Annals and Magazine of Natural History

Series 5

ISSN: 0374-5481 (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah11>

Note on Regalecus glesne, Ascanius

James A. Grieg

To cite this article: James A. Grieg (1887) Note on Regalecus glesne, Ascanius , Annals and Magazine of Natural History, 19:111, 246-247, DOI: [10.1080/00222938709460235](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222938709460235)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222938709460235>

Published online: 12 Oct 2009.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 4

View related articles [↗](#)

Note on Regalecus glesne, Ascanius. By JAMES A. GRIEG.

This note relates to a herring-king found on the 9th March at Seimstranden, a little to the north of Bergen. It was in water about 2 metres deep, and was landed with some difficulty, in consequence of which, and of the lapse of a week before it was brought to the Museum at Bergen, it had sustained considerable injury. Since 1740, when the first herring-king was found on the Norwegian coast, this makes the fourteenth specimen known with certainty, so that on the average one of these animals has been stranded every ten years. On the English coast these fish occur more frequently; since 1759 twenty individuals have been stranded, or about one in every six or seven years.

The measurements of the *Regalecus* found at Seimstranden are as follows :—

	ft.	in.
Total length	8	0
Length of head	0	9
Diameter of orbit	0	$1\frac{4}{10}$
Distance of anal aperture from tail	2	1

	Total depth.	Elevation of lateral line.
	in.	in.
At the pectoral	$10\frac{4}{10}$	$5\frac{1}{2}$
Between pectoral and anal . . .	15	$4\frac{1}{2}$
At the anal	$13\frac{1}{2}$	$3\frac{1}{2}$

This *Regalecus* is the smallest known specimen, for it is barely 8 feet long, and therefore a little smaller than the individual stranded in Cornwall in 1788 ($8\frac{1}{3}$ feet, Day). Shaw's *Gymnetrus Russellii*, found at Vizagapatam in 1788, measured only 2 ft. 8 in.; but it is uncertain whether this is identical with the northern *Regalecus glesne*. The Bergen *Regalecus* is also remarkable for its great depth, 15 inches, which is about one seventh of the total length, while the proportion varies in other cases between $\frac{1}{6}$ and $\frac{1}{3}$, and even sometimes falls to $\frac{1}{5}$; in the Cornish specimen the proportion was $\frac{1}{10}$.

The pectorals had 12 rays. The number of occipital rays seems to have been 13. The dorsal, which was of a fine red colour in the fresh animal, had 138 rays ($125+13$); but the existence of a gap behind the occipital rays leads the author to conclude that there were altogether about 145 rays, probably more, as there were many rays broken and removed. If Lütken's supposition, that the number of dorsal rays increases with the age of the animal, be correct, as there is every reason to believe, the small number of rays in this specimen is very natural. Unfortunately the number of rays in the English *Regalecus* of 1788 is not stated; it would have been very interesting to compare the numbers in these two specimens of nearly equal size. The ventrals were represented by fragments $2\frac{3}{4}$ and $1\frac{1}{8}$ in. long.

The end of the tail, as usual in the *Regaleci*, is obliquely truncated; at the extreme tip there was a small scar or mark.

The length of the head, 9 inches, is contained 11.7 times in the total length, so that it is larger in proportion than usual; according to Lütken the proportion varies between $\frac{1}{16}$ and $\frac{1}{21}$. The head showed the typical form of the genus, and, as in the two older and larger specimens in the Bergen Museum, there are no teeth. The apparatus of teeth, mentioned by Collett, on the first branchial arch seems to have about 40 rays, but the head is so much damaged that it is impossible to state the exact number. The tongue also was lost. The pupil was round and deep black, and the iris silvery white in the fresh animal. The silvery-white body had several black cross bands, of which five larger ones extended across the whole side obliquely from above downwards.

This herring-king therefore differs from the typical *Regalecus glesne* only in its comparatively larger head, its greater depth, and the smaller number of rays in the dorsal; but as these characters are very variable, the specimen may be regarded as a true *Regalecus glesne*.

The distance from the tip of the snout to the anus is about 6 feet, or 75 per cent. of the total length, and a proportion so abnormal that the author concludes that a portion of the tail had been lost, as according to Collett the normal proportion is $\frac{4}{10}$ instead of $\frac{3}{4}$. Hence this animal would normally have measured nearly $15\frac{1}{2}$ feet in length, which is not unreasonable, as examples have been met with over 5 metres in length, and this supposition is confirmed by the great depth of the body. It must, however, be remarked that the caudal part was complete and smooth with the exception of the fresh lesion at the apex; the form of the tail most resembled that of the Stavanger specimen of 1881.

The individual was a female with a well-developed ovary. The upper part of the intestine was empty, while the lower part contained a yellowish-brown undeterminable fluid.—*Nyt Magazin for Naturvidenskaberne*, Bd. xxx. p. 232.

Carterius Stepanowii, *Petr.* By H. J. CARTER, F.R.S. &c.

This freshwater sponge, which in 1884 was named "*Dosilia* (?) *Stepanowii*" by Dr. W. Dybowski, from a specimen found near Charkow, in Southern Russia ('Annals,' 1884, vol. xiv. p. 60), was also found in 1885 by Prof. Fr. Petr, of the University of Prague, in the neighbourhood of Deutschbrod, in Bohemia, about 60 miles south-east of that city; and his description of it, which is beautifully illustrated, was published in the Czech language at Prague in 1886 ("Dodatky ku Fauně Českých Hub Sladkovodních," Tisdem dra. Ed. Grégra v Praze, 1886). It appears to me to be the same as that discovered by Mr. H. Mills, of Buffalo, New York, in the Niagara River in 1880, viz. *Carterius tubisperma* (Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 14th June, 1881, p. 150).

Thus this remarkable genus of *Spongilla*, first brought to notice