(4) by Dwight W. Taylor *(Pacific Marine Station, Dillon Beach, California 94929)*

I hereby support the proposal to designate the type-species of *Pleurocera* as *P. acuta* Rafinesque; to place *Pleurocera* Rafinesque, 1818, *Lithasia* Haldeman, 1840, *Pleurocera acuta* Rafinesque, 1831 and *Lithasia geniculata* Haldeman, 1840, on the Official Lists of names in zoology.

Consideration by the Commission of family names such as PLEUROCERIDAE and PALUDOMIDAE is premature. What is needed is sound morphological data, not legal rulings. There is as yet no consensus among zoologists as to the family classification of freshwater snails of the Cerithiacea (principally THIARIDAE, MELANOPSIDAE and PLEUROCERIDAE).

Paragraphs 18 and 20 of the proposal mention the family-group names "Pachychili" and "PACHYCHILINAE" further stating that PLEUROCERIDAE should not be replaced. But that replacement was made years ago in a work not cited in the proposal. The title is (translated from the Russian) "Molluscan fauna and zoogeographical classification of continental waters of the earth" (Leningrad, 1970) and the author is Y. Starobogatov, himself a member of the Commission. PACHYCHILIDAE is credited to Troschel, 1857, and replaces PLEUROCERIDAE.

From limited experience with the tropical fauna I doubt that *Pachychilus* is to be grouped with *Pleurocera*. The differences in radula are quite striking to my eye. In time I think we shall come to a family PACHYCHILIDAE, including such genera as *Brotia, Melanatria, Potadoma, Goodrichia, Pachychilus* and *Doryssa*. But that is a matter for future taxonomic studies. The most useful thing the Commission could do in the matter of family-group names is to abandon the application to them of the Law of Priority.

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF RANA *SPHENOCEPHALA* COPE, 1886 AND SUPPRESSION OF *RANA UTRICULARIUS* HARLAN, 1826. Z.N.(S.) 2141

(see vol. 33: 195-203)

(1) By John K. Tucker *(105 E. Fayette, Effingham, Illinois 62401, USA)*

Brown, Smith & Funk in their application in this case show that the resurrection of *Rana utricularia* Harlan by Pace (1974) is contrary to spirit and overriding purpose of the Code, which is to promote stability of zoological nomenclature. Nomenclatural stability within the *Rana pipiens* complex was the result of a large number of studies on both the regional (e.g. Smith, P.W., 1961, *Bull. Illinois nat. Hist. Survey*, vol. 28: 1-198) and national (e.g. Wright & Wright, 1949, *Handbook of frogs and toads of the United States and Canada*. New York, Comstock Publ. Assoc.) levels. The names were further stabilised by a number of investigations of leopard frog vocalisations (reviewed by Brown,

1973, *Amer. Zool.*, vol. 13: 73-79). Pace's actions undermine these works and will cause considerable confusion among workers unfamiliar with anuran systematics.

I should like to point out that the neotype designated by Pace for *R. utricularia* appears not to have been validly designated in the first place. Article 75b states that a neotype must not be designated for a species whose name is not in general use either as a valid name or a synonym. *R. utricularius* has certainly not been in general use as a valid name, and I hardly believe that Schmidt's use of the name as a synonym of *R. pipiens* (1953, *A check list of North American amphibians and reptiles,* 6th edit., Amer. Soc. Ichth. Herpet., Chicago) qualifies it as being in general use as a synonym. Under Article 75c(3), Pace did not say why she believed the original material was lost or destroyed, nor did she indicate what steps she had taken to trace it. Although Schmidt restricted the type-locality to "the vicinity of Philadelphia", it was perhaps injudicious to designate a neotype from Philadelphia itself even though it falls within Harlan's original locality ("Pennsylvania and New Jersey") for his doubtfully identifiable species.

Since the resurrection of the forgotten name *Rana utricularius* Harlan threatens the nomenclatural stability of the *Rana pipiens* complex, and since the neotype designation appears to be invalid, I strongly support the request of Brown, Smith & Funk.

(2) By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Comments have been received from the zoologists listed below, all in favour of the application by Brown, Smith & Funk. The grounds for their support are: that Pace (1974) wrongly revived an unused name and applied it so as to displace a junior name in general use; that this action was a cause of confusion and instability of nomenclature in a group of frogs (the *Rana pipiens* complex) which is widely used by physiologists, geneticists, embryologists and developmental biologists who are not familiar with the taxonomic refinements involved; and that Pace's taxonomic conclusions are debatable even given her own terms of reference. No adverse comment has been received.

Dr A.N.G. Aldrete *(Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico, Mexico City)*, Prof. W.F. Blair *(University of Texas, Austin, Texas)*, Dr H.S. Cuellar *(University of Texas Dental School, Houston, Texas)*, Dr O. Cuellar *(University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah)*, Mr H.A. Evans *(University of Leeds, U.K.)*, Dr J.S. Frost *(University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona)*, Mr R.H. Gray *(Battelle-Pacific Northwest Labs, Richland, Washington)*, Dr E.J. Greding *(Del Mar College, Corpus Christi, Texas)*, Mr Tom R. Johnson *(2820 Oakland Avenue, St Louis, Missouri)*, Dr L.E. Licht *(York University, Downsview, Ontario, Canada)*, Prof. G. Matz, *(Université d'Angers, France)*, Dr E.O. Moll, *(Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois)*, Prof. E. Nevo *(University of Haifa, Israel)*, Mr O. Sanders *(Southwestern Biological Supply Co., Dallas, Texas)*, Prof. Dr H. Schneider *(Universität Bonn, BRD)*, Dr F.E. Schwalm *(Albert-Ludwigs Universität, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, BRD)* and Dr P.W. Smith *(Illinois Natural History Survey, Urbana, Illinois)*.