the majority of the bird species described since the 1950s with eponymic names are tropical, but they are named after someone from the Global North (DuBay & al. in BioRxiv. https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.08.09.243238. 2020). Linnaeus initiated modern taxonomy and was shortly joined in his endeavour by a small group of principally European men. The names published by them reflected their interests and values. The range of people involved in taxonomy has gradually expanded over the last 250 years. It is time to go further and reflect the diversity of people who all have an interest in the scientific names of algae, fungi and plants. Taxonomy is at the heart of biodiversity research, and conservation science can greatly benefit from more inclusive approaches (Tallis & Lubchenco in Nature 515: 27–28. 2014). In New Zealand, the use of the indigenous languages te reo Māori and ta re Moriori has proved increasingly popular in constructing the scientific names of a wide range of organisms, including plants (Veale & al. in New Zealand J. Ecol. 43: 3388. 2019). Nevertheless, this practice represents only 4% of species names in New Zealand (Galbreath in New Zealand J. Ecol. 45: 3429. 2021), probably in part because the *Code* has discouraged this kind of practice for a long time.

As it is currently formulated in Rec. 20A.1 and 23A.3, the avoidance of names difficult to pronounce in Latin is a hindrance to increasing the use of vernacular names, eponyms from diverse origins, and words from indigenous languages in building epithets. It has also been applied inequitably, possibly with a greater tolerance to names derived from widespread languages (e.g. English) as illustrated with the *brown-*/*brunon-* example. The requirement of a Latin description or diagnosis for the valid publication of a name of a new non-fossil taxon was considered as a relict (Figueiredo & al. in Taxon 59: 617–620. 2010) and has now been removed from the *Code*. It is time to go further and remove the parts of Rec. 20A.1 and 23A.3 that recommend against forming names or epithets that are "not readily adaptable to the Latin language" or are "difficult to pronounce in Latin".

(112) In Rec. 20A.1 delete clause (b) and amend clause (c) as follows (deleted text in strikethrough):

"*20A.1*. Authors forming generic names should comply with the following:

[…]

~~*(b)* Avoid names not readily adaptable to the Latin language.~~

(c) Not make names that are very long~~ or difficult to pronounce in Latin~~."

(113) Amend Rec. 23A.3 clause (b) as follows (deleted text in strikethrough):

"*23A.3*. In forming specific epithets, authors should comply also with the following:

[…]

(b) Avoid epithets that are very long~~ or difficult to pronounce in Latin~~."

(114) Proposal to amend Article 23.2 and Recommendation 23A.3 to eliminate arbitrary formation of, and future use of hyphens in, specific epithets

Rohan Maity[1] & Sudhansu Sekhar Dash[2]

1 *Botanical Survey of India, Arunachal Pradesh Regional Centre, Senki View, Itanagar – 791111, India*
2 *Botanical Survey of India, CGO Complex, 3rd MSO Building, Salt Lake, Kolkata – 700064, India*
Address for correspondence: *Sudhansu Sekhar Dash, ssdash2002@gmail.com*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12615

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

Article 23.2 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018) states: "The epithet in the name of a species may be taken from any source whatever, and may even be composed arbitrarily." The word "arbitrarily" contradicts Rec. 23A.1–3 and creates confusion. The Recommendations of Rec. 23A are useful and practical to follow by any author while coining specific epithets. However, the phrase "may even be composed arbitrarily" of Art. 23.2, which can lead to the formation of specific epithets that are very long, multi-hyphenated or sometimes unpronounceable, makes these Recommendations appear useless. Two examples are *Cycas pschannae* R.C. Srivast. & L.J. Singh (in Int. J. Curr. Res. Biosci. Pl. Biol. 2(8): 35. 2015) and *Kobresia rcsrivastavae* Jana (in Indian J. Fundam. Appl. Life Sci. 2: 256. 2012). Similarly, Art. 23.1, stating "If an epithet consisted originally of two or more words, these are to be united or hyphenated", is implicitly in favour of formation of epithets composed of two or more words, which is also against Rec. 23A.3(d), which recommends to avoid formation of specific epithets with "two or more hyphenated words". One such example is *Henckelia collegii-sancti-thomasii* A. Joe & al. (in Phytotaxa 415: 248. 2019). Hence, to avoid such incidences in the future, it is proposed to amend Art. 23.2 by replacing the phrase "and may even be composed arbitrarily" with "may not be composed arbitrarily" and by incorporating Rec. 23A.3(d), converting it to a rule and then deleting the Recommendation. A new Example under Art. 23.2 can serve to clarify the meaning of "composed arbitrarily".

(114) Amend Art. 23.2 as follows (new text in bold, deleted text in strikethrough), add a new Example under it, and delete Rec. 23A.3(d):

"*23.2*. The epithet in the name of a species may be taken from any source whatever ~~and may even~~ **but may not** be composed arbitrarily (~~but~~ see **also** Art. 60.1). **In a name published on or after**

1 January 2026, the specific epithet may not be formed of two or more hyphenated words."

[Art. 23] "*Ex. n. Cycas pschannae* R. C. Srivast. & L. J. Singh (in Int. J. Curr. Res. Biosci. Pl. Biol. 2(8): 35. 2015) and *Kobresia rcsrivastavae* Jana (in Indian J. Fundam. Appl. Life Sci. 2: 256. 2012) have specific epithets unpronounceable in Latin, due to the presence of consecutive consonants at the beginning of the epithets. These epithets were formed from abbreviated names of scientists P. S. Channa and R. C. Srivastava, respectively. Such arbitrary formations of specific epithets are not permitted on or after 1 January 2026."

"*23A.3*. In forming specific epithets, authors should comply also with the following:

[…]

~~*(d)* Avoid those formed of two or more hyphenated words.~~"

Acknowledgements

The authors are thankful to Dr A.A. Mao, Director, Botanical Survey of India for facilities and encouragement throughout. The authors also acknowledge the National Mission on Himalayan Studies (NMHS) scheme under the Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change (MoEF&CC), Government of India, New Delhi, for grant support (project number GBPNI/NMHS-2017-18/LG-03/570 dt. 26/02/2018).

(115) Proposal to amend Article 23.5 and add a new Example to include specific epithets that consist of a noun and its accompanying adjective in the genitive case

Mark A. Garland[1] & Jefferson Prado[2]

1 *National Plant Data Team, Natural Resources Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 2900 East Gate City Boulevard, Suite 2100, Greensboro, North Carolina 27401-4901, U.S.A.*

2 *Instituto de Botânica, Herbário, C.P. 68041, CEP 04045-972, São Paulo, SP, Brazil*

Address for correspondence: *Mark A. Garland, mark.garland@usda.gov*

DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/tax.12616

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

Article 23.5 of the *Shenzhen Code* (Turland & al. in Regnum Veg. 159. 2018) specifies correctable errors in the gender of specific epithets (our emphasis in bold): "The specific epithet, when adjectival in form and not used as a noun, agrees with the gender of the generic name; **when the epithet is** a noun in apposition or **a genitive noun, it retains its own gender and termination irrespective of the gender of the generic name**. Epithets not conforming to this rule are to be corrected […]."

This Article, however, does not encompass all possible epithets that should be correctable. One such class of epithets includes those that are composed of a genitive noun with an accompanying adjective. In these epithets, the adjective should match the gender and the genitive case of the noun it modifies, but sometimes authors instead make the adjective match the gender and nominative case of the generic name. Because of this, we propose below one amendment to Art. 23.5 and a new Example.

(115) Amend Art. 23.5 as follows (new text in bold) and add an Example:

"*23.5*. The specific epithet, when adjectival in form and not used as a noun, agrees with the gender of the generic name; when the epithet is a noun in apposition or a genitive noun **or a noun and its accompanying adjective in the genitive case**, it retains its own gender and termination irrespective of the gender of the generic name. Epithets not conforming to this rule are to be corrected (see Art. 32.2) to the proper form of the termination (Latin or transcribed Greek) of the original author(s). In particular, the usage of the word element *-cola* as an adjective is a correctable error."

"*Ex. n*. Correctable errors in Latin epithets that consist of a noun and its accompanying adjective in the genitive case: *Agrostophyllum montis-jayani* Ormerod (in Orchadian 17: 379. 2013, *'montis-jayanum'*); *Loranthus cycnei-sinus* Blakely (in Proc. Linn. Soc. New South Wales 47: 392. 1922, *'Cycneus-Sinus'*); *Salicornia sinus-persici* Akhani (in Pakistan J. Bot. 40: 1638. 2008, *'sinus-persica'*)."

Published 2021. This article is a U.S.Government work and is in the public domain in the USA.