

Sollas 1889

Scientific Proceedings of the Royal Dublin
Society 6(5): 276-277.

[276]

XXV.

ON THE GEODINE GENERA, *SYNOPS*, *VOSM.*, AND *SIDONOPS*. A CORRECTION. By PROFESSOR W. J. SOLLAS, D. Sc., LL.D.

[Communicated January 9, 1889.]

In my Report on the Tetractinellid Sponges of the *Challenger* Expedition, I have defined the genus, *Synops*, Vosm., as follows:—
“Poriferous and oscular surfaces distinct; oscules the simple openings of excurrent chones; pores in sieves overlying incurrent chones.”

My friend Dr. Vosmaer has kindly directed my attention to the last part of this definition, truly remarking that it is at variance with that originally given by him,¹ in which the pores are described as simple, and not sieve-covered openings. At Dr. Vosmaer's request I have re-examined the fine specimen of the type species, *Synops pyriformis*, Vosm., which I owe to his kindness, and with the result of fully confirming his views. I have, indeed, to confess to an oversight, for there can be no doubt that in *Synops*, Vosm., the openings of the incurrent, like those of the excurrent chones, are quite simple, and not sieve-covered.

This character *Synops* shares with *Isops*, Soll., and Dr. Vosmaer recognising this, wrote to me some time ago, inquiring whether the two genera should not be merged into one. At that time I was under the influence of the error just corrected, and imagined that in the character of the pores of *Synops* there existed quite sufficient grounds of distinction. With the disappearance of this imaginary difference, the distinction between the genera to my mind breaks down, and *Synops* becomes a synonym for *Isops*. Dr. Vosmaer is now, however, inclined to maintain a distinction, on the ground that the oscules are congregated in *Synops* in shallow depressions; this is, however, possibly explicable as a result of growth. Specimens

¹ Vosmaer, Report on Sponges, “Willem Barents,” p. 20, 1882.

of *Isops* and *Synops* are found together in the same area, but those of *Isops* are always smaller than those of *Synops*, which are evidently more fully grown.

Whatever may be the fate of Vosmaer's *Synops*, it is quite clear that my *Synops* is a misnomer, and must be replaced. I propose to substitute for it *Sidonops*. When making my preliminary examination of the *Challenger* material, I had assigned in MS. to the sponges wrongly called *Synops* the name *Kalops*: my subsequent error is all the more unintelligible. *Kalops*, however, is pre-occupied.

This renders necessary the following corrections:—

On page cxlix. of the *Challenger* Report (vol. xxv.), for *Synops* read *Sidonops*, and for the type species substitute *Sidonops neptuni*, Soll., for *Synops pyriformis*, Vosm.

For *Synops* read *Sidonops* in each of the following cases:—

Synops neptuni, p. 227; *Synops nitida*, p. 231; *Synops vosmaeri*, p. 234; *Synops macandrewii*, p. 265; and for *Synops pyriformis*, Vosm., p. 266, read *Isops pyriformis*,

In conclusion, I have to express my best acknowledgments to Dr. Vosmaer for affording me the opportunity of making this correction.