(229) Proposal to Improve Art. 29 (Effective Publication)
Author(s): R. J. Hnatiuk and J. G. West
Reviewed work(s):
Source: *Taxon*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Nov., 1986), pp. 826-827
Published by: International Association for Plant Taxonomy (IAPT)
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/1221667
Accessed: 24/07/2012 13:23

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

exact day of effective publication would be readily established for every name published from 1990 onwards.

We believe that these proposals could resolve the many problems surrounding effective publication which exist at present and which seem to defy any other attempt to cope with them. Minimal changes would be imposed on current practices in publishing botanical names, and little additional bureaucracy or financial support would be required.

Proposed by: R. K. Brummitt, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 3AB, UK; D. L. Hawksworth, CAB International Mycological Institute, Ferry Lane, Kew, Surrey TW9 3AF, UK and J. McNeill, Department of Biology, University of Ottawa, 30 Somerset E, Ottawa K1N 6N5, Canada.

(229) Proposal to improve Art. 29 (effective publication).

(229) Proposal to add to Article 29 the following new paragraphs:

"29.6. For names to be effectively published on or after 1 Jan. 1990, the place of publication must be listed in the Register of Publications maintained by the General Committee (Division III). The cumulative list of registered publications to date appears as Appendix . . . of this Code."

"29.7. Any applications for registering publications must be submitted by the editors of the publication, or their equivalent, to the General Committee."

Comments: Complete literature searches for new names and the original descriptions of new taxa for any systematic study are becoming increasingly difficult. The rapid development in modern printing methods has led to the proliferation of places of publication. Ideally it would be convenient to have all new names and descriptions published in one place, i.e. in one central register. However, to achieve this seems to be impractical. The separate registration of all new names to make them effective would be much more complicated than the system we propose. To set up a register of approved publications as the only acceptable places for effective publication of any new names or descriptions of new taxa should be feasible and seems to be a realistic compromise.

There has been much previous discussion concerning regulation of Effective Publication and on the problems of interpretation and application of Article 29 (e.g. Weresub and McNeill, 1980; Brummitt, 1980; Dahlgren and Friis, 1981; Eichler, 1981). As with the earlier suggestions the purpose of our proposal is to clarify the interpretation of the words "distribution" and "printed matter" in Article 29. Our proposal places the responsibility for interpreting what will be considered to be "printed matter" and "effective distribution" on the General Committee rather than on each taxonomist.

The approved publications listed in the register would be the only places where publication could be effected under the *International Code of Botanical Nomenclature.* Such a register would a) ensure that new names and descriptions of new taxa were readily available, and b) reduce the number of publications which had to be searched for new names and descriptions of new taxa. In other words, it would give taxonomists a known list of the only acceptable places to check for nomenclatural matters relevant to the Code after the time line.

It is suggested that the register should apply to modern work on or after a given date, e.g. 1 Jan. 1990. The register would need to be regularly revised and to be published regularly (e.g. in *Taxon* and as part of the Code).

Any proposal for registering a publication which may be used for the effective publication of new names and the original descriptions of new taxa by inclusion in Appendix . . . must be submitted to the General Committee. Guidelines for criteria to be met by publications to be eligible for listing should be issued by the General Committee. We do not envisage that there would be any maximum limit to the number of publications which could be included in the Register.

There are of course two main forms of publication which would need to be dealt with: periodicals and separate publications such as books and independently published monographs. The following points should be included in the discussion of criteria for registration of publications.

We consider that the criteria for the registration of periodicals should require the *editor* to apply to the General Committee for registration. Information to be supplied by editors should include the title, publisher, place of publication, a statement that for each issue the date of publication can be determined,

and an indication that a minimum number of copies of each issue (simultaneously produced) will be distributed to the general public or to botanical institutions. (It may be useful if the General Committee were provided with a list of libraries which regularly receive copies.)

The publication of separate publications, such as books and independently published monographs, pose special problems. They have not been specifically excluded from the above proposal, but if they were to be included by the General Committee, it is suggested that they would have to be subject to the same regulations as the periodicals and would need to be registered before publication. It may be simpler for such publications to be made ineligible for registration. Then, in order to effectively publish under the Code authors would have to extract at least nomenclaturally relevant material to be published in one of the approved publications.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Hansjoerg Eichler for urging us to formulate these proposals (instead of just talking about them). His considerable nomenclatural experience and guidance has assisted us greatly in the preparation of this note.

Literature Cited

Brummitt, R. K. 1980. Questions of effective publication. *Taxon* 29: 477–483.

Dahlgren, R. and I. Friis. 1981. A note on effective publication. *Taxon* 30: 499–501.

Eichler, Hj. 1981. A further note on effective publication. *Taxon* 30: 501.

Weresub, L. K. and J. McNeill. 1980. Effective publication under the Code of Botanical Nomenclature. *Taxon* 29: 471–476.

Proposed by: R. J. Hnatiuk, Bureau of Flora and Fauna, G.P.O. Box 1383, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601, Australia and J. G. West, Australian National Herbarium, CSIRO, G.P.O. Box 1600, Canberra, A.C.T. 2601, Australia.

(230) Proposal to amend Art. 29.1 by adding the italicized words so that the first sentence begins "Publication *of any action affecting nomenclature* is effected . . . ."

The proposed amendment attempts to spell out what, obviously, the majority of taxonomists consider self-evident. At the Sydney Congress, a similar proposal from the floor was not accepted, although it was pointed out that this kind of amendment would fill a real gap in the Code (for discussion, see Englera 2: 68–69. 1982).

Effective publication is a basic prerequisite of valid publication. Further, everybody obviously agrees that, in order to be acceptable (priorable), nomenclatural actions such as selection between names of equal priority (Arts. 57.2 and 64.4), or between alternative orthographic variants (Art. 75.2), must be effectively published. The only difference of opinion might concern the selection of lectotypes and neotypes: indeed, occasional examples in the literature show that, in the absence of an explicit rule, some botanists have automatically adopted (and thus "validated") lectotype designations previously written on herbarium specimens by another author who never published them in print. I feel, however, that it would be contrary to the spirit of the Code to consider unpublished (frequently undated) type designations binding. Typification determines the application of names and cannot be fixed by information that has not been effectively published.

There are several alternative ways available in writing in this requirement in Art. 29 (see l.c.) or elsewhere in the Code; the amendment proposed here is one of the briefest.

Proposed by: Pekka Isoviita, Botanical Museum, University of Helsinki, Unioninkatu 44, SF-00170 Helsinki, Finland.

(231)-(242) Proposals to improve the Code.

The following proposals are suggested as a result of my own work with the Code or of observations made by students who have challenged me with apparent contradictions or inconsistencies.