

This article was downloaded by: [Purdue University]

On: 15 January 2015, At: 10:56

Publisher: Taylor & Francis

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer
Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 6

Publication details, including instructions
for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah12>

IX.—On *Pherusa fucicola*, Leach

Alfred O. Walker

Published online: 12 Oct 2009.

To cite this article: Alfred O. Walker (1891) IX.—On *Pherusa fucicola*,
Leach , *Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 6*, 8:43, 81-83, DOI:
[10.1080/00222939109460392](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460392)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222939109460392>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever

caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

brownish stramineous, with a small brownish-black spot on the upper discocellular nervule and a row of three indistinct minute brown spots across the disk in the interspaces between the median nervules; costa at the base pale orange, outer margin white.

Expanse of wings $1\frac{7}{8}$ inches.

Hab. Mahobo.

The male is very near *mabella*, but the female shows that it is distinct.

Libythea tsiandava.

Male.—*Upperside.* Anterior wings resemble those of *L. laius*, Trimen, but the fulvous longitudinal bar in the cell is uninterrupted and wider than in *laius*, and the subovate discal spot, which is traversed by the second median nervule, is larger. On the posterior wings it also resembles *laius*, but the small ochreous spot of *laius* above the second subcostal nervule is absent, and in the straight longitudinal bar of four contiguous spots beyond the middle the second spot is the largest, instead of the first, as in *laius*.

On the *underside* it is paler and browner than *laius*, and on the anterior wings the pale fulvous colouring of the bar and spots extends below the cell and over nearly the whole of the central area of the wings.

Expanse of wings $1\frac{3}{4}$ inch.

Hab. Mahobo.

IX.—On *Pherusa fucicola*, Leach.

By ALFRED O. WALKER.

To the Editors of the *Annals and Magazine of Natural History.*

GENTLEMEN,—The fact that a principle of considerable importance in zoological nomenclature is involved must be my excuse for troubling you again on the above question. Either No. 11 of Strickland's Rules for Zoological Nomenclature, adopted and confirmed by strong committees of the British Association, should be observed, or it should be condemned as authoritatively as it was accepted; and if it is ever to be observed, it surely should be in such a case as this, where the original definition of both genus and species is not only insufficient, but positively misleading.

Ann. & Mag. N. Hist. Ser. 6. Vol. viii.

Mr. Pocock ('Annals,' June 1891, p. 533) says:—"All that those who hold to" Rule 11 "can expect is that an author should point out such characters as are believed in his day to be essential." He then quotes my article, in which I state that *Pherusa fucicola* disagrees in almost every particular with Leach's definition both of its genus and subdivision, and says that this is substantially true of the later description in the Linn. Trans., but not of the original description in the Edinb. Encycl. But, in the first place, the only important difference between the two descriptions is that the latter contains the correct addition that the tail is not "fasciculato-spinosa" and the incorrect one that there is no secondary appendage to the upper antennæ. If we are to accept this view, then we shall come to the *reductio ad absurdum* that the more indefinite our descriptions are the better, and that if Leach had simply described *Pherusa* as an "animal having legs" his position would have been unassailable! In the second place, as will be seen by reference to p. 533, Leach went altogether wrong in his classification of *Pherusa*. His division *a*, including *Melita* and *Mæra*, is obviously founded on the characters of the males, in which the second gnathopods are very much larger than the first, while in the females the difference is trifling. *And this is precisely the case with Gammarella brevicaudata*; so that had Leach known the male he would certainly have placed his *Pherusa* in division *a*, and not in *c*! Can it then be said that Leach "pointed out such characters as" he "believed to be essential"? What carcinologist, with only the Edinb. Encycl. description to go upon, would have dreamt of referring *Gammarella* to *Pherusa*? Much rather would he have thought it referred to one of the large family of Lysianassinæ, in which the first and second gnathopods are nearly always "filiform" (as Leach would have called them) in both sexes, but whose affinities are sufficiently remote from *Pherusa* (*Gammarella*).

As regards the retention of Bate's genus *Pherusa*, 1862, I must unreservedly admit that Mr. Pocock is right and I am wrong. In my anxiety to avoid encumbering our list with another genus, and also in the hope that it might be found possible to absorb the present species of *Pherusa* (of which there appear from the 'Challenger' Bibliography to be eight) into other existing genera, I did not consider the possibility of other authors between 1815 and 1862 having used the name. As Mr. Pocock says, and as Dr. Norman had previously pointed out to me, this has been done in more than

one instance. *Pherusa*, Bate, is therefore inadmissible, and I propose to substitute the name *Apherusa* (*a* = not) for "*Pherusa*, Bate," on p. 421, 'Annals' for May 1891.

ALFRED O. WALKER.

Nant-y-Glyn, Colwyn Bay,
June 4, 1891.

X.—On the Occurrence of *Discoglossus* in the Lower Miocene of Germany. By G. A. BOULENGER.

WHILST accidentally looking at some fossil frogs exhibited in the Geological Galleries of the Natural-History Museum a specimen caught my eye as so closely resembling the living *Discoglossus pictus* that I determined to submit it to a careful examination. It is described in the recently published fourth part of the 'Catalogue of the Fossil Reptilia and Amphibia' by Mr. Lydekker as *Rana Meriani*, H. v. Meyer, with the following particulars:—

"35657. Slab of lignite with the impression and some of the bones of a rather smaller skeleton, from Rott. One humerus is entire. This specimen agrees very closely in size with the skeleton figured by Meyer, *op. cit.* pl. xvi. fig. 3. The contour of the soft parts is exhibited. Purchased, 1859" *.

Now *Rana Meriani* is a true *Rana*, closely allied to *R. esculenta*, as shown by the skull and the vomerine teeth, and as correctly stated by H. v. Meyer, not to *R. temporaria*, as suggested by Mr. Lydekker. The specimen under consideration, on the other hand, is a *Discoglossoid*, as the arciferous pectoral arch, the impressions of opisthocelous vertebræ, and the presence of transverse processes to the coccygeal style distinctly indicate. The fourth vertebra even shows, as an impression, one of the ribs which are characteristic of the anterior vertebræ of the *Discoglossidæ*.

In all those features which can be distinguished it agrees very closely with the female *Discoglossus pictus*, particularly in the following characters:—

a. The proportions, as shown by the bones and the impression of the soft parts. These are given approximately in the first column in comparison with those of a female *Discoglossus pictus* from Spain, recorded in the second column.

* I may add that the specimen is exposed ventrally.