

## CORRESPONDENCE

Sir:

I was sorry to see Mayr's misrepresentation (*Oiseau*, 1966, 35 no. spec.: 93) of my proposals (*Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*, 1961, 137: 623-626) for the alphabetical sequence of taxa reproduced in *The Auk*, 84: 145, 1967, especially as he has since corrected himself. I should like to recall that an integral part of my proposals was that, in listing the species of a genus, species-groups should be designated and the reasons therefore published. Can anyone seriously maintain that this is an "unheuristic" and "intellectually lazy solution" of our present horrible muddles? Lazy compared with those taxonomists who arrange a sequence without giving any reasons and without giving in their sequence any indication of where they conceive close affinities to begin and to end? Incidentally, I wonder how many readers of Austin's "special review" failed, like myself, to get the full flavour of "unheuristic." Well, "heuristic" means "serving to find out or discover" (O.E.D.); to apply the reverse of this word to my proposals is singularly inappropriate.

Now, after seven years more experience since I wrote my paper in 1961, I should of course advocate the designation of superspecies as well as species-groups in any formal list. For this purpose my original typographical device could easily be amplified, while that of Amadon (*Syst. Zool.*, 15: 245-249, 1966) is complementary.—R. E. MOREAU, *Curlews, Sutton St. Nicholas, Hereford, England.*