Contributions by Deceased Botanists?
Author(s): Krister Karttunen
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Feb., 1990), p. 66
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1223181
Accessed: 27/07/2012 07:38

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Taxon.*

http://www.jstor.org

TAXON 39(1): 66. FEBRUARY 1990

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS[1]

CONTRIBUTIONS BY DECEASED BOTANISTS?

Krister Karttunen[1]

Literature and author citations cannot be used to acknowledge merit nor should there necessarily be justice in them. Some logic, nevertheless, would be very nice. Often books are attributed to people who have contributed nothing to their content except possibly their name on the title page.

Some examples: *English botany* was originally prepared by J. E. Smith (1759–1828) and illustrated by J. Sowerby (1757–1822). Some years after their death a supplement to the work was issued under the name "*Supplement to the English botany of the late Sir J. E. Smith and Mr. Sowerby.*" Volume 2 (1833) was, however, edited and largely written by W. J. Hooker, a fact that is evident from the title page as well as from the preface. Similarly, the posthumous second edition of Smith's *English flora,* volume 5, part 1 (1833), was written by Hooker, but is often attributed to Smith. Similar cases are very common.

On the contrary, C. F. Schwaegrichen's supplements (1811–1842) to *Species muscorum,* the starting-point book of mosses, is not attributed to J. Hedwig (1730–1799). Also, only few cite Limpricht's *Die Laubmoose Deutschlands, Oesterreichs und der Schweitz* (1890–1904) as a book by Rabenhorst (1806–1881), although it was published as part of the second edition of the series "*Dr. L. Rabenhorst's Kryptogamen-Flora.*"

Naturally it is necessary and feasible to cite the editors of large compilations by many people. But I cannot understand how any man can edit a book after his death. In the above cases the name of the "editor" is just a part of the title of the book, and should not be included in literature citations. One could write, for example, "Hooker, W. J. 1833. *The English flora of Sir James Edward Smith,* vol. 5." It should not be too tedious to read the title pages and prefaces to make sure who is the author or editor of a book.

As a secretary of the *Special Committee on 'ex' and 'in'* I am also worried about unnecessary cumbersome author citations. Ex-citations must be judged mechanically, but with in-cases there can be some consideration. I believe it would be silly to cite names as Hooker in Smith, if in truth Hooker was also the editor of the book.

[1] Department of Botany, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 44, SF-00170 Helsinki, Finland.