murray) B. Bock - *comb. nov.* - [*Leontodon hispidus* L. × *Scorzoneroideis pyrenaica* (Gouan) Holub]". Although there is no separate entry for the nothogenus and parent genera, the nothogeneric name has been considered validly published simultaneously with the nothospecies combination, because the parent generic names are part of the parent species names cited. From the statement of the parent species and the condensed formula of the nothogenus there can be no doubt that the parent genera are *Leontodon* L. and *Scorzoneroideis* Moench. Although we stress that this is bad practice, it seems unnecessarily strict to consider such names as not validly published, forcing the authors to publish both names again with an explicit statement of the parent genera. Because this mostly applies to horticultural names, there is often little interest or incentive to publish such names, so they remain technically not validly published. Indication of a type, even though

not explicitly required for monotypic genera in Art. 40.3 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018), is important for the application of a non-hybrid generic name. The equivalent for nothogenera does not apply, however, because whichever species within the parent genera are postulated, the application of the nothogenus remains the same (Art. H.9 Note 1). Therefore, this proposed Note will have no nomenclatural impact, whereas not allowing this will require the republication of numerous nothogenera and, because this issue has not been routinely recorded in the International Plant Names Index (IPNI; <https://www.ipni.org/>) or elsewhere, it will be destabilizing to require that retrospectively.

(284) Add a new Note after Art. H.9.1:

"Note 1bis. A statement of the names of the parent species of a nothogenus, or of the names of the parent species of any of its included taxa, is sufficient to validly publish the name of a nothogenus, if the full names of all parent genera appear among the species names, when there is no separate statement of the names of the parent genera."