

Article 74.7.3 of the Code: proposed deletion

W.J. Pulawski & I.M. Kerzhner

Pulawski, W.J. & Kerzhner, I.M. 2001. Article 74.7.3 of the Code: proposed deletion. *Zoosystematica Rossica*, **10**(1): 1-7.

Publication of the full original text of the proposal, which appeared in "The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" (vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 133-140) in considerably shortened form. The authors appeal to zoologists to send messages to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature informing on their attitude to the proposal.

Wojciech J. Pulawski, *California Academy of Sciences, Golden Gate Park, San Francisco, California 94118, USA; e-mail: wpulawski@calacademy.org*

Izясlav M. Kerzhner, *Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia; e-mail: kim@ik3599.spb.edu*

Introduction

The proposal published below was sent to the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and to all members of the Commission in February 2001. The proposal has not been put to a vote under Article 16.1.1 of the Commission Constitution and has been published within a discussion in "The Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" (vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 133-140) in considerably shortened form with omission of some important arguments. We appeal to all zoologists agreeing or disagreeing with the deletion of Article 74.7.3 to send a brief message to the Secretariat of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (e-mail: iczn@nhm.ac.uk) stating their attitude to the proposal, e.g., "I support (do not support) deletion of Article 74.7.3. Name, Address". This is the best way to inform the Commission on the opinion of the zoological community. We will be thankful for copying your message to the first author (e-mail: wpulawski@calacademy.org).

Proposal

1. Article 74.7.3, which has first appeared in the Fourth Edition of the Code, requires that "to be valid, a lectotype designation made after 1999

must contain an express statement of the taxonomic purpose of the designation". On 21 November 2000 W. J. Pulawski sent a letter to the Secretary of the Commission arguing for deletion of the Article from the Code. Copies of the letter were circulated to more than 200 zoologists worldwide, several dozens of whom replied. Most, but not all, agreed with the proposal, and some have written to the Secretary. Some of their comments are discussed below. Independently, a discussion of the Article occurred on the Internet on the TAXACOM webpage. To evaluate the observance of the Article in current publications, a random search of the literature was performed (see Appendix).

2. The meaning of the Article is not clear. Some colleagues believe that lectotypes should be designated only from mixed type series (i.e., including two or more species or subspecies), but this is not stated explicitly in the Code. Most give other reasons for lectotype designations, e.g., fixation of a taxonomic concept, or a higher accuracy based on a single name-bearing type (preference for one specimen as name-bearing type is clearly expressed in Recommendation 73A for designating holotypes). In Article 74.3 it is unclear whether the statement must be repeated for every lectotype designated

or whether the statement can be presented only once in a given work, as is the common practice for similar repetitive statements (e.g., “all lectotypes are deposited... “ or “... are provided with an additional red label ...”). No guidelines are provided in the Code.

3. The Article requires a justification of the obvious. It is true that some rare lectotype designations are failures (e.g., specimens unsuitable for identification purposes are designated when better specimens exist; or a lectotype is selected from a mixed series, changing the established species concept). However, no protection mechanism exists against poor quality work, and similar failures may occur with holotype designations or fixations of type species. The formal statement required by the new Code adds nothing to the quality of lectotype designation, and there is no need to justify in words the usual process of typification, the importance of which is already stated in Article 61.1. For the same reason and to the same effect, the Code might as well require justification of the taxonomic purpose of each new holotype and each new taxon (“this genus is established for a better understanding of biological diversity”).

4. Some believe that the Article’s intention is to prevent lectotype designations by non-specialists or for curatorial purposes, but the Code does not say that lectotypes should be designated by a specialist, nor does it prevent designations made for the sole purpose of increasing the number of lectotypes in an institutional or personal collection (to which a statement like “designated to increase stability of nomenclature” could be easily added).

The Code, in fact, supports publication of lists of types. Recommendation 72.F.4 states that “Every institution in which name-bearing types are deposited should ... publish lists of name-bearing types in its possession or custody”. For example, Chérot & Pauwels (2000) published a list of types (not a taxonomic revision) in which they designated 23 lectotypes. For each designation they used a statement “Afin de lever tous risques d’ambiguïté concernant le taxon nominal du niveau espèce défini par ostension comme [name, author, date], nous en avons sélectionné le lectotype”. If indeed the intention of Article 74.7.3 was to prevent lectotype designation as a curatorial practice, it failed, only resulting in lengthy repetition. Another list by Pesenko

(2000), who designated 41 lectotypes, has only one statement in the Introduction, here translated from Russian: “Lectotypes are designated in order to provide objective standards for application of names”. But the 17 lectotype designations, partly from mixed series, in the type list by Glaubrecht & Salvado-Vargas (2000), are invalid only because of absence of such a statement.

5. A statement of the taxonomic purpose of lectotype designation was never required or recommended in the previous editions of the Code (neither is it required by the other codes of biological nomenclature), a need for it was never widely discussed, and it seldom occurred in pre-2000 publications. It is not surprising that most authors, reviewers, and editors overlooked the new requirement. A contributing factor is that many academic centers, let alone countries, do not have a copy of the current Code.

We have searched electronically the volumes of the Zoological Record that are available on-line (vol. 115-136, for 1978-2000). These volumes list a total of 10,123 publications in which lectotypes have been designated, the annual average being 460. For volumes 133-136 (1997-2000) the annual average was 597, and 759 papers are listed in volume 136 (2000), demonstrating an increasing trend. We randomly checked 60 papers that appeared in 2000 and January 2001 and found that 50 (83%) included no statement of taxonomic purpose. The lectotypes designated without such statement totaled 138, averaging 2.7 per publication. There was no significant geographic difference between the works that provided a statement of purpose (Belgium, France, Germany, Russia, and USA) and those that did not (Australia, Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Switzerland, United Kingdom, and USA), and most of the invalid designations were published in prestigious journals or series. Based on this analysis, one can extrapolate that at least 600 publications and 1,600 lectotype designations have not followed Article 74.7.3 in the year 2000 alone (at a rate of 50 publications and 130 designations per month). The number of invalid designations will certainly increase in the near future.

6. According to Article 86.1.1, the Commission should be asked to validate designations in the works that were explicitly submitted for publication before 1 January 2000. The Commission should consider them (without preliminary notification), publish corresponding rulings, and add

the names to the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology. This procedure would require a great amount of the authors' and commissioners' time and result in cluttering the Official List, without effectively improving the nomenclature. In addition, it is not clear how to deal with those papers published in 2000 that contain no submission date (about half of the papers examined). Going to correspondence with the authors and/or journal editors on this matter is hardly a practical option.

The authors who submitted manuscripts after 31 December 1999 should probably republish their designations if Article 74.7.3 remains in power or perhaps only publish the lacking statement(s) of the taxonomic purpose, in accordance with Article 10.1.1. This again would result in a loss of researchers' time without really helping taxonomy. As the designations will be credited to the later date and maybe even to another author, republications will create further confusion.

Adding to the confusion is the fact that volume 136 of Zoological Record does not distinguish between the designations that comply with Article 74.7.3 and those that do not comply.

7. In conclusion, Article 74.7.3 does not contain anything positive for nomenclature and is destabilizing. In our opinion, the current situation must be urgently corrected, and elimination of the Article from the Code is the only reasonable solution (this change would affect no other part of the Code, including the Recommendations). If two thirds of the Commissioners agree that deletion of the Article is not a major change of the Code, the Commission may immediately publish an appropriate Declaration (Code, Articles 78.3.2, 80.1; Constitution, Article 16.1.1). This will eliminate the current chaos and save the zoologists and Commission unnecessary work.

8. We are submitting this proposal to the Secretary and all the members of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. We are asking the Secretariat to organize a vote of the Commission to determine whether the proposed deletion of Article 74.7.3 is a minor change. If this motion is not supported by two thirds of the Commissioners, we are requesting that the procedure for major changes of the Code be used, as described in Article 16.1 of the Constitution.

APPENDIX

A. Works containing a statement of the taxonomic purpose of the lectotype designations

1. Assing, V. 2000. A taxonomic and phylogenetic revision of Maorothiini trib. n. from the New Zealand subregion (Coleoptera: Staphylinidae, Staphylininae). *Beiträge zur Entomologie*, **50**(1): 3-64. (2 lectotypes).
2. Chérot, F. & Pauwels, O.S.G. 2000. Les spécimens-types de Miridae (Insecta: Heteroptera) des collections du Musée Royal de l'Afrique centrale (Tervuren, Belgique). *Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale Tervuren, Belgique. Documentation Zoologique*, **24**: 1-23. (23 lectotypes).
3. Gayubo, S.F. & Felton, J.C. 2000. The European species of the genus *Nitela* Latreille, 1809 (Hymenoptera: Sphecidae). *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France* (N.S.), **36**(3): 291-313. (1 lectotype).
4. Kasantsev, S. 2000. To the knowledge of the African subgenus *Planeteros* of the genus *Melaneros* (Coleoptera: Lycidae). *Beiträge zur Entomologie*, **50**(1): 103-118. (5 lectotypes).
5. Keyrematen, R.A.K., Andersen, T. & Sæther, O.A. 2000. A review of Oriental *Rheotanytarsus* Thienemann & Bause, with descriptions of some new species (Insecta, Diptera, Chironomidae). *Spixiana*, **23**(3): 225-258. (1 lectotype).
6. Menke, A.S. & Pulawski, W.J. 2000. A review of the *Sphex flavipennis* species-group (Hymenoptera: Apoidea: Sphecidae: Sphecini). *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*, **9**(2): 324-346. (1 lectotype).
7. Pesenko, Yu.A. 2000. *Catalogue of type specimens in the collection of the Zoological Institute RAS. Hymenopterous insects, no. 1. Superfamily Apoidea: genera Psithyrus Lepeletier, 1832 and Apis Linnaeus, 1758*. 28 p. St.Petersburg. (In Russian). (41 lectotypes; general statement of the taxonomic purpose in the Introduction).
8. Ward, P. 2000. On the identity of *Pheidole vasliti* Pergande (Hymenoptera: Formicidae), a neglected ant from Baja California. *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*, **9**(1): 85-98. (1 lectotype).
9. Zorn, C. 2000. Die Arten der *Anomala porovatula* Ohaus-Gruppe von Sumatra (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Rutelinae). *Beiträge zur Entomologie*, **50**(1): 79-89. (2 lectotypes).

B. Work with valid and invalid lectotype designations

10. Roisin, Y. & Pasteels, J.M. 2000. The genus *Mictocerotermes* (Isoptera: Termitidae) in New Guinea and the Solomon Islands. *Invertebrate Taxonomy*, **14**(2): 137-174. (2 lectotypes, *Termes biroi brevior* with a statement "designated here, to fix type colony", *M. papuanus* with no statement; received 9 March 1999, accepted 24 Nov. 1999).

C. Works with delinquent lectotype designations (in violation of Article 74.7.3)

11. Baehr, M. 2000. Review of the *Pericalus guttatus*-complex (Insecta, Coleoptera, Carabidae, Lebiina). *Spixiana*, **23**(1): 33-39. (1 lectotype from a mixed series(!), but no express statement; no submission date).
12. Caldara, R. 2000. Revisione dei *Pachytychius* delle regioni Afrotropicale e Orientale (Coleoptera Curculionidae). *Memorie della Società Entomologica Italiana*, **78**: 131-166. (7 lectotypes; no submission date).
13. Chérot, F. & Pauwels, O.S.G. 2000. Révision du genre *Peltidiopsis* Poppius, 1912, avec description d'une espèce nouvelle de Papouasie et d'un genre nouveau d'Australie (Insecta, Heteroptera, Miridae, Mirini). *Zoosystema*, **22**(1): 121-137. (1 lectotype; submitted 22 Oct. 1998).
14. Davie, P.J.F. & Ng, P.K.L. 2000. *Bountiana*, a new genus for *Eriphia norfolcensis* Grant & McCulloch, 1907 (Crustacea: Brachyura: Eriphiidae). *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum*, **45**(2): 267-272. (1 lectotype; submitted or accepted 21 March 2000).
15. Fernandes, J.A.M. & Doesburg, P.H. van. 2000. The *E. dolichocera*-group of *Edessa* Fabricius, 1803 (Heteroptera: Pentatomidae: Edessinae). *Zoologische Mededelingen*, Leiden, **73**: 303-315. (2 lectotypes; no submission date).
16. Ferrer, J. 2000. Réhabilitation de *Peltoides capensis* Fähræus (1870), bona species, non junior synonym de *Peltoides senegalensis* Laporte de Castelnau (1832) (Coleoptera, Tenebrionidae). *Nouvelle Revue d'Entomologie* (N.S.), **16**(4), (1999): 387-388. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
17. Gibson, G. 2000. Differentiation of the species of *Urolepis* (Hymenoptera: Chalcidoidea: Pteromalidae), potential biocontrol agents of filth flies (Diptera: Muscidae). *The Canadian Entomologist*, **132**: 391-410. (1 lectotype; submitted 11 Jan. 2000).
18. Glaubrecht, M. & Salcedo-Vargas, M.A. 2000. Annotated type catalogue of the Cephalopoda (Mollusca) in the Museum für Naturkunde, Humboldt University of Berlin. *Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin, Zoologische Reihe*, **76**: 269-282. (17 lectotypes; submitted March 2000).
19. Gomy, Y. & Vienna, P. 2000. I *Chalcionellus* Reichardt, 1832 della fauna afro-tropicale (Coleoptera, Histeridae). *Nouvelle Revue d'Entomologie* (N.S.), **16**(4), (1999): 343-355. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
20. Gorczyca, J. 2000. A systematic study on Cylapinae with a revision of the Afrotropical Region (Heteroptera, Miridae). *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach*, no. 1863. 176 pp. (4 lectotypes; no submission date, but sent to printer in April 2000).
21. Hellermann, J. 2000. The taxonomic status of *Acanthosaura fruhstorferi* Werner, 1904 and *Calotes brevipes* Werner, 1904 (Squamata, Agamidae). *Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin, Zoologische Reihe*, **76**(1): 143-150. (2 lectotypes; received Sept. 1998, accepted Jan. 2000).
22. Hernando, C. & Ribera, I. 2000. Notes on Limnichidae (Coleoptera): *Cyrtolimnichus punctulatus* Deleue new junior synonym of *Simpliocarina curticolis* Pic. *The Coleopterists Bulletin*, **54**(3): 291. (1 lectotype; received 10 Nov. 1999; accepted 2 Febr. 2000).
23. Hinz, R. & Horstmann, K. 2000. Die westpaläarktischen Arten von *Exephanes* Wesmäl (Insecta, Hymenoptera, Ichneumonidae, Ichneumoninae). *Spixiana*, **23**(1): 15-32. (4 lectotypes; no submission date).
24. Huber, B. 2000. New World pholcid spiders (Araneae: Pholcidae): a revision at generic level. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*, **254**: 1-348. (9 lectotypes; no submission date).
25. Kennedy, J.A. 2000. Resolving the "*Jaspis stellifera*" complex. *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum*, **45**(2): 453-476. (Porifera; 2 lectotypes; submitted or accepted 20 Oct. 1999).
26. Klimaszewski, J., Uhlig, M. & Maus, C. 2000. Diversity of *Aleochara* species in Madagascar (Coleoptera Staphylinidae Aleocharinae). *Belgian Journal of Entomology*, **2**: 227-256. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
27. Kononenko, V.S. 2000. A review of the *Maliattha vialis* species-group (Lepidoptera, Noctuidae, Acontiinae) with description of four new species. *Insecta Koreana*, **17**(1/2): 39-50. (1 lectotype; received 15 Feb. 2000).
28. Kozár, F. & Miller, D.R. 2000. World revision of *Ortheziola* Šulc (Homoptera: Coccoidea: Ortheziidae) with description of eleven new species. *Systematic Entomology*, **25**(1): 15-45. (2 lectotypes; accepted 3 Dec. 1998).
29. Lesaye, C. 2000. A propos de la série type d'*Altica ignita* Illiger, 1807 (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae). *Nouvelle Revue d'Entomologie* (N.S.), **16**(4), (1999): 373-376. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
30. MacRae, T.C. 2000. Review of the genus *Purpuricenus* Dejean (Coleoptera, Cerambycidae) in North America. *Pan-Pacific Entomologist*, **76**: 137-169. (1 lectotype; received 18 Aug. 1999, accepted 7 Feb. 2000).
31. Mauriès, J.-P. & Geoffroy, J.-J. 2000. Nouvelle description, classification, répartition et variations morphologiques interpopulations d'un diplopede troglodyte du sud-est du Brésil (Diplopoda, Polydesmida, Chelodesmidae). *Zoosystema*, **22**(1): 153-168. (1 lectotype; submitted 4 Nov. 1998).
32. Miller, K.B. 2001. Revision and phylogenetic analysis of the New World genus *Neochypeodytes* Young (Coleoptera: Dytiscidae: Hydroporini: Bidessini). *Systematic Entomology*, **26**: 87-123. (15 lectotypes; accepted 22 Feb. 2000).
33. Norris, K.R. 2000. Lectotype designation and description of the Tasmanian blowfly *Calliphora dispar* Macquart 1846 (Diptera: Calliphoridae). *Australian Journal of Entomology*, **39**: 256-258 (1 lectotype; accepted 9 June 2000).
34. Orousset, J. 2000. Coléoptères hypogés de Corse. XXX. Le genre *Paramaurops* (Coleoptera, Pselaphidae). *Nouvelle Revue d'Entomologie* (N.S.), **16**(3), (1999): 269-280. (3 lectotypes; no submission date).

35. Pomorski, R.J. 2000. New data on European *Hymenaphorura* (Bagnall, 1948) (Collembola: Onychiuridae). *Genus*, **11**(4): 511-520. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
36. Puplesis, R. & Robinson, G.S. 2000. A review of the Central and South American Nepticulidae (Lepidoptera) with special reference to Belize. *Bulletin of the Natural History Museum. Entomology Series*, **69**: 1-114. (6 lectotypes; no submission date).
37. Rausch, R. & Adams, A.M. 2000. Natural transfer of helminths of marine origin to freshwater fishes, with observations on the development of *Diphyllbothrium alascense*. *Journal of Parasitology*, **86**(2): 319-327. (1 lectotype, a figure from the original work, syntypes are lost); received 15 Jan. 1999).
38. Roach, A.M.E. 2000. Review of the Australian species of the dermestid genus *Anthrenocerus* Arrow (Coleoptera: Dermestidae). *Invertebrate Taxonomy*, **14**(2): 175-224. (13 lectotypes; received 7 Oct. 1997, accepted 8 June 1999).
39. Russell, L.M. 2000. Notes on the family Aleyrodidae and its subfamilies: redescription of the genus *Aleurocybotus* Quaintance and Baker and description of *Vasdavidius*, a new genus (Homoptera: Aleyrodidae). *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, **102**(2): 374-383. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
40. Sassi, D. & Kismali, S. 2000. The Cryptocephalinae of Turkey, with annotations on their distribution and ecology. *Memorie della Società Entomologica Italiana*, **78**, (1999): 71-129. (2 lectotypes; no submission date).
41. Savitskii, M.Yu. 2000. New and little-known species of seed-beetles from the genus *Spermophagus* (Coleoptera, Bruchidae). *Zoologicheskii Zhurnal*, **79**(5): 556-563 (in Russian). (3 lectotypes; received 3 March 1998).
42. Schauff, M.E. & Garrison, R. 2000. An introduced species of *Epichrysocharis* (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae) producing galls on *Eucalyptus* in California with notes on the described species and placement of the genus. *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*, **9**(1): 176-181. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
43. Schmidt, C. 2000. Redescription of *Platyctoniscus spinosus* Herold, 1932 (Crustacea, Isopoda, Oniscidea) from Indonesia. *Mitteilungen aus dem Museum für Naturkunde in Berlin, Zoologische Reihe*, **76**(1): 61-74. (1 lectotype; received Jan. 1999).
44. Schmidt, K. 2000. Bestimmungstabelle der Gattung *Cerceris* Latreille, 1802 in Europa, dem Kaukasus, Kleinasien, Palästina und Nordafrika (Hymenoptera, Sphecidae, Philanthinae). *Stapfia*, **71**: 1-325. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
45. Schöller, M. 2000. The genus *Acolastus* Gerstaecker, with revision of the *A. callosus* species-group (Coleoptera: Chrysomelidae: Cryptocephalinae). *Genus*, **11**(4): 541-571. (3 lectotypes; no submission date).
46. Schrödl, M. 2000a. Taxonomic revision of the common South American nudibranch *Anisodoris fontaini* (d'Orbigny, 1837), with discussion on its systematic placement. *Journal of Molluscan Studies*, **66**(1): 9-81. (1 lectotype; received 16 Dec. 1998, accepted 12 May 1999).
47. Schrödl, M. 2000b. Revision of the nudibranch genus *Cadlina* (Gastropoda: Opisthobranchia) from the Southern Ocean. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, **80**(2): 299-309. (1 lectotype; submitted 10 May 1999).
48. Sharkey, M., Finnell, K., Leathers, J., & Fiana, J. 2000. Microgastrinae (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) parasitoids of *Colias lesbia* (Fabricius) (Lepidoptera: Pieridae). *Journal of Hymenoptera Research*, **9**(1): 108-110. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
49. Schuh, R.T. 2000. Revision of *Oligotylus* Van Duzee with descriptions of ten new species from Western North America and comments on *Lepidargyrus* in the Nearctic (Heteroptera: Miridae: Phyllinae: Phyllini). *American Museum Novitates*, **3300**: 1-44. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
50. Skarżyński, D. 2000. A redescription of *Ceratophylla stercoraria* (Stach, 1963) (Collembola: Hypogastruridae). *Genus*, **11**(1): 1-6. (1 lectotype; no submission date).
51. Ślipiński, S.A. & Jadwiszczak, A. 2000. Two new species of *Monocoryna* Gorham, 1885 from the Philippines (Coleoptera: Coccinellidae), with notes on some known species. *Annales Zoologici* (Warsaw), **50**(1): 1-5. (2 lectotypes; received 20 Jan. 2000).
52. Smith, A.B.T. & Paucar, C.A. 2000. Taxonomic review of *Platycoelia lutescens* (Scarabaeidae: Rutelinae: Anoplognathini) and a description of its use as food by the people of the Ecuadorian highlands. *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, **93**(3): 408-414. (1 lectotype; accepted 23 Nov. 1999).
53. Steenius, J. van. 2000. The West-Palaearctic species of *Spilomyia* Meigen (Diptera, Syrphidae). *Mitteilungen der Schweizerischen Entomologischen Gesellschaft*, **73**(1-2): 143-168. (2 lectotypes, one from a mixed series, but no express statement of the taxonomic purpose; received 25 March 1999, accepted 18 Jan. 2000).
54. Švec, Z. & Poneš, P. 2000. Taxonomical and biogeographical notes on the Phalacridae of Turkey (Coleoptera, Phalacridae). *Nouvelle Revue d'Entomologie* (N.S.), **16**(3), (1999): 231-247. (3 lectotypes; no submission date).
55. Tol, J. van. 2000. The Odonata of Sulawesi and adjacent Islands. Part 5. The genus *Protosticta* Selys (Platystictidae). *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie*, **143**: 221-266. (1 lectotype; received 1 Sept. 2000).
56. Viella, C.R. & Bächli, G. 2000. Morphological and ecological notes on the two species of *Drosophila* belonging to the subgenus *Siphodora* Patterson & Mainland, 1944 (Diptera, Drosophilidae). *Mitteilungen der Schweizerischen Entomologischen Gesellschaft*, **73**(1-2): 23-47. (1 lectotype; received 23 Dec. 1999, accepted 27 Jan. 2000).
57. Wesolowska, W. 2000. A redescription of *Lophostica mauricianae* Simon, 1902 (Araneae: Salticidae). *Genus*, **11**(1): 95-98 (1 lectotype; no submission date).
58. Williams, J.R. 2000. A revision of the Mascarene weevil genus *Szygops* Schönherr (Coleoptera: Curculionidae: Entiminae). *Invertebrate Taxonomy*, **14**(3): 411-432. (7 lectotypes; received 2 Feb. 1999, accepted 17 Dec. 1999).

59. Yagishita, N. & Nakabo, T. 2000. Revision of the genus *Girella* (Girellidae) from East Asia. *Ichthyological Research*, 47(2): 119-135. (1 lectotype; received 10 Febr. 1999).
60. Zur Strassen, R. 2000. Thysanopterologische Notizen (7) (Thysanoptera, Terebrantia). *Entomologische Nachrichten und Berichte*, 44(1): 25-34. (1 lectotype; no submission date).

Comments

The discussion in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature" (vol. 58, pp. 133-140) includes a comment by Rasnitsyn supporting our proposal and a list (pp. 133, 136) of 20 other zoologists who sent letters in support to the Commission.

The comment by Rider should be excluded. It was taken from the discussion in TAXACOM. Rider told us that he neither sent it to the Commission nor authorized anybody to do so, and that he would have stopped its publication, had he been informed about it, because he admitted his mistake long before. Actually, Rider, through misinterpretation, discussed Articles 74.7.1 and 74.7.2, and not Article 74.7.3, of which he, probably, was unaware. To obscure this fact, the crucial words in his text, "taxonomic statement of a lectotype designation" [i.e., statement that the lectotype is designated in the given paper], were changed in the "Bulletin" to "statement of the taxonomic purpose of a lectotype designation". In fact, Rider never stated the purpose of lectotype designation in his papers.

Webb and Hamilton discuss the admissible reasons for lectotype designation rather than the merits of Article 74.7.3 or lack thereof. Their views differ drastically. Webb apparently admits lectotype designation only for composite series. Hamilton admits lectotype designations when some of the syntypes are better than others (e.g., are better labelled, are more easily accessible, or belong to the sex that is easier to identify). His approach allows lectotype designation in many cases, except when all syntypes are equally good or when definitely only one syntype is present.

The remaining four comments, all opposing views, are by the members of the Editorial Committee of the Code.

Kraus is principally against changes in the Code. His opinion is difficult to reconcile with the fact that the Code and the Constitution of the Commission include provisions and procedures for changes of the Code, and even name special documents, Declarations, to be used.

Thompson stresses the wide distribution by the Commission of the information on the new requirement. His data are correct, but it is also correct that the absolute majority of zoologists were unaware of this requirement. Of the 60 papers examined by us in a random search, 83% lacked the required statement. In terms of statistics, this means that 78 to 88% of zoologists with 95% probability, or 76 to 90% with 99% probability were unaware. The actual level of awareness is even lower, as reviewers and editors should be included. The large countries and the most renowned taxonomic centers are no exception.

The situation is not comparable, say, to the requirement to designate the name-bearing type in the species group. In fact, designation of one specimen as the holotype ("type") was required by many serials (e.g., by Proceedings of the US National Museum since the 1890's!) long before it was recommended by the Code in 1961, and has become a nearly universal practice by 2000.

Ride argues that the presence of a statement of purpose prevents "careless or taxonomically unneeded lectotypification". Using published works (see above) we have demonstrated that presence or absence of a statement does not change anything. Ride thinks that some statements of purpose can be declared meaningless, but no guidelines exist either in the Code or in the opinion of zoologists (see above on Webb and Hamilton) to decide which statements of purpose are meaningless and which are not. For example Pesenko (2000) stated "Lectotypes are designated in order to provide objective standards for application of names". Such a statement can be added to any lectotype designation. It follows directly from Article 61.1 of the Code ("The fixation of the name-bearing type of a nominal taxon provides the objective standard of reference for the application of the name it bears"). Is such a statement meaningless? Or is the Article meaningless?

Contrary to Ride, we do not see how deletion of Article 74.7.3 can be destabilizing; as we have shown, it is its presence in the Code which may produce long-standing confusion and instability.

Tubbs cited Opinion 1828 as an example of problems caused by failures in selection of lectotypes. It is not the case. In fact, for two species of bumble bees, material in the Linnaeus collection contradicted the prevailing use of the

names. Were lectotypes designated or not, it was necessary to set aside this material and to designate neotypes.

The discussion shows that some of our opponents do not distinguish between purposes of identification and typification. For identification, it is desirable to compare the specimen with a large, representative sample of originally included (and/or authoritatively identified) specimens. The same is true for identification of a genus- or family-group taxon.

The purpose of typification is to provide maximum objectivity for the standard of a nominal taxon (name-bearing type). As long accepted by biologists, typification means designation as the name-bearing type of one (and only one!) of the originally included elements. Such element is a nominal genus in the family group, a nominal species in the genus group, and one specimen in the species group. A specimen is usually an individual, and exceptions are made when it is difficult to separate individuals (e.g., a colony, a slide, etc. in special cases in zoology and botany, or a strain in bacteriology). The statement of the Code, 3rd and 4th editions, that the totality of syntypes (i.e., all originally included specimens) may serve collectively as name-bearing type is an obvious abandonment of the principle of typification. This statement contradicts the concept of typification accepted for family-group and genus-group names in all biological codes and the concept accepted for the species-group names in the botanical and bacteriological

codes, the first two editions of the zoological code, and documents which preceded to it (see, e.g., Banks, N. and Caudell, A.N. 1912, *The Entomological Code*, p.14: "The type of a species is a single specimen").

Typification in the family and genus groups is now obligatory in all codes. Designation of a type strain is obligatory in bacteriology and of a holotype, since 1 January 1958, in botany. The botanical code recommends (not requires!) that lectotypes should be designated by those intimately knowing the group, but does not require any statements of the purpose of the lectotype designation.

The zoological code is now the only one not requiring holotype designation for newly established species and subspecies, declaring (in the 3rd and 4th editions) that syntypes may constitute a collective name-bearing type, and trying (in the 4th edition) to restrict lectotype designations. It is clear that some influential members of the Commission are opposed to typification in the species group, but their opinion is not shared by the majority of zoologists.

Our proposal was made after correspondence with many taxonomists. Some of them, clearly a minority, are against lectotype designations, and some even against holotype designations. But we hope that, after due consideration, even these colleagues will agree that Article 74.7.3 in its present form does not serve their wishes.

Received 10 September 2001