



The enigma of the genus *Stenaphorura* Absolon, 1900 (Collembola, Tullbergiinae)

JOSEF RUSEK

Institute of Soil Biology BC AS, v.v.i., Na Sádkách, 370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic. E-mail: rusek@upb.cas.cz

Abstract

Stenaphorura japygiformis Absolon, 1900 was redescribed based on the holotype and on virtually topotypic material from the Moravian Karst, Czech Republic. Lectotype of *Stenaphorura lubbocki* Bagnall, 1935 was redescribed and used for comparison with *S. japygiformis*. The postantennal organ, composed of 50–56 simple vesicles, is 3.8 times the length of the frontal pseudocellus in *S. japygiformis*, compared to 75 vesicles and 6.3 times in the related *S. lubbocki*. Figures and measurements of some structures are given for the first time. As a consequence of my studies *Stenaphorurella* Lucíañez & Simón, 1992 is sunk into synonymy of *Stenaphorura* Absolon, 1900. All species transferred into *Stenaphorurella* by Lucíañez & Simón (1992) and by Khanislamova *et al.* (1997) are reintroduced into *Stenaphorura* Absolon, 1900.

Key words: type redescrptions, taxonomy, synonym

Introduction

Absolon (1900) discovered and described a new genus and species of Collembola *Stenaphorura japygiformis* Absolon, 1900 from the Elisabeth cave (Eliščina jeskyně) near Sloup in the northern part of the Moravian Karst. The characteristic morphological features of the new genus were described as: 4 anal spines, postantennal organ with many narrow vesicles and antennal organ III present, antennae cylindrical, pseudocelli present, empodial appendage absent. The new species was characterised as slim, third antennal segment organ consisting of only two thick sensory rods and a postantennal organ which is extremely large, consisting of 80–100 vesicles by Absolon (1900). He was not able to give an accurate account of the pseudocelli number and their distribution. He mentioned one large pseudocellus on each antennal base and two large pseudocelli on posterior head margin. He could not accurately describe the pseudocelli number of individual segments of the body because he did not use KOH treatment on the single delicate specimen. The whole body, except last abdominal segment which has long setae was described as covered with short setae. More detail about *Stenaphorura japygiformis* was given in an extensive paper written in Czech (Absolon 1901); however this description is also insufficient and does not provide more details than in the original German article (Absolon 1900) except for some figures (dorsal view of the animal, side view on the leg, dorso-lateral view on the antenna, end of the leg with claw) in the Table 1 in the mentioned second paper (Absolon 1901). The figures are lack the detail need for contemporary taxonomy. The pseudocellus morphology is assumed to be similar to *Protaphorura*-species and it is clear, that Absolon did not observe the quite different morphology of Tullbergiinae pseudocelli. It is mentioned in the Czech version that the not many numerous pseudocelli on the whole body. Absolon (1901) did not use microarthropod treatment by KOH solution because of the then common conviction that KOH is destroyed many morphological structures in these fragile microarthropods.