And this task is so difficult that it may be doubted if we will ever get to the end of it. Mayr's book, *Systematics and the Origin of Species* therefore, is already a failure in its title.

The Subspecies (Race) as a Partial Subcategory of the Species

It has been known for a long time that certain species split into subspecies or races. Linnaeus and Fabricius commonly speak of "varieties." Kant (1775) was the first who recognized the difference between species, subspecies, and variety. Esper (1781, *De Varietatibus*) clearly defined: "Subspecies which are generally called varieties, are to be clearly separated from them. That they took their origin from species, is clearly revealed by the perfect similarity of the essential parts."

The subspecies was first introduced into zoological nomenclature by the ornithologist H. Schlegel (1844) who added a third Latin name to the name of the species (trinary nomenclature). This practice was taken up later by entomologists and is sanctioned today by the International Rules of Nomenclature. With Darwin's *Origin of Species* (1859) began a movement which can be designated as devaluation of the species. Through the fusion of the doctrine of *Formenkreis* (Kleinschmidt) and *Rassenkreis* (Rensch) with the evolution theory the cult of races came into full swing. Originally destined to cleanse the "Augean stable" (Kleinschmidt) of ornithological nomenclature, it was eagerly seized upon by the neodarwinists (Huxley, Rensch, Mayr) and proclaimed as "one of the most productive working hypotheses of taxonomy" (Mayr). All this led to an inflation of infraspecific nomenclature, which is a symptom of decline and deterioration of present-day systematics. Taxonomy is being reduced to an affair of nomenclature. Systematics becomes the science which gives a great many names to the same thing. According to Burt (1954, p. 99) 150 subspecies have been described for *Thomomys bottae* alone, and there are more to come! Wilson and Brown (1953, p. 102) characterize the situation with the following remark: "From our experience in the literature we are convinced that the subspecies concept is the most critical and disorderly area of modern systematic theory."

Because of the abuse of "subspecies" in zoological nomenclature some authors "wish to abolish trinominalism root and branch" (Huxley). With that, there would be an end to "the tyranny of subspecific names." Such a panacea might be considered a successful solution in the case of many so-called "races" mentioned in the literature, for instance, those of *Passer domesticus* and *Phasianus colchicus* in Kleinschmidt (1926), or those of *Cyclophorus perdix* in Rensch (1934), or those of *Mimegralla albimana* in Hennig (1950, p. 136). But things are not so simple if we look a little deeper into the matter and consult nature, instead of literature. "Study nature, not books," Agassiz used to say.

If we want to find out whether actual "subspecies" do exist in nature, we must proceed from the species. Only in well worked genera whose species are sufficiently known can the study of infraspecific variation be undertaken with any prospect of success. Now experience teaches that some species have a tendency to form races, others not. "The multiplicity of races of natural as well as of cultivated species is extraordinarily different. Without perceptible reason, we see that some species break up into a vast number of hereditary races (for instance, *Daphnia longispina*), while closely related species (*Daphnia pulex*) do not" (Woltereck, 1931, p. 290). The same observation can be made in ants. We find monotypic species together with polytypic ones, sometimes in the same genus. *Eciton hamatum* is constant, *E. vagans* and *burchelli* split up into races. Wheeler (1936, p. 176) writes of *Termitopone commutata*: "The stability of the ant is attested by the fact that, so far as known, it exhibits neither