to the Code. This would eliminate the current chaos and save zoologists and the Commission unnecessary work'. They proposed that the Commission should issue such a Declaration.

(7) Support for the proposal from Drs Pulawski and Kerzhner has been received from G.C.D. Griffiths (*Edmonton, Canada*), U. Kallweit (*Dresden, Germany*), A.L. Ozerov (*Moscow, Russia*), A.C. Pont (*Goring-on-Thames, U.K.*) and K. Rognes (*Stavanger, Norway*).

(8) O. Kraus

Zoologisches Institut und Museum, Universität Hamburg, Martin-Luther-King Platz 3, 20146 Hamburg, Germany

Stability of nomenclature is one of the basic aims of the Code, and this is of necessity linked to stability of the Code itself. The present edition should remain the basis for many years. Its provisions, specifically including Article 74.7.3, are the result of years of open discussions. Perhaps that Article is not truly fundamental, or it could be improved in its wording, but I am very strongly against its deletion. Amendments to the Code, if any, should be limited to real essentials, and changes which are said to be 'minor' should await the development of some future edition.

(9) A.P. Rasnitsyn

Paleontological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, 117868 Moscow, Russia

I wish to join the protest against Article 74.7.3. I have designated tens of lectotypes in a single publication, and it would be absurd if I had to explain the self-evident necessity to designate lectotypes of old and often confused species-group names under each individual type or species. In designating lectotypes a worker clears the field of taxonomy for future generations of colleagues in a comparatively safe way. I firmly believe that lectotype designations should be considered an important part of a taxonomist's professional activity, and particularly so for the everyday curatorial responsibility for the animal groups of which he or she has intimate knowledge. In my opinion Article 74.7.3 weakens the value of the type principle. It suggests that lectotype designation is appropriate only in cases of direct necessity (i.e. in cases of doubtful application of the name). This might be taken as a reason to consider *all* type designations as redundant unless there is a definite ambiguity in name application.

(10) F.C. Thompson

Systematic Entomology Laboratory, USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

Contrary to Drs Pulawski and Kerzhner (see (5) above), what became Article 74.7.3 was widely publicized during the development of the Code. For example, Article 74a of the Discussion Draft of which more than 1000 copies were issued in May 1995 stated 'a lectotype designation made after 19.. must give the author's reasons for believing that the designation is necessary', and this was flagged as a significant new proposal on p. 3 of the accompanying Explanatory Notes, in the Bulletin (BZN **52**: 123, June 1995), and elsewhere. In the ensuing discussions (which involved more than 500 zoologists at meetings and in written and electronic correspondence) there was very little expressed opposition to this, although Dr

Comments on Article 74.7.3 of the Code (requirement for an express statement of the taxonomic purpose of a lectotype designation), including a proposal that it should be revoked

Article 74.7 of the Code reads: 'To be valid, a lectotype designation made after 1999 must . . . [74.7.3] contain an express statement of the taxonomic purpose of the designation'.

There was no requirement for such a statement in the previous (1985) edition of the Code, which prescribed (as does the current edition) that 'each designation . . . must have as its object the definition of the taxon'.

(1) W.J. Pulawski

California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California 94118, U.S.A.

As a practicing taxonomist I feel obliged to protest against the Article 74.7.3 that first appeared in the new edition of the Code. In my view, this Article is objectionable and unnecessary for two reasons:

1. It requires a justification of the obvious. It is true that there are some rare cases of very unsatisfactory lectotype designations (e.g., specimens unsuitable for identification purposes are designated when better specimens are present; or a lectotype is selected from a mixed series, changing the established species concept or resulting in some other negative nomenclatural impact). Unfortunately we have no protection mechanism against unqualified work, and the formal statement required by the new Code adds nothing to the quality of lectotype designations. There is no need to justify in words the usual process of typification, the importance of which is clearly stated in Article 61.1. It is also inconsistent to require such a statement for lectotype designations when no similar provision is made for holotype designations.

2. Since every designation of a lectotype has to be individual (Article 74.3), the provision requires multiple repetitions when more than one lectotype is being designated in a paper. For example, I am preparing a large paper on *Tachysphex* wasps in which some 40 lectotypes are designated. Article 74.7.3 forces me to repeat 40 times the formula 'here designated in order to ensure the name's proper and consistent application'. I find this to be ridiculous.

I would strongly recommend that this ill-conceived innovation in the Code be deleted as soon as possible.

(2) Subsequently Dr Pulawski informed the Commission Secretariat that he had circulated his letter to more than 200 zoologists worldwide, and copies of it, with small individual variations, have been received from C. van Achterberg (*Leiden, The Netherlands*), H. Dollfuss (*Mank, Austria*), F. Gusenleitner and J. Gusenleitner (*Linz, Austria*), J. Klimaszewski (*Sainte-Foy, Québec, Canada*), M. Kuhlmann (*Münster, Germany*), J. Leclercq (*Liège, Belgium*), A.S. Menke (*Bisbee, Arizona, U.S.A.*), M. Ohl (*Berlin, Germany*) and M. Schwarz (*Ansfelden, Austria*). Support for Dr Pulawski's letter has also been received from C.L. Bellamy (*Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.*), P. Dessart (*Bruxelles, Belgium*), P.K.L. Ng (*Singapore*), J.S. Noyes (*London, U.K.*) and F. Ronquist (*Uppsala, Sweden*).