

## (012–013) Proposals to amend Article 53 \*Ex. 9

Tseng-Chieng Huang<sup>1</sup>, Ming-Jou Wu<sup>2</sup> & Shing-Fan Huang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Institute of Plant Biology, National Taiwan University, Taipei 106, Taiwan*

<sup>2</sup> *Graduate Institute of Biological Resources and Technology, National Hualien University of Education, Hualien 970, Taiwan*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Applied Science, National Hsinchu University of Education, Hsinchu 300, Taiwan. sfhuang@mail.nhcue.edu.tw (author for correspondence)*

### (012) Add the following text to Art. 53 voted Ex. 9:

“*formosana*, *formosanus* or *formosanum*, and *formosensis* or *formosense*.”

### (013) If Prop. 012 is accepted, add the following text immediately before that insertion:

“*formosae* and either of the two following sets of terms,”

#### Exposition

The word *Formosa* is well known as a geographical name for Taiwan Island long used by western people after being named by a Portuguese explorer “Ilha Formosa”, meaning “beautiful island”, ultimately from the Latin *formosus* meaning beautiful. The epithets derived from the geographical name *Formosa* (i.e., *formosae*, the genitive substantive form, and *formosanus* (-a, -um), or *formosensis* (-e), two adjectival forms) used in the names of native plants of Taiwan literally designate the Island of Taiwan and were often applied by Taiwanese and Japanese taxonomists and

by many western botanists. Unfortunately, the usage of the derivative epithets from the geographical name *Formosa* for species in the same genus is quite confusing (Huang & al. in *Taiwania* 52: 247–252. 2007). In order to avoid confusion in the application of the derivative epithets from *Formosa* in a geographical sense for Taiwanese plants within the same genus, e.g., *Elaeagnus formosensis* Hatusima and *E. formosana* Nakai, and also in order to agree with the recommendation 23A.2 “The use of the genitive and the adjectival form of the same word to designate two different species of the same genus should be avoided”, we propose to amend Art. 53.3 Ex. 9 in accordance with what we believe to be the real sense of Art. 53.3.

The *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature* (ICBN) has been published to be followed by botanists worldwide. It is hopefully to be useful to botanists in any region. Therefore, we hope that our proposal would be beneficial and convenient tools for all users worldwide, especially to taxonomists in Taiwan.

## (014) Proposal to add a new paragraph to Recommendation 8A

Subir Bandyopadhyay\* & Mithilesh K. Pathak

*Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India.*

*\*subirbandyopadhyay@yahoo.com (author for correspondence)*

In the course of revisionary studies, we sometimes face great difficulty in ascertaining whether a particular specimen is in fact the lectotype or neotype designated earlier by an author because it was not precisely indicated during the typification process. No such difficulty is, however, faced when an author indicated precisely the specimen while designating the lectotype or neotype.

As the lectotype, epitype or neotype plays a very significant role in the application of a name it would be of great convenience to future workers if the author precisely indicates the specimen while designating the lectotype, epitype or neotype.

Similarly we feel that the designated holotype and its isotype(s), if any, or a specimen accepted as the holotype

should also be precisely indicated to facilitate their easy location in the herbaria. Hence we are proposing a new Recommendation as follows:

### (014) Insert a new Rec. 8A.5:

“8A.5. When the type of a name is a specimen, it is strongly recommended that the designated specimen be precisely indicated by annotating it (or, when the type has been designated by examining its image or photograph, by requesting the curator of the collection involved to do so), by mentioning the accession number or bar code identification number of the sheet, and, if possible, by publishing a photograph of the specimen, or by any other means suitable to the author(s).”

This new Recommendation, if followed sincerely, would surely facilitate easy location in herbaria of designated type specimens, or of a specimen accepted as the holotype.

#### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India for his help and encouragement and to Dr. John McNeill, Edinburgh for his constructive suggestions and refining the proposed Recommendation.

## (015) Proposal to add a new paragraph to Recommendation 37A

Mithilesh K. Pathak\* & Subir Bandyopadhyay

*Botanical Survey of India, P.O. Botanic Garden, Howrah – 711103, West Bengal, India. \*mithileshkp@yahoo.com (author for correspondence)*

In some herbaria the specimens have already been digitized while in some others it is in an ongoing process. When we received an image of a herbarium specimen from G-DC, we found that they had bar coded the sheet with a unique identification number. We feel that if this were done generally it would be very useful in taxonomic studies for precisely locating a specimen. Further, the process of digitization is at its initial stage and thus it would not be difficult to bar code each and every herbarium sheet and give it a unique identification number.

However, in those herbaria where digitization is not possible in the near future due to financial stringencies or technical incapability the purpose can also be served by providing accession numbers to each herbarium specimen. Hence we are proposing a new Recommendation as follows:

#### (015) Insert a new Rec. 37A.2:

“37A.2. In order to facilitate precise type designation, it is recommended that while digitizing the specimens in a herbarium, every sheet should be bar coded with a unique identification number. In those herbaria where digitization is not possible in the near future, accession numbers should be given to each herbarium sheet.”

This new Recommendation would surely help to locate a particular herbarium specimen more easily.

#### Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Director, Botanical Survey of India for his help and encouragement and to Dr. John McNeill, Edinburgh for his constructive suggestions and refining the proposed Recommendation.

## ERRATUM TO TAXON 55(3)

In Taxon 55(3): 707–716 in the paper “The problem of generalized flowers: morphological aspects” by F. Weberling, the authors of two references in Literature Cited on p. 716 are erroneous:

**Ollerton, J.M.** 2000. Exactly how generalized are pollination interactions? *Norske Vidensk.-Akad. I. Mat.-Naturvidensk. Kl., Skr., Ny Ser.* 39: 161–178.

**Ollerton, J.M. & Watts, S.** 2000. Phenotype space and floral typology: towards an objective assessment of pollination syndromes. *Norske Vidensk.-Akad. I. Mat.-Naturvidensk. Kl., Skr., Ny Ser.* 39: 149–159.

should read

**Olesen, J.M.** 2000. Exactly how generalized are pollination interactions? *Norske Vidensk.-Akad. I. Mat.-Naturvidensk. Kl., Skr., Ny Ser.* 39: 161–178.

**Ollerton, J. & Watts, S.** 2000. Phenotype space and floral typology: towards an objective assessment of pollination syndromes. *Norske Vidensk.-Akad. I. Mat.-Naturvidensk. Kl., Skr., Ny Ser.* 39: 149–159.