XLVIII.—*The Genera Cyclostoma and Pomatias, and on a misapplied rule of Zoological Nomenclature.* By the Rev. Canon A. M. NORMAN.

ALARMED, on reading Mr. R. B. Newton's paper in last month's 'Annals,' at the prospect of having to give up the titles of the above genera, so long familiar to me, and at that of having to change the names of about one hundred and twenty "species" in my collection, I at once was led to look into the matter in order to discover how it was that conchologists for the last ninety years had been ignorant of what they were about.

The result is* that it seems clear that Mr. Newton has misapprehended the facts, and that no need exists for changing the names *Cyclostoma* and *Pomatias* as now in use.

The year 1799 is not the same as 1891, and our ideas of genera are very different from those then in vogue. In the last century genera were very few, now we are groaning under the weight of far too many. Has not Mr. Newton fallen into the mistake of supposing that Lamarck formed three genera named *Cyclostoma*, whereas he only formed one, but employed that name with different applications? Again, Draparnaud established no new genus; he simply excluded the marine shells which fell under the characters of Lamarck's *Cyclostoma* (which genus, as first defined by Lamarck, was designed to include every genus to which Mr. Newton refers in his paper), and restricted its use to the round and entire-mouthed land and freshwater species.

Lamarck himself and his editor Deshayes shall testify to facts out of the last edition of Lamarck, which I am led to suppose Mr. Newton did not consult. It must be borne in mind that in this and the previous edition species of *Cyclostoma*, Lamarck, 1799, are distributed in the three genera *Scalaria*, *Delphinula*, and *Cyclostoma*.

Under *Scalaria* Lamarck writes:—"Les Scalaires, qu'on nomme aussi vulgairement Scalata, sont des coquillages marins très distingués des Cyclostomes, non-seulement par la habitation, et leur forme subterriculée &c."

Under *Delphinula* he writes:—"Ces coquilles se rapprochent évidemment des Scalaires par leurs rapports. . . . Ces coquilles marines sont fort différentes, par leur épaisseur, leur solidité, l'état de leur surface externe, des coquilles terrestres que nous nommons Cyclostomes, quoique, de part

* Though I have not the opportunity of referring to the earlier, but only to the last two editions of Lamarck.

et d'autre, les bords de l'ouverture soient réunis circulairement."

Thus, though Lamarck had at this time separated these genera, he still saw fancied alliances, and therefore points out differences.

Upon the whole matter Deshayes, in his observations under *Delphinula*, writes:—"Lamarck rassemblait en un seul genre, sous le nom de Cyclostome, tous les coquilles à ouvertures ronde et entière. Depuis, Draparnaud réduisit aux seules espèces terrestres * le genre Cyclostome de Lamarck; et ce savant zoologiste dans ses mémoires sur les fossiles des environs de Paris, adoptant l'opinion de Draparnaud, proposa le genre Delphinule pour les espèces marines de son ancien genre Cyclostome."

Next we come to the history of *Pomatias*. Hartmann, wishing to divide the genus *Cyclostoma*—as understood in 1821—and at the same time not wishing to change that well-established name, very wisely employed the genus *Pomatias*, R. Studer, for the section which he desired to separate and to name. He was perfectly justified in doing this, because Studer had included in his *Pomatias* two species, "*P. elegans*" and "*P. variegatus*, a new species;" to this second species therefore and its allies Hartmann restricted the name *Pomatias* †; and the genus is by most authors properly referred to Studer and not to Hartmann.

But to pass from a particular to a general subject, I especially desire to call attention to a rule of nomenclature only too often altogether overlooked or most wrongly applied. Rule 10 of the British Association "Rules of Zoological Nomenclature" runs thus:—

"§. A name should be changed which has before been proposed for some other genus in zoology or botany, or for some other species in the same genus, *when still retained for such genus or species.*"

The part of the rule which I wish to emphasize is contained in the words which I have italicized. The object of the rule is that the same name should *not be in use* for two genera at the same time. It follows that if an earlier name is obsolete, say *Cyclostoma*, a subsequently described genus bearing the same name may be employed.

* By "terrestres" Deshayes means non-marine, for Draparnaud included the freshwater operculated univalves now referred to *Bythinia*, *Paludina*, &c. under his *Cyclostoma*.

† Westerlund, in his 'Fauna der in der paläarktischen Region lebenden Binnenconchylien,' makes *Pomatias variegatus*, Studer, a synonym of *Pomatias septemspiralis*, Razoumovsky (1789), as previous writers had done.

To apply this : granted, for the sake of argument, that all which Mr. Newton has written is correct, still *Cyclostoma* is the title of this very genus, because if the genus *Cyclostoma*, Lamarck, is inadmissible, his genus being blotted out, the next title given to the genus must be adopted, and that is *Cyclostoma*, Draparnaud ; so that we should simply have *Cyclostoma*, Draparnaud, instead of *Cyclostoma*, Lamarck—and indeed most authors write *Cyclostoma*, Drap.

It is desirable to give another and fuller instance illustrative of the application of Rule 10, and I hope I may be excused if that taken has reference to the genera named after myself, inasmuch as these genera happen to furnish the fullest example of the right and wrong applications of the rule—three right and one wrong—which at this moment occurs to my mind.

There have been three genera, thus :—

1. *Normania*, G. S. Brady (Crustacea Ostracoda), 1865.
2. *Normania*, Bowerbank (Spongida), 1868.
3. *Normania*, A. Boeck (Crustacea Amphipoda), 1870.

1. Brady's genus was obsolete at the time of its publication, Prof. G. O. Sars having just before given the same form another name.

2. When Bowerbank described his genus *Normania*—which dates from 1868 ("Last Report Shetland Dredging," Brit. Assoc. Rep. 1868, p. 328), and not from 1874, the date of Bowerbank's Brit. Spongiadæ, vol. iii. p. 258, as a reference to that work would lead the reader to suppose—he stated as follows :—"A genus *Normania* was established by Mr. G. S. Brady in 1866 for a section of *Crustacea Copepoda* * (*vide* Trans. Zool. Soc. vol. v. p. 382), but that title cannot be adopted, as the *Normania* of Brady is identical with *Loxiconcha* of G. O. Sars, which was founded a few months previously (*vide* G. O. Sars, 'Oversigt af Norges Marine Ostracoder,' 1865, p. 61, and G. S. Brady, Trans. Linn. Soc. vol. xxvi. 1868, p. 432)." But Professor Sollas, in his "Report on the Tetractinellida of the 'Challenger,'" 1889, after expressing his regret at being obliged to reject the name *Normania*, Bowerbank, and substituting for it *Pœcillastra*, n. n., writes :—"True, Bowerbank remarks that Brady's genus *Normania*, which has precedence, cannot stand ; but this makes no difference, since according to convention, a discarded name which has ceased to be used for one species,

* "*Crustacea Copepoda*" is a mistake for "*Crustacea Ostracoda*." There is a genus in the former, *Normanella*, G. S. Brady, but that is a different name and dates only from 1880.

or genus, cannot be applied to another, otherwise the door would be opened to confusion." Now here Prof. Sollas has laid down a rule of his own nowhere else to be found. Bowerbank affords a right and Sollas an erroneous interpretation of Rule 10; and I notice that Schulze and Lendenfeld, in a later paper, have recognized this and again restored Bowerbank's name*.

3. *Normania*, Boeck, is in use, having been just again employed by Prof. G. O. Sars in his beautiful new work on the Crustacea Amphipoda of Norway. That name must be changed. There is little doubt that Sars fell into the error of retaining it from referring to Bowerbank only or to "Scudder," who erroneously gives the date of *Normania*, Bow., as 1875 instead of 1868; and had the former date been correct, Boeck's genus would have had precedence of Bowerbank's, but not of Brady's. This last, however, Sars knew to be only a synonym of his own genus *Loxoconcha*.

Thus we see that Bowerbank, Schulze and Lendenfeld, and G. O. Sars rightly apply, and that Sollas wrongly applies the rule.

I will not cite the very many instances in which well-established generic names have been of late wrongly, for a time at least, supplanted, and useless generic names thus added to our nomenclature. The fact is that 'Scudder's Nomenclator,' instead of being of service to science, is in this way frequently used to its detriment. Authors consult it to see if a generic name has been previously used. If it has been, many of them at once proceed to coin for the second or later use a new generic title or supplant it by some other; whereas the later employment of the generic name ought to have been retained if the earlier is not in use.

Inquiry should always be made as to whether the name applied in previous instance or instances is *in use* before the later name is changed.

One word more. I have been surprised to find that many of the younger naturalists are totally ignorant of the very existence of the Association Rules. For the information of those who may need it I may therefore state that they are to be found in the British Association Reports of 1842, and as last revised in the Report of 1865 (1866); and separate copies of the Rules can be procured at the offices of the Association, 25 Albemarle Street. At least I believe that this is the case. At the Newcastle-upon-Tyne meeting in 1889, at the request of several young zoologists, as Vice-President of

* F. E. Schulze and R. von Lendenfeld, 'Ueber die Bezeichnung der Spongiennadeln,' 1889, p. 31.

Section D, I brought the question before the Committee, and it was thought desirable that the Rules should be reprinted, and a committee for the purpose was appointed; but I was subsequently informed that copies still remained for sale. If applicants should fail to obtain them, and in that case think it well to put themselves into communication with me, I will take care that the matter shall be again brought forward in Section D.

I have taken this opportunity as an addendum to my notes on Mr. Newton's communication to carry out an intention of some standing to direct the attention of zoologists to what is undoubtedly a common misapplication of a rule of nomenclature.

With respect to the word Botany in Rule 10 the attempt has long been given up to exclude the use of a botanical generic name from Zoology, or *vice versâ*, and the introductory notes of the revised edition of the Rules (1865) intimate this. This may be illustrated by a genus referred to in my notes in last month's (April) 'Annals.' The genus *Linckia*, Nardo, was rejected by Forbes because of previous use in botany. Under altered views in this matter it is now in use for another section of the original genus of Nardo than that to which Forbes applied the name *Cribrella*.

XLIX.—*Descriptions of three new Species of Helix from New Guinea.* By EDGAR A. SMITH.

1. *Helix (Papuina) hero.*

Testa rimata, depresso trochiformis, tenuicula, in medio acute carinata, albida, superne lineis obliquis opacis lutescentibus subfulguratis, interdumque aliis fuscis ornata, infra zonis concentricis paucis fuscis et opaco-lutescentibus cincta; anfractus $4\frac{1}{2}$, supremi convexiusculi, striis spiralibus confertis, lineisque incrementi obliquis sculpti, ultimus minus convexus, similiter striatus, sed antice minute rugosus, breviter descendens, pone medium labri leviter depressus, ad peripheriam acute luteo carinatus, inferne radiatim et concentrice subrugose striatus; apertura perobliqua, subnasuta, intus colores externos aliquanto obscuros exhibens; peristoma album vel superne pallide lilaceum, margine superiore leviter reflexo, in medio depresso, inferiore latius expanso, albo, supra umbilicum dilatato, rimam fere obtegente.

Diam. maj. 28 millim., min. 22; alt. $16\frac{1}{2}$.

Var. Testa pallida, radiis zonisque fuscis haud ornata.

The apical whorls of this very pretty species and the region

Norman, Alfred Merle. 1891. "LXVIII.—The genera Cyclostoma and Pomatias, and on a misapplied rule of Zoological nomenclature." *The Annals and magazine of natural history; zoology, botany, and geology* 7, 447–451.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460640>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/63422>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460640>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/59211>

Holding Institution

University of Toronto - Gerstein Science Information Centre

Sponsored by

University of Toronto

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

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>.