

echten *piceae* in seiner jüngsten Schrift⁸ als *funitectus* ausgegeben hat. Diese Tatsache wird nicht erwähnt, so daß man anzunehmen berechtigt ist, daß Cholodkovsky »nach wie vor« die Laus der deutschen Edeltanne, die ich mit Nüßlin und Dreyfus *piceae* nenne, für *funitectus* Dreyfus hält. Um endlich der Artenverwirrung in der *Dreyfusia*-Gruppe ein Ende zu machen, sei hier mitgeteilt, daß *funitectus* wie *pectinatae* als Hiemalis - Junglarve pleurospinale Rückenplatten auf dem Thorax und den vier vorderen Abdominalringen tragen, während die Hiemalis-Junglarven von *piceae* normal getrennte pleurale und spinale Rückenplatten auf den beiden hinteren Brust- und den fünf vorderen Abdominaltergiten besitzt. Und der *funitectus* von Cholodkovsky (1907) hat getrennte Pleural- und Spinalplatten, ist also in Wahrheit ein *piceae*, und zwar die Hiemalisform. Nüßlin⁷ ist durchaus im Recht, wenn er *funitectus* mit *pectinatae* zusammenführt, von dem er sich anscheinend nur durch geringfügige Merkmale unterscheidet, die indes leider noch der Aufklärung harren, da der auf *Tsuga canadensis* lebende *funitectus* seither noch nicht wieder entdeckt worden ist. *Piceae*, *funitectus* und *pectinatae* sind also vorläufig als selbständige Arten anzusehen, aber nicht im Sinne von Cholodkovsky, welcher sagt, daß eine Korrektur seiner Beschreibung der Fühlertriechorgane von seiten Nüßlins »das Einzige sei, was er diesem Forscher gegenüber zugeben kann und muß«.

Weshalb ich endlich die Varietas *bouvieri* Chol. nur als Hungerform von *piceae* gelten lasse, möge man in meiner Monographie nachlesen; so »vollständig in der Luft schwebt« diese Annahme eben nicht.

St. Julien bei Metz, den 30. März 1908.

6. On the systematic position of *Eunephthya maldivensis* Hickson.

By Sydney J. Hickson, Manchester.

eingeg. 9. April 1908.

In a recent paper Professor W. Kükenthal¹ has criticised my action in placing this species in the genus *Eunephthya* and has suggested that it belongs either to his genus *Dendronephthya* or to *Seleronephthya*. The diagnostic characters of the genus *Eunephthya* given by Professor Kükenthal are as follows (p. 389) I. Polypen ohne Stützbündel. A. Kanalwände dünn, nicht dicht mit Spicula erfüllt. 2) Die Polypen stehen in Bündeln oder einzeln. b. Polypen ohne gesonderten Kelch, entweder vollkommen oder gar nicht retractil. If we are to accept Prof. Kükenthal's, system of classification of the family Nephthyidae

⁸ N. Cholodkovsky, Die Coniferen-Läuse *Chermes*, Feinde der Nadelhölzer. Berlin, R. Friedländer & Sohn, 1907. 44 S. 6 Taf.

¹ Zool. Jahrbüch. XXIV. 1907. S. 380.

we must either place the species I have described from the Maldives in the genus *Eunephthya* or give it a new generic name. There are no large spicules arranged in the manner we are so familiar with in the anthocodiae of the genus *Spongodes* (of earlier authors) known as "Stützbündeln". The walls of the coelenteric cavities are not filled with spicules, the anthocodiae are isolated and scattered and have no distinct calyx.

Professor Kükenthal complains that I said nothing about the armature of the anthocodiae (Polypenbewehrung) but he must have overlooked the passage in my paper². "The aboral sides of the tentacles are armed with small irregular spicules, mostly rod shaped, with long tubercular processes having a length of 0,5—1 mm, and a few of the large spicules are occasionally found on the body wall." I did not state that there were no "Stützbündeln" and no spicules in the walls of the canals because if there had been the species could not have belonged to the genus *Eunephthya* according to his own classification³ which I said I had adopted.

The difficulty appears to be a geographical one. The species attributed to the genus in Kükenthal's last paper are all cold-water forms, and mainly arctic or sub-arctic or antarctic in distribution.

The species *E. maldivensis* (Hickson) and *E. purpurea* of Thomson and Henderson are tropical, and therefore geographically remote from the other species of the genus.

This consideration has induced me to reexamine the specimen from the Maldives and to compare it with specimens of *Eunephthya (Dura) rosea* from Norway and from the west coast of Ireland. As I pointed out in my original description of the species the spicules of the coenenchym are long spindles very similar in form and size to those of *Spongodes* and, I should have added, to those of some species of *Nephthya*. But it differs from both these species in the absence of definite "Stützbündeln". Professor Kükenthal suggests that there may be rudiments of this kind of spiculation (Stützbündelrudiment) but apart from the fact that occasionally a portion of one of the long spicules of the coenenchym projects on to the body wall of the polyp as I originally mentioned, there is nothing to be seen in any of my preparations that can be called a rudiment of a supporting bundle.

If we are to consider that the presence of a Stützbündel is a diagnostic feature of *Nephthya* and *Spongodes* (*Dendronephthya + Steronephthya*), the species in question cannot belong to either of these genera. It is like *Paraspongodes crassa* Kükenthal, which it resembles in its ramification, a species incertae sedis in Prof. Kükenthal's classification.

² Aleyonaria of the Maldives. Faun. Geogr. Maldives and Laccadive Archipelagoes Vol. II. pt. 4. p. 824.

³ Zool. Jahrbüch. XIX. 1903. S. 103.

In the original description of the *Dura rosea* now called *Eunephtha rosea*, Koren and Danielssen⁴ describe and figure the stomodaeum, Kükenthal describes the stomodaeum of *Eunephtha rosea* v. *umbellata* from Spitzbergen⁵. I have examined the stomodaeum of a specimen of the same species from the coast of Ireland.

In all these cases the stomodaeum appears to be long and thrown into folds and in specimens examined by Koren & Danielssen and myself the epithelium is glandular.

In *Spongodes* on the other hand the stomodaeum is short, and but slightly folded and does not contain gland cells⁶. In a series of sections I have made through a branch of *Eunephtha maldirensis*, I find that the species agrees with *Eunephtha* and differs from *Spongodes* in this character. The stomodaeum is long, considerably folded and glandular.

In order to test the value of this character of the stomodaeum in the classification of the family I have reexamined the specimens of *Nephtha chabrolii* and *Nephtha (Lithophytum) virescens* described by Miss Hiles and myself from New Britain. In both these specimens the stomodaeum is longer than in *Spongodes* but as the preservation is not very good I cannot feel certain that the histological character resembles that of *Eunephtha*.

On comparing our specimen from the Maldives with *Nephtha (Lithophytum) virescens* in respect of other characters I find there are many points of resemblance but as the anthocodiae are not confined to the lobules but scattered and somewhat isolated on the branches, it does not come within the range of the definition of the genus *Lithophytum* as defined by Kükenthal. However as the specimen is a small one, and the species may undergo some change in this character as it attains its full dimensions, I am disposed to believe that the species would be better placed in the genus *Lithophytum* as defined by Kükenthal than remain in the genus *Eunephtha*.

I am willing to adopt this course rather than extend the diagnosis of *Eunephtha* to include it, in order to avoid further confusion in the systematic arrangement of the tropical species of the family. But in doing so and thereby adopting Prof. Kükenthal's definition of the genus *Lithophytum*, I cannot fully accept the view that the presence or absence of the Stützbündel is a satisfactory character on which to base the classification of the family. The genus *Lithophytum* as amended by Kükenthal, which includes the species formerly referred to *Ammothea*, is closely related to *Nephtha*, although the Stützbündel is present in the latter and absent in the former. These two genera are also more closely related to *Eunephtha* than either of them is to *Spongodes*. Moreover I cannot accept the proposal to divide the genus *Spongodes* into

⁴ Koren u. Danielssen, Nye Alcyonider. 1883. p. 2.

⁵ l. c. p. 366.

⁶ W. Harms, Zool. Anz. XXX. 1906. S. 542.

two genera with new names (*Dendronephthya* and *Stereonephthya*). I have reexamined the specimens in my large collection of this genus and I have found so many cases in which it is extremely difficult to determine with certainty that the anthocodiae are "never" connected together to form bundles; moreover in many specimens there are very many isolated anthocodiae, and I cannot believe that the distinction is one of any practical importance.

The generic name *Spongodes* is one that has been well established for a great many years, it is used in nearly all the large Museums and Laboratories of the world and should not be discarded without some very strong reasons based upon a thorough anatomical study of its species. I would suggest therefore that the generic name *Spongodes* be retained and that those zoologists who have found Prof. Kükenthal's classification useful should retain *Dendronephthya* and *Stereonephthya* as sub-generic names.

The proposal made by Prof. Kükenthal as it stands is contrary to rule 29 of the "International rules of Zoological nomenclature" published in 1905 which reads as follows. »Wird eine Gattung in zwei oder mehr Gattungen geteilt, so verbleibt ihr gültiger Name einer der aus der Teilung hervorgegangenen Gattungen. War der Typus der Gattung ursprünglich bestimmt, so verbleibt der Gattungsnname derjenigen aus der Teilung hervorgegangenen Gattung, welche diesen Typus enthält.«

Whether we are prepared to abide by these rules or not, it is clearly very inconvenient to discard altogether from our literature a generic name such as *Spongodes* which is so well known as the name applied to a very common Alcyonarian in the tropical seas.

III. Personal-Notizen.

Hamburg.

Herr Dr. Georg Duncker, wissenschaftlicher Hilfsarbeiter am Naturhistorischen Museum, ist auf ein Jahr beurlaubt, um als Zoologe an der Hamburgischen ethnographischen Expedition zur Erforschung der Südsee teilzunehmen.

After 1st June, 1908, my Address will be:

Biological Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Thos. H. Montgomery, jr.

Nekrolog.

Am 7. April d. J. starb in Wien Prof. Dr. Ludwig Karl Schmarda, geboren am 23. Aug. 1819 in Olmütz, bis 1883 Professor der Zoologie an der Universität Wien, bekannt durch seine Arbeiten zur Morphologie und besonders zur geographischen Verbreitung der Tiere.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Zoologischer Anzeiger](#)

Jahr/Year: 1908

Band/Volume: [33](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Hickson S.J.

Artikel/Article: [On the systematic position of Eunephthya maldivensis](#)
[Hickson. 173-176](#)