Recently, the oyster research, aquaculture, and trade communities were shaken up by the publication of two papers by Daniele Salvi et al. (2014, 2017) in which the genus *Crassostrea* was split into three different genera, such that the genus *Crassostrea* was shrunk to include only the Atlantic species, while the Pacific species were assigned to the genera *Talonostrea* and *Magallana*. The consequence of this taxonomic action was that the well-known *Crassostrea gigas* was rebaptized to *Magallana gigas*. This nomenclatural change was almost immediately endorsed and implemented by the “World Register of Marine Species” (WoRMS), which could give the erroneous impression that from now of the name *Crassostrea gigas* should be abandoned in favour of *Magallana gigas*. Such a rash nomenclatural change for this well-known species was, however, already observed long before the work of Salvi et al. (see e.g. O’Foighil et al. 1995; Wang et al. 2004), but it was never felt necessary to translate this division into a genus-level split. Now one can discuss how many and what sort of data are needed to delimit genera (since there is no operational definition of a genus, except that it should be a monophyletic taxon) and one can question a number of specific issues in the work of Salvi et al. (as is done by Bayne et al. 2017), but the main point I wish to make here is that taxonomists should always try as much as possible to maintain nomenclatural stability and thus should wonder about the relevance and added value of introducing a new taxonomy and its concomitant nomenclatural changes. As such taxonomists should, by default, act conservatively. In the present case of *Crassostrea*, there simply is no added value to splitting this genus into three separate genera, since the former *Crassostrea* clade remains phylogenetically unaltered. On the contrary, by dividing *Crassostrea* into three genera one complicates nomenclature for the users since now three generic names have to be remembered and associated with the correct species. So, who gains from this? How does it help the users of *Crassostrea* taxonomy? Moreover, one will always be able to divide a “genus” into subclades (up to individual species), but is that a logical ground to give such subclades a genus-level rank? Of course not, for there is no general definition of what a genus really is (in fact it is just one of the, many, human hierarchical classificatory categories to delimit clades). As such, the former genus *Crassostrea* is just as well acceptable as a genus, as are the three “genera” into which it was split. All in all... the whole issue comes to a choice between splitting and lumping, and in that perspective I would always advocate to use nomenclatural stability as a decisive benchmark.

Against this background, there is no reason to drop the current use of *Crassostrea* for the Atlantic and Pacific cupped oysters jointly, and hence let us appreciate the work of Salvi et al. (2014, 2017) for its contribution to documenting the relationships among these two clades, without destabilizing a long-standing, commonly accepted nomenclatural framework. This is not only my opinion, but the opinion of a large community of oyster biologists, who expressed their concerns in the Bayne et al. (2017) rebuttal paper.

So, the name *Crassostrea gigas* should prevail, and the genus *Crassostrea* should be maintained as it was before its split into two or three genera.
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