This article was downloaded by: [UQ Library]

On: 15 March 2015, At: 01:33

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 8

Publication details, including instructions
for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah14>

XXXIX.—The genus Encrinus

Austin Hobart Clark ^a

^a United States Bureau of Fisheries

Published online: 08 Sep 2009.

To cite this article: Austin Hobart Clark (1909) XXXIX.—The genus Encrinus,
Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 8, 3:15, 308-310, DOI:

[10.1080/00222930908692580](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222930908692580)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222930908692580>

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>

Mandible.

Total length	137
Length of symphyseal region	58
Width at hinder end of symphysis	14
„ at narrowest point behind anterior expansion	6.2

EXPLANATION OF THE PLATES.

PLATE VIII.

Fig. 1. Steneosaurus leedsi, sp. n. Semi-diagrammatic figure of the upper surface of the type skull (R. 3320). $\frac{1}{4}$ nat. size.

Fig. 2. Steneosaurus durobrivensis, sp. n. Semi-diagrammatic figure of the upper surface of the type skull (Leeds Coll. 18). $\frac{1}{4}$ nat. size.

PLATE IX.

Fig. 1. Steneosaurus nasutus, sp. n. Upper surface of type skull (R. 3577). $\frac{1}{4}$ nat. size.

Fig. 2. Steneosaurus obtusidens, sp. n. Semi-diagrammatic figure of the upper surface of the type skull (R. 3168). $\frac{1}{4}$ nat. size.

XXXIX.—*The Genus Encrinus*. By AUSTIN HOBART
CLARK, of the United States Bureau of Fisheries.

MR. F. A. BATHER in 1898 ('Natural Science,' xii. p. 245) attempted to unravel the snarl in which the generic names of the recent (and fossil) Pentacrinitidæ have become enmeshed, thanks to the nomenclatorial carelessness of certain of the writers on the subject of the Crinoidea. Passing over the fact that *Balanocrinus* is not available for any genus of Pentacrinitidæ, that *Metacrinus* was first diagnosed in 1882 (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. x. p. 167), and that *Isocrinus* was first proposed in 1836 (L. Agassiz, Mém. de Soc. de Sci. Nat. de Neuchâtel, i. p. 195, type *Isocrinites pendulus*, de (sic) Meyer, 1835, nomen nudum, = *Isocrinus pendulus*, von Meyer, 1837), we come to a consideration of the genus *Encrinus*. Mr. Bather ascribes *Encrinus* to Schulze, 1760; but Schulze was not binomial, as a glance at his work suffices to show; moreover, if he were, why does not Mr. Bather use his genera *Decacnimos*, *Polyactinis*, and *Triscædecacnimos* instead of the later *Antedon* and *Actinometra*?

Encrinus was first proposed binomially by Blumenbach in 1779 ('Handbuch der Naturgeschichte,' Göttingen, p. 435), and contained three species, all recent—(1) *asteria* (*Isis asteria*, Linnæus, 1766, based on Guettard), (2) *mylii* (a pennatulid of the genus *Umbellularia*), and (3) *boltenii* (an ascidian of the genus *Boltenia*).

In 1788 Blumenbach ('Handbuch der Naturgeschichte,' Göttingen, p. 503) again gives *Encrinus*, with the three species, (1) *asteria* (as before), (2) *radiatus* (= *Vorticella encrinus*, Linnæus); and (3) *ouifer* (= *Vorticella ouifer*, Linnæus). Thus the genus *Encrinus*, as understood by Blumenbach in 1779 and 1788, contained the same three species, though two of them were included under different names.

Lamarck in 1801 ('Syst. des Animaux sans vertèbres,' p. 379) appears to have been the first reviser of the genus. He included in it two species, (1) *caput-medusæ* (= *Isis asteria*, Linnæus, = *Encrinus asteria*, Blumenbach) and (2) the fossil *Encrinus liliiformis*. The latter is excluded from all claims as the type of *Encrinus* by the fact that it did not appear in the genus as originally proposed by Blumenbach. Furthermore, Lamarck removed from all consideration the second species, *mylii* or *radiatus*, by establishing for it the new genus *Umbellularia* (p. 580). According to the views of Lamarck, *asteria* was the only species of the original *Encrinus* which could be retained in that genus, as restricted by him.

In 1804 Blumenbach ('Abbildungen naturhistorische Gegenstände,' p. 60, pl. lx.) gives the name *Encrinites fossilis* to Lamarck's second species, *E. liliiformis*, and also (p. 70, pl. lxx.) gives the name *Pentacrinites fossilis* to the species subsequently called *Pentacrinus briareus* by J. S. Miller. Neither of these names can have any influence on the selection of the type of *Encrinus*, as neither species was included in the original genus.

In 1816 Lamarck repeats his original disposition of the genus *Encrinus*, and in the same year Savigny ('Mém. sur les Animaux sans vertèbres,' 2^e partie, p. 140) finally removes the third species of Blumenbach's original genus, *boltenii* or *ouifer*, making it the type of his new genus *Boltenia*. This makes it clear that *asteria* alone remains as the type of *Encrinus*; summarized, the elimination is as follows:—

ENCRINUS, Blumenbach, 1779.

- (1) *asteria*.
- (2) *mylii* (or *radiatus*) (type of *Umbellularia*, Lamarck, 1801).
- (3) *boltenii* (or *ouifer*) (type of *Boltenia*, Savigny, 1816).

It may, perhaps, be mentioned that Oken's use of *Encrinus* ('Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte,' 1815, iii. p. 110) for Blumenbach's second species only does not enter into the question at all, for that species had, fourteen years before, become the type of Lamarck's *Umbellularia*.

Since the type of *Encrinus* is the *Isis asteria* of Linnæus, this involves considerable change in the nomenclature of the recent stalked Crinoids. The species of *Metacrinus*, *Eudoxocrinus*, and *Hypalocrinus* remain as previously understood (see Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, xxi. pp. 151, 152); the other species of the recent Pentacrinitidæ, *asteria*, *decorus*, and *blakei*, falling into two groups which cannot be separated more than subgenerically, must be treated as follows:—

Genus ENCRINUS, Blumenbach, 1779.

(Genotype.—*Isis asteria*, Linnæus, 1766.)

Subgenus ENCRINUS, Blumenbach.

Encrinus (*Encrinus*) *asteria* (Linnæus).

Subgenus ISOCRINUS, L. Agassiz, 1836.

(Genotype.—*Isocrinus pendulus*, von Meyer, 1837.)

Encrinus (*Isocrinus*) *blakei* (P. H. Carpenter).

Encrinus (*Isocrinus*) *decorus* (Wyville Thomson).

XL.—Note on a rare Plumularian Hydroid, *Cladocarpus formosus*. By JAMES RITCHIE, M.A., B.Sc., Natural History Department, the Royal Scottish Museum.

IN 1874 Allman described, under the name *Cladocarpus formosus*, several hydroid specimens obtained by the