

scribed and named this extremely important genus by the name of *Hippiospongia*, adding only the one letter "i." Also there is a good type specimen in the National Museum to bind it. Now if Burton's action is valid, my name stands, and if not, Schulze's name is still good, and in either case the two names are so nearly identical that there should be no doubt as to what sponge sort is being discussed, with or without the extra letter in its name.

The fresh-water sponges are widely available to zoologists, and are therefore much noticed. Their first genus is *Spongilla* of Lamarck, 1815; well and good. However, a year earlier in 1814 a certain L. Oken had described a fresh-water sponge and given it the genus name *Tupha*. Then in 1816 Lamouroux set up another name *Ephydatia*, about which the one certain thing is that it is a synonym of *Tupha*. Lamouroux wasn't describing a specimen at all. He just made a name, and specifically referred to the identical specimen to which Oken had referred.

*Spongilla* is the main fresh-water sponge, but there is a second sort, nearly as common and important. Carter in 1881 described it well and named it *Meyenia*. A few years later some one named Vejdovsky got the notion, with no evidence whatsoever, that this *Meyenia* should be called *Ephydatia*, and to-day he is widely copied. If it were the same genus as *Ephydatia* (which is anybody's guess) it would certainly have to be *Tupha*. Yet in complete default of specimens, and with the utterly unrecognizable descriptions of the ancient authors, there is absolutely no justification for digging up the ancient names at all. The genus is *Meyenia*; first, last and always.

My article in *SCIENCE* for February 19, 1937, pointed out that the common Calcsponge that is used as standard class material in America had been carelessly mis-identified, and is really *Scypha*, not *Grantia*. There is a common European sponge correctly named *Grantia*, but not at all the same as the one we use so much in this country. Now recent text-books of zoology are calling this genus still another name, *Sycon*. It is a pity to have to dig up the history of this set of names, but apparently necessary. The name *Scypha* was given to this sponge in 1821 by J. E. Gray, but like so many biologists of that era, he thought that all sponges were vegetable, therefore he stated that this was a genus of plants. Five years later, in 1826, Mr. A. Risso decided that Gray was wrong, and that since the sponge had been named as a plant it was fair game for a new name as an animal. So he proposed to call it *Sycon*. Yet it has long been regarded that the sort of mistake Gray made does not invalidate the name he gave. We may not like the name *Scypha*, but unless official international action is taken, it is correct.

The term "sycon" is well established as the name of a certain type of sponge architecture. It is therefore here suggested that it would not be wise to have the earlier name set aside in its favor.

It has long been recognized that there are three classes of sponges. The prior names for these are

- (1) Calcispongiae—Blainville 1830 (or Schmidt 1862).
- (2) Vitrea—Wyville Thomson 1868.
- (3) Demospongiae—Sollas, 1875.

Priority does not need to be followed in regard to class names, although wanton shifting about is deplored. In 1886 Vosmaer proposed changing the second class from Vitrea to Hyalospongiae, which gives us three classes of the sponge phylum, all ending in the syllables "-spongiae." This harmony is very helpful to students, and it is therefore probable that Vosmaer's change does deserve to be followed.

Since the turn of the century there has been a growing tendency to alter the first name to Calcarea and to alter the second name further from Vitrea to Hexactinellida. It is not clear at all what advantage (if any) is served by these changes. There is, and has been for a very long time, in the Hyalospongiae a family named Hexactinellidae. In my publications it has therefore been suggested that it would be most helpful to adhere to the long-established class names: Calcispongiae, Hyalospongiae and Demospongiae.

M. W. DE LAUBENFELS

#### NOTES ON RUSSIAN AND OTHER EUROPEAN HERBARIA

FROM a communication recently received from Leningrad it is reported that the very large and important herbarium and library at the Komarov Institute of Botany (Principal Botanical Garden) suffered no damage during the siege of Leningrad although many bombs fell in the grounds. Most of the living greenhouse collections were lost because of breakage of glass by bombs. Likewise the Siberian part of the important Turczaninow herbarium at Karkov was removed to Leningrad, and is thus safe. The general Karkov herbarium, however, the Ukrainian Academy of Science at Kiev and the Nikita Botanical Garden near Yalta in the Crimea were confiscated by the German invaders and moved to Germany.

The one important herbarium and botanical library in France that we know to have been utterly destroyed is that of the University of Caen, for the university buildings were wrecked during the invasion of Normandy. However, it is reported from Paris that nothing was disturbed in the great historical collections at the Muséum d'histoire naturelle.

E. D. MERRILL

ARNOLD ARBORETUM,  
JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS.,  
MARCH 29, 1945