NAIADGEOGRAPHY OF MISSOURI.

BY W. I. UTTERBACK.

The writer would presume to use the term, NAIADGEOGRAPHY, because it is a convenient and comprehensive expression for "the geographic distribution of the *Naiades*, or Fresh-water mussels." This coined term is employed here to correspond with that one in good accepted usage, that is, ZOÖGEOGRAPHY. However, the latter term is less specific, having reference to "the geographic distribution of animals generally."

After some years of study of the *Naiades* of Missouri the writer has been able to work out a key to the mussel faunae which may be used as a summarized account to precede the tabulated list on NAIADGEOGRAPHY.

I.—PRAIRIE DRAINAGE. NAIADGEOGRAPHY:— (Ecology:— Streams sluggish, turbid, mud bottom); (Coincidental Morphology:— *Shells mostly large, smooth, inflated*).

1.—*NORTH MISSOURI FAUNA*.—Missouri R. Southern Boundry. Physiography:—Level or rolling plains with lower stream conditions; Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels scarce, mostly lacustrine*.

a.—NEW PRAIRIES, OR GLACIAL PLAINS.

a1.—MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD PLAINS (*Depauperated Mussel Fauna*).

2.—*CENTRAL MISSOURI FAUNA*.—Missouri R. Northern Boundry. Physiography:—Intermediate Topography and Hydrography; Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels fairly abundant, primitive-modern*.

II.—OZARK DRAINAGE. NAIADGEOGRAPHY.—(Ecology:—Streams swift, clear, rock bottom); (Coincidental Morphology:—*Shells mostly small, rough, compressed*).

2.—*CENTRAL MISSOURI FAUNA*.—Ozark Crest Southern Boundry.

a.—Ozark Border (Lower Osage).

b.—Ozark Plateau (Gasconade Basin).

c.—Ozark Center (Meramec Basin).

3.—*SOUTH MISSOURI FAUNA*,—Southern Slope of the Ozark Uplift. Physiography:—Dissected Uplift with upper steam conditions; Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels abundant, modern mostly fluviatile*.

a.—Ozark Border (S. W. Mo., Neosho Basin).

b.—Ozark Plateau (White River Basin).

c.—Ozark Center (Black River Basin).

EOGRAPHY OF MISSOURI.

BY W. I. UTTERBACK.

ıld presume to use the term, NAIADGEOGRAPHY, venient and comprehensive expression for "the tion of the *Naiades*, or Fresh-water mussels." employed here to correspond with that one in e, that is, ZOÖGEOGRAPHY. However, the latter c, having reference to "the geographic distri- generally."

ars of study of the *Naiades* of Missouri the ble to work out a key to the mussel faunae l as a summarized account to precede the tabu- GEOGRAPHY.

INAGE. NAIADGEOGRAPHY:— (Ecology:— Streams turbid, mud bottom); (Coincidental Morphology:— *ly large, smooth, inflated*).

MISSOURI FAUNA.—Missouri R. Southern Boun- siography:—Level or rolling plains with lower stream s; Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels scarce, mostly*

PRAIRIES, OR GLACIAL PLAINS.

SOURI RIVER FLOOD PLAINS (*Depauperated una*).

L MISSOURI FAUNA.—Missouri R. Northern Physiography:—Intermediate Topography and Hy- Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels fairly abundant, modern*.

NAGE. NAIADGEOGRAPHY.—(Ecology:—Streams swift, k bottom); (Coincidental Morphology:—*Shells mostly gh, compressed*).

L MISSOURI FAUNA.—Ozark Crest Southern

Border (Lower Osage).
Plateau (Gasconade Basin).
Center (Meramec Basin).

MISSOURI FAUNA,—Southern Slope of the Ozark Physiography:—Dissected Uplift with upper steam s; Coincidental Characters:—*Mussels abundant, modern riatile*.

Border (S. W. Mo., Neosho Basin).
Plateau (White River Basin).
Center (Black River Basin).

a2.—MISSISSIPPI FLOOD PLAINS AND LOWLANDS (S. E. Mo. *Depauperated Mussel Fauna*). This region and the similar one above (a1) are really separate from both the Ozarks (II) and the Praities (I) since their ecologic conditions, i. e., the excess of loess and other alluvia in their waters, are the causes of their *impoverished to extinct mussel faunae*.

The author would adopt the same nomenclature in this paper as the one employed in his illustrated and descriptive catalogue of the *Naiades* of Missouri.[1] It may be well to repeat here that the radical changes from that of the Simpsonian system[2] are due to the acceptance of the Rafinesque Priority as recently revived by Frierson,[3] Ortmann,[4] Vanatta[5] and other recognized students of *Naiades;* also to a greater recognition of the nutritive and reproductive structures of the soft parts than to the conchological morphology as bases of classification; however, the writer would not disregard the value of shell characters, yet does not consider their constancy so great for taxonomic purposes. In the following list the progressive form of taxonomy is employed and, in most cases, the Lindahl orthographic modification[6] of Simpson and others is used; however, it is thought that, instead of following the uniform code of not capitalizing names for species in any case, it would be more consistent with Latinic etymology to retain the initial capital in all names of species derived from those of persons when used substantively.

For the sake of clearness the more familiar names, when appearing as synonyms, follow the revised terms as equalities in parentheses, but, in most cases, only the abbreviated name of the author can appear for lack of space. In the accompanying list the geographic distribution (*Naiadgeography*) of species and subspecies is indicated thus: —=scarce; X=fairly abundant; +=abundant, as occuring individually; G=General Distribution of Species.

[1]American Midland Naturalist, Vol. IV, Plates I-XXIX, -1915-1916; also special paper p. 519.

[2]C. T. Simpson, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., XXII, pp. 504-1044, Pl. XVIII, 1900b.

[3]L. S. Frierson, Nautilus, XXVIII, p. 6, May 1914; Footnote 5, Mid. Nat., IV, p. 519.

[4]A. E. Ortmann, *op cit.*, as collaborator.

[5]E. G. Vanatta, Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phil., pp. 549-559, Dec. 8, 1915.

[6]Josua Lindahl, Jour. Cinn. Soc. Nat. Hist., 1906.

SUMMARIZED DISTRIBUTION OF MISSOURI MUSSELS.

Gen. Mussel Faunae	No. of Mussel Species and Varieties			Total for each Fauna.
	Primitive (Unioninae)	Intermediate (Anodontinae)	Modern (Lampsilinae)	
1.—North Missouri	22	9	21	52
2.—South Missouri	12	4	28	44
3.—Cen. Missouri	19	8	26	53

In comparing with other lists of *Naiades*, mostly secured by the writer in correspondence with students for the surrounding States, it is found that North Missouri is mostly that of the Mussel fauna of Illinois and Iowa; that South Missouri belongs to the *great South-West*, i.e., Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana and Texas and that *Central Missouri* is really a combined or transitional zone for these two sections of the Mississippi Valley. The Numbers in the second column of the following comparative lists represent those Species of the writer's list for Missouri that are identical with those of the lists most representative of the Upper Mississippi and the South-West:—

Upper Mississippi	*North Missouri*
No. Species in Illinois (W. S. Strode's List)[1] 29	No. in common 29
No. Species in Iowa (T. Surber's List) 42	No. in common 40
South-West	*South Missouri*
No. Species in Ark. (H. E. Wheeler's List) 50	No. in common 26
No. Species in Miss. & Tex. (L. Frierson's List)[2] 25	No. in common 15
No. Species in Okla. (B. F. Isely's List)[3] 29	No. in common 29
No. Species in La. (Vaughan & Frierson's List) 43	No. in common 21

Many peculiarities are noted in the *Naiadgeography of* Missouri. It is surely a geologic paradox to note a predominance of *primitive species of Naiades*, in the New Prairies, or Glacial Plains. Another problem to be worked out is that of the reason for the limitation of the distribution of *Elliptio dilatata*, *Nephronaias ligamentina* and *Strophitus edentulus*,—Species of the widest and most general distribution in other States. While *S. edentulus* is one of the commonest of shells for Central and South Missouri, yet its occurrence is very doubtful for North Missouri, as the author, in his more thorough investigation of this more accessible part of the State,

[1]W. S. Strode, Nautilus, V., p. 61, Oct, 1891; IX, pp. 115-116, Feb. 1896.
[2]L. S. Frierson, Nautilus, XXIV, p. 134, Apr. 1911.
[3]F. B. Isely, U. S. Bureau Fis. Doc. No. 792, pp. 1-24, 1914; U. S. Bu. Fish. Econ. Cir. No. 9, Feb. 17, 1914.

ISTRIBUTION OF MISSOURI MUSSELS.

No. of Mussel Species and Varieties			Total for each Fauna.
Primitive (Unioninae)	Intermediate (Anodontinae)	Modern (Lampsilinae)	
22	9	21	52
12	4	28	44
19	8	26	53

th other lists of *Naiades*, mostly secured by ondence with students for the surrounding t North Missouri is mostly that of the Mussel Iowa; that South Missouri belongs to the , Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana and Texas *souri* is really a combined or transitional zone is of the Mississippi Valley. The Numbers of the following comparative lists represent riter's list for Missouri that are identical with ost representative of the Upper Mississippi

ppi	*North Missouri*
W. S. Strode's List)[1]....29	No. in common....29
Surber's List)....42	No. in common....40
	South Missouri
E. Wheeler's List)....50	No. in common....26
Tex. (L. Frierson's List)[2]....25	No. in common....15
F. Isely's List)[3]....29	No. in common....29
ghan & Frierson's List)....43	No. in common....21

s are noted in the *Naiadgeography of* Missouri. paradox to note a predominance of *primitive* the New Prairies, or Glacial Plains. Another d out is that of the reason for the limitation of *Elliptio dilatata*, *Nephronaias ligamentina ulus*,—Species of the widest and most general States. While *S. edentulus* is one of the com- Central and South Missouri, yet its occurrence North Missouri, as the author, in his more on of this more accessible part of the State,

ilus, V., p. 61, Oct, 1891; IX, pp. 115-116, Feb. 1896.
utilus, XXIV, p. 134, Apr. 1911.
Bureau Fis. Doc. No. 792, pp. 1-24, 1914; U. S. 9, Feb. 17, 1914.

was only able to secure two individuals and these were too immature and small to be assigned to any definite Species although they were so identified as *edentulus* by recognized students. As indicated in the accompanying Key to the Mussel Faunae these eccentricities of distribution are due to the very different faunal and ecologic conditions. Yet Mr. Bryant Walker, that thorough student of *Naiadgeography*, comments:—"There are some very interesting problems connected with the distribution of Missouri *Naiades* that should be worked out. The poverty of the fauna of the Missouri Valley, as compared with that of either the Upper Mississippi, or of the rivers that flow south through the Arkansas, is very curious. . . . I have never had sufficient data to attempt to even guess at the solution of it."

As to the depauperated to extinct faunae of the South-East Lowlands and of the immediate waters of the Loess-Alluvial Flood-Plains for the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers the writer agrees with Dr. Paul Bartsch of the Division of Mollusks, U. S. National Museum, and leader of the party for the U. S. Pearl Mussel Investigation of the Mississippi River during the summer of 1908. Dr. Bartsch writes: ". . . . we found no *Unios* between the mouth of the Missouri River and that of the Ohio in the Mississippi. This, I believe, is altogether *due to the enormous amount of mud emptied by the Missouri* into the Mississippi, making it impossible for the forms to exist there. . . . I have reported on the Missouri River as 'The Great Faunal Barrier.'"

Concerning the distinctive characteristics of the Ozark Fauna Dr. A. E. Ortmann remarks:—"The Ozark region apparently *is a continuation of the Cumberland Plateau* in the fauna of its rivers so that there will be geographic and faunistic relations with the Tennessee-Cumberland System." Mr. L. S. Frierson also makes this comment:—"The appearance of *Truncillae*, *Pleurobemae* and other forms, so intimately resembling those of East Tennessee, in the mountain streams of Missouri and Arkansas is an interesting and remarkable fact illustrating the power of environmental factors."[1]

The writer is in the position to verify the observations of Ortmann,[2] Clark and Wilson[3] and other field investigators, who have

[1]An unpublished paper, read before a Washington (D. C.) Society of Scientists.

[2]A. E. Ortmann, Proc. Am. Phil. Soc., LII, No. 210, May–Aug., 1913.

[3]H. Walton Clark, and C. B. Wilson, U. S. Bu. Fish. Doc. No. 781, pp. 1-23.

made source-to-mouth surveys of Ohio Valley streams, after having made similar surveys of the most representative streams of the general faunae of this State, especially those of Central and South Missouri, when, during the summers of 1913 and 1916, it was the writer's pleasure and profit to survey the Osage and White Rivers from head-waters to mouth by means of a row-boat. The author is especially able to vouch for the report that many species, notably those of the most primitive *Quadrulae*, are generally found to be light, rough, compressed froms in the head waters and to become heavier, smoother and more inflated further down stream; e g., a plicated *Quadrula* may exist as a flat, light (conventional) *Quadrula undulata* (Barnes) in the swifter, shallower head-waters and as the heavy, inflated (conventional) *Q. plicata* (Say) in the quiet, deeper water nearer the mouth. Then, too, in some instances, it has been observed, especially in the Osage survey, that the nacre-color of certain species, such as *Rotundaria tuberculata* (Raf.) and *Elliptio dilatata* (Raf.), is found to be darker in the upper stream sections and fading out toward the mouth.

CRITICAL NOTES ON NEW AND OLD GENERA OF PLANTS.—IX.

BY J. A. NIEUWLAND.

WINTERIA

Winteria Rehm. is but another way of writing *Wintera*. The latter name was used by Murray[1] in 1784. Another name should be used for the fungus. There is perhaps some diminutive form available for those who favor such and we refrain from adding a new one even though the available ones be rather undesirable.

MYRIACTIS

Kutzing's[2] plant name was preceded by a *Myriactis* Lessing,[3] and must receive a new appellation. *Gonodia* may be suggested, named after Eugene Gonod.

Gonodia Nom. Nov.

Myriactis Kutz, (1843) l. c. not *Myriactis* Lessing. (1831) l. c.

Gonodia pulvinatum Nov. Comb.

[1] Murray, Syst. ed. XIV 567 (1784).
[2] Kutzing, F. T., Phyc. Gen. (1843).
[3] Lessing, in Linnaea, VI., 127, (1831).