

6. „*Branchiocerianthus*” a Correction<sup>1</sup>. 593.711 M,  
593.65 B.

By E. L. Mark.

eingeg. 15. Mai 1899.

The description of a supposed new genus of Actinians, »*Branchiocerianthus*«, published last summer<sup>2</sup>, was based on external anatomy. An examination of sections from several individuals which have been prepared during the winter has, much to my surprise, revealed no trace of the radial partitions which the external appearance of the animal led me to suppose existed. In another point, too, I was unfortunately hasty. I at first imagined that the peculiar organs surrounding the oral proboscis were reproductive in function, and consequently made sections of them from an individual to ascertain if that opinion were correct, but found the organs destitute of sexual products. This fact, together with the uniform, or gradually diminishing, calibre of the branches in the case of an individual which was dissected out with some care led me to reject the idea of their sexual character. It turns out, however, on examination of sections from other individuals that these are really sexual organs.

It results from all of these errors of mine that I have needlessly burdened the literature of Zoology with a new name, which no one can regret more than I, though I believe that the description given is fairly accurate as far as it goes.

It is clear from what I have said that the animal in question must be more nearly related to the *Hydroidea* than to the *Actinia*, though its exact affinities I have not yet determined.

I may add that a similar, though much larger animal has been recently dredged off Misaki in about 300 fathoms by my friend Professor Mitsukuri of the University of Tokyo.

Zürich, March 25, 1899.

P.S. Since writing the above, and while waiting for an opportunity to settle more definitely the relations of this animal, I have received from Professor Mitsukuri a letter in which he says that he has come to the conclusion that the animal dredged by him is not an Actinian, but is allied to the Tubularian Hydroids, and that possibly it is the same thing as the Tubularian caught by the »Challenger« at about the same locality and named *Monocaulus imperator*. Notwith-

<sup>1</sup> Contributions from the Zoological Laboratory of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, E. L. Mark, Director, No. XCVII.

<sup>2</sup> Mark, E. L., Preliminary Report on *Branchiocerianthus urceolus*, a new Type of Actinian. Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. Harvard Coll. Vol. XXXII. No. 8. August, 1898.

standing the remarkable differences between the published account of *M. imperator* and the specimens in my possession, — especially the total absence in the description of *Monocaulus* of anything suggesting bilateral symmetry, — I think it probable that both belong to the same genus, and that Professor Mitsukuri's specimen is, as he suggests, identical with the *M. imperator* of Allman.

Stazione Zoologica Naples, May 3<sup>d</sup> 1899.

P.S. In going through the »Bibliographia Zoologica« of the Zool. Anz. to ascertain what had been written recently about Tubularian Hydroids, I to-day came upon the reference to the article by O. Carlgren (Zool. Anz. 6. März 1899) in which he has already corrected my errors and has quite rightly maintained that the animal in question is at least closely related to *Corymorpha*. This is the first knowledge I have had of Carlgren's article, which has strangely been overlooked both by me and by several of my friends, who, I am sure, would have called my attention to it, had they noticed it.

I may avail myself of this opportunity to add that I think the same, or a closely related, Hydroid was described by S. F. Clark[e] in the Proceed. Acad. Nat. Sc. Philadelphia for 1876 (p. 233—234) under the name *Rhizonema carnea*.

Zürich, June 20, 1899.

## 7. Vorschläge zu einer objectivierenden Nomenclatur in der Physiologie des Nervensystems.

Von Th. Beer, A. Bethe und J. v. Uexküll.

eingeg. 21. Mai 1899.

Jeder kennt Empfindungen und Alles, was sich aus ihnen aufbaut, das Subjective, Psychische nur aus sich selbst; außerhalb seiner beobachtet er nur Bewegungserscheinungen und gelangt nur mit Hilfe von Analogieschlüssen, indem er diese Bewegungen mit seinen eigenen vergleicht, zur Annahme psychischer Eigenschaften für andere Menschen und höhere Thiere; den niederen Thieren wie den niederen Centren des Menschen Empfindungen zuzuschreiben, dazu fehlt sogar dieses unwissenschaftliche Hilfsmittel. Trotzdem tragen viele in der vergleichenden Physiologie üblichen Ausdrücke den ausgesprochenen Stempel des Subjectiven und verleiten so zu Mißverständnissen. Es scheint daher angebracht eine neue Nomenclatur einzuführen.

In dieser Nomenclatur sind zu trennen:

### I. Der objective<sup>1</sup> Reiz,

<sup>1</sup> Wir sind uns darüber klar, daß ein Reiz auch nichts Anderes ist als eine ob-

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Zoologischer Anzeiger](#)

Jahr/Year: 1899

Band/Volume: [22](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Mark E. L.

Artikel/Article: [„Branchiocerianthus" a Correction. 274-275](#)