

By D. F. McMichael (*The Australian Museum, Sydney, Australia*)

I wish to record my opposition to the proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Pupa* Röding, 1798, and of the family name PUPIDAE for the opisthobranch group which includes *Pupa* Röding.

The names in the *Museum Boltenianum* have now been known to be acceptable nomenclatorially since the year 1926, when Opinion 96 was published. During the intervening 36 years these names have, for the most part, gained wide acceptance among active malacologists and have appeared in numerous reference works, taxonomic studies and check-lists. *Pupa* Röding is clearly established as the name for an opisthobranch genus in the minds of the majority of recent workers and stability of nomenclature would not be aided by its suppression in favour of the abandoned name *Solidula*.

A more reasonable approach towards achieving stability would be for workers generally to adopt those Röding names which are valid (as they have been clearly analysed by Winckworth) and to refrain from using the junior synonyms of Lamarck and later workers, a course of action which has been widely adopted in Australia.

The case of the family name PUPIDAE is a little different, for the name has been used until recent years by a few workers for the land snail family, though not widely amongst workers on terrestrial molluscs. In fact, the name PUPIDAE is not listed by Baker\* as pertaining to the PUPILLIDAE in the restricted sense, but as a synonym of CERIONIDAE. However, it cannot be denied that the vernacular term pupoid is still used by some workers for the small pupillid snails, and so some purpose might be served by not using PUPIDAE for the marine opisthobranch group. However, as an alternative name for the land snails, PUPILLIDAE, and the vernacular "pupillid" have gained general acceptance among terrestrial malacologists, and since PUPIDAE has appeared in a number of publications referring to the Opisthobranch family, it would seem that matters might be resolved in the simplest manner by confirming the names PUPILLIDAE for the land snails, PUPIDAE for the opisthobranchs and letting the old, invalid usages disappear with the passage of time.

By Myra Keen (*Stanford University, California, U.S.A.*)

The proposal that *Pupa* Röding, 1798, be suppressed seems to me not to be in the interests of stability. It is true that the name has been used in two or more widely different senses, but suppression will not erase this fact. No problem is involved other than the matter of inconvenience generated by the Commission's acceptance of the Röding work in Opinion 96, published in 1926. Since that date, workers have more and more consistently adopted the Röding generic names. To suppress them piece-meal at this time only adds to confusion. I therefore would urge that this proposal be rejected.

#### COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF *BIOMPHALARIA* PRESTON, 1910. Z.N.(S.) 1392

(see this volume, pages 39-41)

By R. Hubendick (*Naturhistoriska Museet, Göteborg, Sweden*)

Referring to Dr. C. A. Wright's application to the Commission to place *Biomphalaria* on the Official List of Generic Names and to suppress certain synonyms I wish to give the following comment.

I have for many years been working with Planorbidae both as a taxonomist and as an expert on problems concerning Bilharzia control. In both connections I have felt the urgent need of getting rid of the nomenclatural confusion of the

\* 1956, *Nautilus*, 69, pp. 128-139.



genus under consideration. As this genus has a considerable practical importance and has to be dealt with not only by zoologists but also by public health workers, etc., the best solution would be the one suggested by Dr. Wright.

By B. G. Peters (*Imperial College of Science and Technology, Field Station, Ascot, Berks.*)

I wish to support the four requests, (1) to (4) listed on page 41 of Dr. Wright's paper. I do so, not as having special knowledge of the systematics of gastropods but as a parasitologist whose tasks are made more difficult by the present confusion in the nomenclature of these vectors of *Schistosoma mansoni*.

By E. Binder (*Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Geneva, Switzerland*)

J'approuve entièrement la proposition de Dr. C. A. Wright d'adopter officiellement le nom *Biomphalaria* Preston et de supprimer les synonymes antérieurs, pour les raisons exposées par l'auteur.

Qu'il me soit permis de remarquer que cette manoeuvre n'aurait pas été nécessaire si les taxonomistes ne s'étaient pas excessivement hâtés d'imposer aux non-spécialistes des noms de genres dont ils ignoraient encore eux-mêmes le contenu exact. Il n'y avait pas grand inconvénient à laisser employer encore, provisoirement, le nom *Planorbis* au sens large. La raison d'être de la forme binominale est bien de fournir un élément de classification utilisable. Le terme *Planorbis* avait sans doute l'inconvénient, du point de vue des spécialistes, d'être un peu vague, mais il est moins grave et moins contraire à la logique d'employer un terme imprécis qu'un terme qui a des chances d'être faux.

By H. J. O'D. Burke-Gaffney (*Bureau of Hygiene and Tropical Diseases, London*)

I am neither a malacologist nor an expert taxonomist, but I have a special interest in the clarity of nomenclature of snail hosts of schistosomes in view of my responsibility for publication of the *Tropical Diseases Bulletin*.

I believe Mr. Wright's proposals add considerably to that clarity and thereby reduce much existing confusion for readers of papers on this subject: and because of their retention, also, of some present well-known names, I consider that the proposals will be particularly welcome to those without specialized taxonomic knowledge who are, nevertheless, constantly concerned in referring to the molluscan hosts concerned.

From the standpoint of an editor of scientific publications I therefore support Mr. Wright's application.

By V. de V. Clark (*Research Laboratory, Causeway, Salisbury, Rhodesia & Nyasaland*)

We have studied Dr. Wright's proposals to the Commission to suppress the generic names *Planorbina*, *Taphius* and *Armigerus* in favour of the genus *Biomphalaria* Preston, 1910. He is not alone in his opinions, and he is certainly correct in his statements that the name *Biomphalaria* is universally known and used by workers on the African continent, and a change in this well established name would lead to considerable confusion among all but malacologists.

We have had little experience with the South American forms referred to by Dr. Wright but we are prepared to accept his opinion based on his widespread knowledge, especially when it is backed by Drs. Barbosa, Hubendick and Abdel-Malek (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (13) 4 : 371-375, 1961).

The adoption of his principles will lead to the standardisation of nomenclature in this group which has enough confusing taxonomic features without additional difficulties due to names.



Hubendick, B et al. 1962. "Comments on the proposed validation of Biomphalaria Preston, 1910." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 19, 260–261.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44461>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/34825>

**Holding Institution**

Natural History Museum Library, London

**Sponsored by**

Natural History Museum Library, London

**Copyright & Reuse**

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.