

© British Heritage Library, http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/download/www.zobodat.at

Zoologischer Anzeiger

herausgegeben

von Prof. **Eugen Korschelt** in Marburg.

Zugleich

Organ der Deutschen Zoologischen Gesellschaft.

Bibliographia zoologica

bearbeitet von Dr. **H. H. Field** (Concilium bibliographicum) in Zürich.

Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann in Leipzig.

XXXVII. Band.

17. Januar 1911.

Nr. 2.

Inhalt:

I. Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen.

1. **Pilsbry**, On the nomenclature of Cirripedia. S. 33.
2. **O'Donoghue**, Two cases of abnormal hearts and one of an abnormal Anterior Abdominal vein in the frog. (With 3 figs.) S. 35.
3. **Berry**, A new Sepiolid from Japan. (With 1 fig.) S. 39.
4. **Dahl**, Die Tierpsychologie, ein Zweig der Zoologie. S. 41.
5. **Hadži, Lamarck**, Der Begründer der Lehre vom Stammbaum. S. 54.

6. **Steche**, Die Färbung von *Dixippus morosus*. S. 60.

II. Mitteilungen aus Museen, Instituten usw.

1. **Thienemann**, Das Sammeln von Puppenhäuten der Chironomiden. S. 62.
2. **Zacharias**, Biologische Station zu Plön. S. 63.
3. **Ergänzungen und Nachträge zu dem Personalverzeichnis zoologischer Anstalten**. S. 63.

III. Personal-Notizen. S. 64.

Literatur. S. 273—288.

I. Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen.

1. On the nomenclature of Cirripedia.

By Henry A. Pilsbry, Philadelphia.

eingeg. 25. August 1910.

In his recent report upon »Die Cirripeden der Deutschen Südpolar-Expedition 1901—1903« Prof. A. Gruvel has devoted many pages to a critique of my work on the Cirripedes of the United States National Museum, published in 1907. His strictures if unanswered might lead some students to heed the warning he sounds against what he considers my dangerous heresies.

Prof. Gruvel's criticisms relate to two aspects of the subject; to questions of nomenclature, and to those of classification.

In nomenclature he objects to my use of *Mitella* Oken, 1815, in place of *Pollicipes* Leach, 1817, and *Octolasmis* Gray, 1825, in place of *Dichelaspis* Darwin 1851; he also ignores the earlier name *Trilasmis* Hinds 1844, in favor of a later one, *Poecilasma* Darwin 1851.

In all of these cases the earlier generic names used by me were properly proposed, and there has never been any question as to their pertinence to the groups. M. Gruvel's sole objection to *Mitella* is that *Pollicipes* is in general use, while he rejects *Octolasmis* and *Trilasmis*

because they are considered inappropriate in meaning. My action in these cases was in accord with the letter and spirit of the code of nomenclature adopted by the International Zoological Congress (Berlin, 1901).

I have been unable to find support in any code of nomenclature for M. Gruvel's contention. I freely admit Prof. Gruvel's right to use any generic names he pleases, but I fail to see why he should ex cathedra denounce me for using the oldest tenable generic names.

I rejected M. Gruvel's family names *Polyaspidae*, *Pentaspidae* etc. because they are not based upon generic names. There are no genera *Polyaspis*, *Pentaspis*, *Anaspis* in Cirripedia though *Polyaspis* is used in Arachnida, and *Anaspis* in Coleoptera. I use the term *Scalpellidae* in preference to *Pollicipedidae* because *Pollicipes* is not a valid generic name, hence cannot serve as the basis for a family name.

In matters of classification M. Gruvel objects to my course in dividing the old genera *Scalpellum* and *Alepas*. He had unfortunately not seen my later paper on *Scalpellidae*¹, in which I have fully developed my ideas, basing the classification upon the total structure of both male and hermaphrodite forms. I venture to believe that no zoologist who looks into the matter will have difficulty in deciding between my classification and the artificial arrangement in Prof. Gruvel's Monograph. His use of the names *Archiscalpellum*, *Euscalpellum* and *Neoscalpellum* (p. 199) cannot be followed, since I have already defined the same groups, have given them names and types, and have indicated their place in the evolution of the group. It must be confessed that M. Gruvel's habit of ignoring the groups and names of his predecessors and contemporaries is calculated to reduce the nomenclature of Cirripedes to chaos. I may say here that

Archiscalpellum Gruvel = *Smilium* Gray 1825.

Euscalpellum Gruvel = *Scalpellum* Leach 1817.

Neoscalpellum Gruvel = *Arcoscalpellum* Hoek 1907.

In the case of *Poecilasma* and *Megalasma*, I have shown that several forms referred to the former group really belong to the latter. No evidence is presented by Prof. Gruvel to show that this course was incorrect. I cannot find from M. Gruvel's work that he has had much material in the group *Megalasma*, while my own conclusions were reached from a study of hundreds of examples of a majority of the known species.

As to *Alepas*, I have shown that the pelagic forms inhabiting me-

¹ Vide Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia 1908. p. 104-111.

dusae, and upon which the genus was originally based, differ in several important particulars from the forms living on the sea bottom (which I call *Heteralepas*). M. Gruvel argues that the characters are adaptive and not of generic significance; yet strangely enough, he adopted the genus *Gymnolepas* Aurivillius, which was based upon one of the medusa parasites, and is really a species of *Alepas* as that genus was originally understood. In this case I am satisfied to have shown clearly the distinctions between the two groups. I have demonstrated that the name *Alepas* belongs to the Medusa parasites. I am content to leave to students of cirripedes the question of whether *Heteralepas* is to be considered of generic value. After all, the conceptions of genera are ever changing. Linnaeus would have called all these creatures „*Lepas*“.

It has given me little pleasure to refute the criticisms of an author to whom all students of cirripedes are deeply indebted. In concluding, I am glad to be able to say that his contention that *Conchoderma* belongs to the lepadine series seems to be well founded. I was probably wrong in placing that group in the Alepadinae.

Philadelphia, July 1910.

2. Two cases of abnormal hearts and one of an abnormal Anterior Abdominal vein in the frog.

By Chas. H. O'Donoghue, B. Sc. F.Z.S. Assistant to the Jodrell Professor of Zoology, University College, London.

(With 3 figures.)

eingeg. 18. Oktober 1910.

The abnormality about to be described was obtained during class-work dissection in this college. It was apparently a normal specimen of an adult male frog (*Rana temporaria*). On removing the ventral part of the pectoral girdle however, it was seen that the heart was in quite an abnormal condition¹. Instead of being of the usual shape it was a bilobed structure 18 mm long, one lobe of which was situated in the position normally occupied by the front end of the heart and the other ran forward from this inclining to the right, thus coming to lie underneath the hyoid bone and between it and the muscles on the ventral side of the head (Fig. 1). It was not attached in any way to the surrounding tissues, although it had a membranous covering, in all probability the pericardium, and was apparently kept in place by the veins and arteries connected with it. The anterior lobe which was 8,5 mm wide by 8 mm long proved to be the ventricle and from it was given off

¹ This was noticed by Miss Gamgee who kindly handed the specimen to me for examination.

ZOBODAT - www.zobodat.at

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Zoologischer Anzeiger](#)

Jahr/Year: 1911

Band/Volume: [37](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Pilsbry Henry Augustus

Artikel/Article: [On the nomenclature of Cirripedia. 33-35](#)