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**ABSTRACT**

The cytological conditions in the genus *Catinella* are discussed. The haploid chromosome number of *Catinella arenaria* is 6. The karyotype morphology differs from other known Catinellinae by the position of the centromeres and the chiasma frequency. The subgeneric characters of the group are surveyed in detail with respect to their phylogenetic value. The unique phylogenetic position of the Succineidae is pointed out and a new order Succineoidea is proposed.
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In one of our previous papers we have demonstrated the feasibility of the taxonomic separation of closely allied gastropod species with numerically equal chromosome complements by the application of comparative cytotaxonomical methods (Butot & Kiauta, 1966). The present study of chromosomes in *Catinella* (*Quickella*) *arenaria* has given us the opportunity to review the cytotaxonomical conditions within the genus of which six species have so far been examined cytologically (table I). Five of these have a numerical equal chromosome complement but to the best of our knowledge no figures of *Catinella texana* or of *C. cf. oregonensis* chromosomes have been published.
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TABLE I. Chromosome numbers in Catinella

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>chrom. numbers</th>
<th>locality</th>
<th>reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catinella (Catinella) rotundata (Gould, 1848)</td>
<td>5 10</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Burch, 1964b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Mediappendix) cf. gabbi (Tryon, 1866)</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Burch, Patterson &amp; Natarajan, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Mediappendix) cf. oregonensis (Lea, 1841)</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Burch &amp; Patterson, 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Mediappendix) texana (Hubricht, 1961)</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>Southern USA</td>
<td>Patterson &amp; Burch, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Mediappendix) vermeta (Say, 1824)</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Burch, 1964a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. (Quickella) arenaria (Bouchard-Chantereaux, 1837)</td>
<td>6 12</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>this paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All individuals were rather young, and most of them in the very beginning of spermatogenesis. In seven specimens the various divisional stages could be studied. Fully developed spermatozoa were, however, very scarce. In all, 71 microphotographs were made.

Ovotestes in active stages of gametogenesis were examined. The tissues were fixed and stained by the lacto-acetic-orceine squash technique (Boytes & van Brink, 1964). The slides were studied using a Wild phase contrast microscope, 100 x oil immersion objective, 10 x oculars, factor 1.25 and photographed on Agfa IFF panchromatic film. The figures in this paper are printed at a magnification of 1750.

The chromosomes of Catinella (Quickella) arenaria

The diploid chromosome number of C. arenaria is 12. The six pairs can be discerned easily in the spermatogonial cells (pl. I, pl. II fig. 1). The centromere position is either submedian, nearly median or subterminal. No structural peculiarities could be found in the mitotic metaphase chromosomes but for an occasionally deeper stained terminal section on one arm of one or both longest chromosomes (pl. I). The chromosome size varies at this stage between 9 and 2.6 μ, approximately.

In early diakinesis the bivalents appear as circles, crosses and rods of varying sizes. In C. arenaria the appearance of at least two bivalents (rods and crosses) suggests a single chiasma, whereas three or four have probably two chiasmata per bivalent (rings). One pair has a pronounced delayed pairing (pl. II fig. 3). At metaphase II the diads appear as "dumb bells" or paired "dumb bells". They are about half the size of the spermatocyte I bivalents (pl. II fig. 4).

The cytological picture of Catinella arenaria is unique among the hitherto examined species of the genus of which microphotographs have been publish-
ed. This feature is stressed by (1) the position of the centromere, which lies in *C. cf. gabei*, *C. rotundata* and *C. vermeta* always medianly or submedianly, and by (2) the chiasma frequency.

Since *C. rotundata* differs clearly from other species of the genus by its lower chromosome number and no figures were available of the chromosomes of *C. texana* and *C. cf. oregonensis*, the centromere position of the remaining three species is tabulated in table II. The data for *C. vermeta* and *C. cf. gabei* were compiled from drawings published by Burch (1964 a), Patterson & Burch (1966) and Burch, Patterson & Natarajan (1966) respectively. Contrary to these authors we considered in table II chromosomes as metacentrics only in the case of the arm ratio being 1:1.

### Table II. Centromere position (constriction) in chromosomes of *Catinella* spp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th><em>arenaria</em></th>
<th><em>cf. gabei</em></th>
<th><em>vermeta</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>submedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>nearly median</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>submedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>median</td>
<td>submedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>nearly median</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>submedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>subterminal</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>submedian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>subterminal</td>
<td>submedian</td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it is often difficult to determine a construction as median or submedian, submedian or subterminal, the smallest two pairs in *C. arenaria* are quite plainly subacrocentric (pl. I, Karyograms), and differ in this feature essentially from the other n = 6 *Catinella* species.

An heterochromatic terminal region in one chromosome arm of the longest pair in *C. arenaria* is also interesting. Burch (1964 a) has described a secondary constriction in one arm of one of the longest chromosomes in *C. vermeta*. In *C. cf. gabei* no structural peculiarities are apparent (Burch, Patterson & Natarajan, 1966).

In *C. cf. gabei* the bivalents are “mostly all” in the form of crosses, indicating only one chiasma per bivalent (Burch, 1964 a), however, Patterson & Burch (1966) record a multiple loop-shaped bivalent with three chiasmata. In *C. arenaria*, on the other hand, the appearance of at least two bivalents suggests a single chiasma, whereas the remaining chromosomes have probably two chiasmata per bivalent.

**Discussion**

The genus *Catinella* Pease, 1870 is divided into three subgenera: *Catinella* s. str., type *Succinea rubida* Pease, 1870; *Quickella* Boettger, 1939, type *Succinea arenaria* Bouchard-Chantereaux, 1837; and *Mediappendix* Pilsbry, 1948, type *Succinea campestris vagans* Pilsbry, 1900. The subgenera are recognized by a penial appendix which is lacking in *Catinella* s. str.; indistinct and existing only as a rudiment in *Quickella*; well developed and protruding from the middle of the penis in *Mediappendix* (Odhner, 1950).
Plate I. Catinella arenaria: spermatogonial metaphase and karyograms (× 1750).

Table III. Phylogenetically important anatomical characters in Catinella

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>subgenus</th>
<th>shell whorls</th>
<th>radula marginals and laterals</th>
<th>radula number of teeth in horizontal row</th>
<th>appendix</th>
<th>vagina</th>
<th>length</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Catinella</em></td>
<td>1 1/4—2</td>
<td>not primitive</td>
<td>115—123</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>equals penis length</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quickella</em></td>
<td>3 3/4—4</td>
<td>greater antiquity than Mediappendix</td>
<td>29—41</td>
<td>hardly developed</td>
<td>longer</td>
<td>twice penis length</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mediappendix</em></td>
<td>2 1/4—3</td>
<td>primitive</td>
<td>45—51</td>
<td>well developed</td>
<td>longer</td>
<td>exceeds penis length</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 111 six morphological characters are tabulated. They are of a definite subgeneric importance. For three of them their relative primitivity is discussed by Odhner (1950).

1. Conchologically ear shaped shells are considered more advanced than shells with a high spire, which consideration points to Catinella s. str. as to the most advanced subgenus and to Quickella as the most primitive one.

2. Quickella and Mediappendix preserved in their broad marginals of the radula a more primitive condition than the radula of Catinella did, while Quickella in the ectocones of the laterals preserved a trace of greater antiquity than Mediappendix.

3. The number of teeth in the horizontal rows of the radula is considered to decrease with increased specialization, consequently Catinella is the most primitive and Quickella the most advanced subgenus in this respect.

4. The phylogenetic value of the penial appendix is unclear. It is well develop-

**Plate II. Catinella arenaria**: mitotic and meiotic stages: 1, early spermatogonial prometaphase; 2, late spermatogonial anaphase; 3, early spermatocyte metaphase I (polar view); 4, spermatocyte metaphase II (polar view) (× 1750).
ed in Mediappendix and it is reduced in Quickella. In Catinella the penial appendix is completely lacking but it is not clear whether this condition is primary (primitive) or secondary (specialized).

5. The vagina in Catinella is clearly shorter than in Quickella and Mediappendix but no difference as to its length is found between the two latter subgenera.

6. The length of the truncus bursae in Catinella equals the penis length. It is longer than the length of the penis in Mediappendix whereas it reaches twice the penis length in Quickella.

From the above is clear that Mediappendix occupies an intermediate position between the subgenera Catinella and Quickella in the following aspects: number of shell whorls, characters of marginals and laterals, number of teeth in the horizontal row of the radula and in the length of the truncus bursae. The length of the vagina and the chromosome number do not contradict this evidence, although they are similar in Quickella. Whatever phylogenetic value is assigned to the penial appendix the subgenus Mediappendix does not take an intermediate position; it is either most specialized if the absence of the penial appendix is a primitive character or most primitive if its absence is a result of reduction. It is not clear which of the remaining two subgenera should be considered the most specialized. The evidence in table III does not permit a conclusion.

Butot (1967) has shown that in the phylum Mollusca a general parallel exists between specialization and increase of chromosome number. If this were true Catinella is more primitive than Quickella. This is supported so far by a high number of teeth in the horizontal row of the radula only. Additional support could be given by the lack of a penial appendix. If the latter condition is primary, the short vagina and the length of the truncus bursae are most likely also primitive features. The number of shell whorls and the nature of the marginals and laterals of the radula, however, are not primitive.

The male genital organ of the genera Quickia and Indosuccinea in Catinellinae according to Odhner (1950) represent the most archaic type in any of the Catinellinae. If this were true Catinella is also more primitive than Quickella. The development of penial appendages is in such a case phylogenetically a sign of progressive evolution. For this reason cytological studies of Quickia and Indosuccinea would be most desirable.

THE SYSTEMATIC POSITION OF SUCCINEIDAE

In Succineidae the Catinellinae are generally accepted more archaic when compared to the Succineinae. Their haploid chromosome numbers vary from 5-6 and from 12-22 respectively. The same holds true for Heterurethra compared to the remainder of Stylommatophora, chromosome numbers varying from 5 to 22 and from 20 to 34 respectively, in haploid cells. These numbers form distinct series.

In Succineidae features are found atypical of the constituent orders of
“Pulmonata”. They resemble basommatophorans in the broader bases of the tentacles, the discrete prostate, the occurrence of a posterior gastric coecum, their egg capsules bound together in the spawn, and a caudal vesicle not being visible during the embryonic period (Rigby, 1965). The reproductive system differs from that of Basommatophora and agrees with the pattern of opisthobranch systems. The Succineidae are more advanced than the marine tectibranchs. Rigby (1965) concluded with reference to the anatomy of alimentary and reproductive systems and to cytological features that the Succineidae are more properly placed among the “opisthobranchs” than among the Stylommatophora. The classification in the Anaspidea (= Aplysiacea) is supported by the resemblance of the alimentary and reproductive systems.

Cook (1966) studied the central nervous system of *Succinea putris*. *Succinea putris* resembles the Basommatophora in the presence of a group of chromehematoxylin positive cells lying under the medio dorsal bodies, the presence of a lateral lobe, the structure of the medio dorsal bodies and the lack of cerebral commisure nerves. In other features, however, *S. putris* resembles the other Stylommatophora much more than it does “Opisthobranchia”, it even has typical stylommatophoran features. Therefore reclassification of *S. putris* as a basommatophoran or an opisthobranch on the basis of the morphology of the central nervous system, is not warranted.

Because of the Succineidae are pulmonates with the eyes at the tips of the dorsal tentacles, it would seem logical to regard them as Stylommatophora. Other stylommatophoran “pulmonates” with the eyes at the tips of the dorsal tentacles: the families Onchidiidae, Rathouisiidae and Veronicellidae have been removed from Stylommatophora as a separate order Soleolifera within Euthyneura. Because of the position of the eyes in Succineidae it seems illogical to place the family in Basommatophora. The position at the base of Stylommatophora seems improbable, as the family, especially in the elasmognathous jaw, shows an homogeneity which prevents any phylogenetical relationship to the remainder of Stylommatophora. The family is really remarkable and unique. In fact the origin of the Stylommatophora is uncertain as they cannot be derived from Ellobiidae in Basommatophora as is generally accepted. This family, though primitive basommatophorans, are already too far entrenched in typical basommatophoran characteristics to be possible ancestors of the Stylommatophora (Rigby, 1965). Therefore, the position of Heterurethra at the base of Stylommatophora is most uncertain.

It is clear that Heterurethra cannot be identified with one of the existing euthyneuran orders. No other group shows a combination of stylommatophoran, basommatophoran and tectibranch features. As is done with the Soleolifera, the Heterurethra should be removed from Stylommatophora forming a separate order under the name of Succineoidea 1. The older names Elasmognatha and Heterurethra for this group are rejected as we prefer to follow Taylor & Sohl (1962).
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