

LINCKIA ROSENBERGI VON MARTENS, A SYNONYM OF *L. LAEVIGATA* (L.)

by

Dr. H. ENGEL

(Zoological Museum, Amsterdam)

When Clark (1921) cleared the genus *Linckia* from superfluous synonyms, he could give no opinion on *Linckia rosenbergi* Von Martens 1866, p. 63 from Amboina. The unique holotype was in the Berlin Museum and hence not easily accessible to him, the species had not been described again. In his key Clark lays the stress on Von Martens' remark: "Die Porenfelder liegen zwischen den zwei Reihen grösserer Plättchen an der Armseite dicht aneinander, ohne alle Unterbrechung (wie bei *Ophidiaster suturalis* Müll. & Troschel), aber die Poren behalten dieselbe Anordnung in runde Gruppen (Felder) von circa 10 Poren bei". Clark interpreted this as follows: "Porous areas between superomarginals and inferomarginals in an unbroken, continuous series, more or less circular, each with about 10 pores".

In the Leiden Museum I found an animal, that aroused my curiosity: it was a common *L. laevigata*, labelled *L. rosenbergi* from Amboina. As this Museum possesses many animals collected by Von Rosenberg (cf. A. Gijzen, 's Rijks Museum van Natuurlijke Historie 1820-1915, Dissertation, Leiden, 1938), it is possible, that it is a topotype. It conformed rather well with Von Martens' description, showing R till 38 mm, r 6½ mm, br. 7 mm, so R = 5br and 6r. There are in the armcorners 5 rows of ventrals, 2 of which only continue along nearly the whole arm. The proximal third of the arm shows on the dorsal side the rather distinct area free of pores, formed by a more or less regular median row of plates. The whole in short, is a typical, beautiful and regular *L. laevigata*. Yet it is impossible to give any important difference from the description of *L. rosenbergi*.

The only way to solve the problem was the study of the type specimen. Professor Arndt of the Berlin Museum was so kind to send me the type specimen on loan. I received two animals, one of which conformed to the description of Von Martens. The second has not been mentioned by him. Both were common *L. laevigata* (L.) (= *L. miliaris* auct.).

The measurements of the type specimen were given by Von Martens: R 39 mm, breadth of arm 7 mm, r 8 mm, so $R = 5\frac{1}{2}$ br and 5 r. There are 5 rows of ventral plates in the armcorners, 3 of which continue till over half the arm, 2 nearly till the end. Von Martens mentions 4 rows, a number that may be found not far from the armbase. Between the 2 regular marginal rows are found the poriferous areas, of which Von Martens makes the above cited remark. It is true, that they are not separated by plates, but some granules are always found between each area and its neighbours; as Von Martens expresses it: the pores form round groups. The whole does not differ in any respect from *L. laevigata* of the same size. As usual the dorsal plates are scattered irregularly on the back and the poriferous areas do not show any regularity, continuing on the disc, only leaving free a rather distinct median area on the proximal third of each arm. The animal has one madreporite.

What at first sight looked like the beginning of a new arm, proved to be a cyst, enclosing a parasitic Gastropod. It is very curious, that Von Martens does not mention this parasite. To spare the type specimen I refrained from taking the mollusc out of its cyst. This cyst formed a rather spacious cavity, with a small opening to the outside, through which the Stiliferid shell could be seen.

The second specimen is of about the same size as the first: R till 32 mm, $R = 5\frac{1}{2}$ br and $5\frac{1}{2}$ r. It is not clear why Von Martens did not mention this specimen. Perhaps it was, like the Leiden specimen, a topotype, later added to the type specimen. It further shows the same characters as the latter.

LITERATURE

- CLARK, H. L., 1921. The Echinoderm Fauna of Torres Strait, its Composition and its Origin. Papers from the Dept. of Marine Biology of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, vol. 10, p. 66.
MARTENS, E. VON, 1866. Über ostasiatische Echinodermen. Archiv für Naturgeschichte, vol. 32, part 1, p. 63.
-