



Annals and Magazine of Natural History

Series 5

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

XVIII.—Note on the species of the Linnean Genus Asterias which are ascribed to Retzius

F. Jeffrey Bell M.A.

To cite this article: F. Jeffrey Bell M.A. (1882) XVIII.—Note on the species of the Linnean Genus Asterias which are ascribed to Retzius , Annals and Magazine of Natural History, 9:51, 166-168, DOI: [10.1080/00222938209459016](https://doi.org/10.1080/00222938209459016)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222938209459016>



Published online: 07 Oct 2009.



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



Article views: 3



View related articles [↗](#)

XVIII.—*Note on the Species of the Linnean Genus Asterias which are ascribed to Retzius.* By F. JEFFREY BELL, M.A.

By the almost universal consent of naturalists, two papers written within the first fifty years of the Linnean zoology are ascribed to one whose name, by his own services and by those of his family, is one of the best known to biologists. On p. 234 of the fourth vol. of the 'Nya Handlingar' of the Kongliga Svenska Vetenskaps-Academien (1783) commences a paper entitled "Anmärkningar vid *Asterie* Genus, af A. J. Retzius;" and in its ten pages there are enumerated fifteen species. That this paper is correctly ascribed to Retzius admits of no manner of doubt.

A second paper, dealing with the same subject and entitled a dissertation, appeared more than twenty years later; this paper is ordinarily ascribed to the same author as the paper already spoken of, and allowed to be his.

Is it not, however, somewhat remarkable that a naturalist who was more than sixty years of age and had twenty-two years before dealt with the subject, should be then producing a dissertation (though a dissertation which is indeed of very considerable value, for it enumerates fifty species)? The paper in question is thus quoted by three leading authorities:—

"And. J. Retzius dissertatio sistens species cognitae Asteriarum. Lundæ, 1805, 4" *.

"Retzius, A. J. Dissertatio sistens species cognitae Asteriarum. 1805" †.

"Retzius—Diss. sistens species cognitae Asteriarum. Bruzelius et Lundæ, 1805, 37 pages. Bruzelius in B. H. N. J. p. 560" ‡.

All these three systematic writers are obviously enough referring to the same dissertation, though M. Perrier's citation would be a little difficult to one who would like to see only similar cases united by a conjunction, and who had not at hand the second edition of Engelmann's 'Bibliotheca Zoologica': here, on p. 351, s. v. Retzius, he will find after the title, "resp. Nic. Bruzelius, Lund, 1805 (37 pag.), Bruzelius in B. H. N. I. p. 560 hiernach zu streichen."

Müller and Troschel would seem undoubtedly to have known the work now in question at first hand; they write in their preface, "Die Abhandlung von Retzius Dissertatio

* Müller & Troschel, Syst. der Ast. p. ix.

† Lyman, Ill. Cat. M. C. Z. 1865, p. 9.

‡ Perrier, Rev. de Stellér. Paris, 1875, p. 33.

etc., ist nach Linck die erste systematische Arbeit von Wichtigkeit, und, in Beziehung auf Beschreibung von Arten, eigentlich die einzige ältere von Werth. Sie ist so gut wie völlig unbekannt, von keinem Schriftsteller citirt, und die Citate der Schriften beziehen sich bloss auf seine ältere Abhandlung in den Schriften der schwedischen Academie."

But, now, is this dissertation by Retzcius at all? Not, at any rate, so far as the title will allow us to judge. If, instead of copying Müller and Troschel, or consulting a bibliographical work, we go to the original itself, we find the title to be "Dissertatio sistens species cognitae Asteriarum. . . Quam, consentiente Ampliss. Ord. Philos. sub Praesidio D. M. And. J. Retzii [here follow eight lines reciting Retzcius's dignities] pro Laurea modeste exhibet *Nicolaus Bruzelius*, Scanus. In Lyceo Carolino die i Junii MDCCCV. Lundæ, Literis Berlingianis."

If we ascribe an essay with such a title to Retzcius, then must we give him such other contributions as were "modestly offered" by Planander in his 'Animadversiones in classem Piscium Linneanæ,' or Danielssen on Entomology, or Jacobson on the Crocodile, all of which were read during his tenure of the presidential chair.

One further proof of the position I take up may be offered from the body of the paper itself. After speaking of earlier writers on the subject, the author says, "Non paucas demum post illum observarunt ac descripserunt O. F. Müller et P. C. Abildgaard in Zoologia Danica et Praeses in novis actis Reg. Academ. Scient. Holmensis editis pro anno 1783." In no other than this connexion is the name or assistance of Retzcius referred to.

Had the object of the preceding lines been to bring before the zoological world an essay containing names which would "antedate" those in common use, I should have published them with pain, and I should have suggested whether it would not be advisable here as elsewhere to let the dead bury their dead. But this, I am glad to say, is not the object of these lines; nor have they for any one of their results any alteration of the specific names which have been selected with care and judgment, and with a knowledge of the existence of this dissertation.

In one or two instances it may relieve us of difficulty. The *Ophioderma longicauda* of Müller and Troschel becomes in Mr. Lyman's "Preliminary List" *Ophiura laevis*; this specific appellation is used only by Mr. Lyman, who has taken it from Rondelet (1554); Lamarck called the species *lucertosa*; but as Bruzelius (Diss. p. 28) called it *longicauda*,

we are enabled to retain for this common species the name by which it is best known, and that without any evasion of the rules which have been suggested for the preservation of zoological peace. Dr. Gray and Prof. Perrier are shown to be justified in their adoption of the specific term *Schmideliana* for the *Culcita discoidea* (Lamk.) of Müller and Troschel.

Henceforward, however, those zoologists who add to the specific name the name of its author must bear in mind that Nicolaus Bruzelius claims to share with Retzius in some of the earlier specific titles given to various brachiate Echinoderms.

XIX.—*On some Silurian Leperditiaë.*

By FR. SCHMIDT and RUPERT JONES.

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

GENTLEMEN,

M. Fr. Schmidt, of the Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg, one of the relatively few palæontologists who have taken up the study of *Leperditia* and their allies, has favoured me with the following criticisms on my "Notes on the Palæozoic Bivalved Entomostraca"*, published in the Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. ser. 5, vol. viii. Nov. 1881. His long and intimate acquaintance with these Entomostraca in Scandinavia and Russia makes his opinion of great value, especially in the comparison of the English with the North-European species, and of these latter among themselves. M. Schmidt writes thus:—

"1. You regard *Leperditia balthica*† (His.) and *L. Hisingeri*, Schmidt, as varieties or sexual forms; but they belong to different geological horizons, as shown in my memoir‡, and there is a striking specific difference between them in the strong transverse striation on the inverted plate of the left valve of the true *L. balthica*, as shown in your pl. vi. figs. 4 b, 5 b, Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. 1856, and previously noticed by Hisinger and Keyserling. The inverted plate of *L. Hisingeri* is quite smooth. This latter species belongs to the lowest part of the Upper-Silurian series of Gothland—that is,

* These "Notes," marked "XII.," should be "XIII.," and the "Notes" marked "XIII.," in Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. September 1879, should be "XII."

† See Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. November 1881, p. 334. M. Fr. Schmidt and others adopt the term *baltica*; but I prefer the Linnæan form of the word, as in "*Tellina balthica*."—T. R. J.

‡ Ueber die russischen silur. Leperd. 4to, 1873.