

Preface

For simplicity, the title of this book is 'The Ultrastructure and Phylogeny of Insect Spermatozoa' but its subject is, in fact, the spermatozoa of the Uniramia: Onychophora; Myriapoda; and Hexapoda, including the Insecta. Some out-group comparison with the spermatozoa of the Crustacea and Chelicerata is also made. The primary aim of the work has been to make available in a single volume a critical resumé of all research reports on uniramian sperm, the literature of which is large and scattered, there being substantially more than one hundred works on the spermatozoa of the Diptera alone, as only one order. New data of the author on some groups are added. To keep the size of the volume within acceptable limits, only ultrastructure and only that of the mature spermatozoon is considered, with few exceptions. The intention has been to review the salient points of each publication within a taxonomic framework, insofar as these illuminate the ultrastructure of the spermatozoon, rather than to produce an overall synthesis in which details for each taxonomic entity might be obscured. Phylogenetic studies are also critically reviewed. A taxonomic and phylogenetic overview is, nevertheless, presented in the last chapter. While no other work attempts to review and cite the entire ultrastructural literature, this book complements and does not supplant excellent but briefer reviews by Professor Baccio Baccetti, Dr. David Phillips and the late Professor Odette Tuzet and others which are cited in the text.

The use of spermatozoal ultrastructure for taxonomy and phylogeny is now accepted in an ever-widening circle of *cognoscenti* and opposition to its use is usually dispelled when its effectiveness for resolving hitherto intractable problems of taxonomic placement and relationship is demonstrated. I here coin the term **spermiocladistics** and **spermio-taxonomy** for phylogenetic and taxonomic applications of sperm ultrastructure. To recognize as true cladistics the now numerous examples is appropriate because even where strict Hennigian procedures, the basis of true cladistics, have not been employed, or are employed independently of formal cladism by using well-established principles of **homology**, recognition of affinity on the basis of sperm structure has nevertheless obeyed a fundamental requirement of the Hennigian system. This requirement (Hennig, 1966) is that relationship be recognized on the basis of shared *advanced* (i.e. derived) characters. An advanced character is termed an **apomorphy** and an apomorphy shared between two or more taxa is a **synapomorphy**. Furthermore, each taxonomic or phylogenetic entity must be defined by at least one distinctive apomorphy, an **autapomorphy**. A corollary of the requirement is that relationship is not recognized on the basis of shared unmodified (i.e. primitive) characters. A primitive character is termed a **plesiomorphy** and when shared with another entity is termed a **symplesiomorphy**.

In very briefly mentioning some of the well-established examples of the utility of sperm ultrastructure for taxonomy and phylogeny, it is appropriate to first cite examples which formally employed, and acknowledged their debt to, the methodology established by Willi Hennig. The first was that of Schmidt and Zissler (1979) for anthozoan coelenterates, a particularly interesting example as it showed that even 'primitive' sperm (aquasperm in the author's terminology) have apomorphies distinctive of their various groups, a fact to which Afzelius (1979) had independently drawn our attention. The author (Jamieson, 1983), working on oligochaete sperm, related sperm structure to a holomorphological phylogram,

later (Jamieson, 1984a) used numerical, computer procedures to model Hennig's methods, and recently (Jamieson, 1986; Jamieson *et al.* 1987) employed the excellent program of Swofford (1984) for phylogenetic analysis using parsimony. This Wagner program attains one of the chief aims of Hennigian phylogeny in minimizing homoplasy (homoiology or parallelism), for which the term **symparemmorphy** has been introduced (Jamieson, 1984b). The only other use of computer techniques for spermiocladistics has been that of Harding *et al.* (1986) for the sperm of marsupials. But use of sperm ultrastructure reached its ultimate expression, appropriately in the school of Ax who has done so much to establish the value of Hennigian theory, with the definition and naming of a taxonomic group (and a major one), in an otherwise somatic analysis, on the basis of a spermatozoal apomorphy: recognition of the new taxon Trepaxonemata for platyhelminthes from the Polycladida through Cestoda on the autapomorphy of a single central element in the spermatozoal axoneme by Ehlers (1984). The classification obtained contrasted with that supported by Hendelberg (e.g. 1986) and demonstrated the wide gulf often seen between Hennigian systems and those obtained by other means. Numerous valuable non-Hennigian phylogenetic papers have been published by Justine and Mattei on monogeneans and by Swiderski on cestodes.

Spermiocladistics, with preparation of formal cladograms, has been painstakingly utilized by Wirth (1984), for a number of groups, of which his analysis of chelicerate phylogeny is particularly impressive; Alberti's meticulous studies of chelicerate sperm have laid the foundation for this and further cladistic analyses (see Chapter 1). In the Crustacea, Grygier (1982) has made a strict spermiocladistic analysis of flagellated, maxillopod sperm; Pochon-Masson and colleagues, Hinsch and others too numerous to mention have informally shown the value of sperm ultrastructure for phylogeny; and Wingstrand (1978) has left an example to all in thorough spermiocladistic analysis of a group, the Branchiopoda, though without reference to Hennigian methods (references in Chapter 1). Franzén (1977) has related sperm structure to a conventional phylogeny of the Metazoa. The author (Jamieson, 1985) has made a preliminary spermiocladistic study of echinoderms. The taxonomy of gastropod molluscs is undergoing a valid revolution as a result of the far-reaching investigations by Healy of sperm ultrastructure though he has yet to apply formal cladistics. In the Nematoda, Anya (1976) and later, Baccetti and colleagues (1983), at Siena, have attempted spermatozoal phylogenies. The most prodigious investigations of sperm ultrastructure have been those of Baccetti and his team, chiefly on Uniramia, studies which they have frequently directed to development of phylogenies, again, however, not in an Hennigian framework. In the present work these and other insectan studies are reviewed and the congruence of spermatozoal characters, in Hennigian terms, to a pre-existing, chiefly somatic cladogram of Kristensen is examined for each order. The value of holomorphological cladistics, sampling the entire anatomy of the organism, is not to be disputed but spermatozoa offer an 'independent arbiter' capable in many cases of resolving contentious taxonomic and phylogenetic problems.

This book could not have been written without the generous co-operation of many fellow research-workers who have donated reprints and illustrations. They are too numerous to all be mentioned individually but where their work has been cited they are fully acknowledged in the text. Those who kindly gave permission for reproduction of micrographs or line drawings are cited in the legends to illustrations and are also listed below.

Colleagues whose micrographs or line drawings are reproduced, with kind permission, are: B.A. Afzelius, G. Alberti, J. André, T. Asai, B. Baccetti, A. Baraiti, C. Bareth, S.R. Bawa, F. Beniouri, R. Bernini, J.J. Bieseke, E. Bigliardi, M.S. Blum, J. Bocquet-Védrine, L. Boissin, J.T. Bowman, O.P. Breland, H. Breucker, G.G. Brown, A.G. Burrini, G. Callaini, M. Camatini, M. Cazals, P. Chanmanon, B.-P. Clayton, F. Coste, F. Cotelli, M.A. Cruz-Hofling, C. Cruz-Landim, W.T. Daems, R. Dallai, L.V. Danilova, K. Deutsch, J. Dlugosz, J. Durand, C.D. Eddleman, A.S.N. El-Hawawi, M. Ferraguti, A. Ferreira, F.W. Fisk, M.E. Fitzgerald, M. Folliot, E. Franchi, B. Fratello, M. Friedländer, P. Furieri, E.S. Gaber, G. Gassner, I.D. Gharagazoulu van-Ginneken, F. Giusti, M.J.

Grygier, W.F. Harris, J.W. Harrold, R. Hartwick, B.I. Hihara, G. Hinsch, J. Huignard, P.W. Itaya, Å. Jespersen, B.M. Jordan-Luke, C. Juberthie, B.I. Kiefer, P.E. King, E.W. Kitajima, N. Kociok, N.P. Kristensen, H. Kurokawa, G. Lanzavecchia, P.E. Lee, G. Legg, C. Lora Lamia Donin, J.B. Mackie, J.-F. Manier, M. Mazzini, C.B. Metz, L.G. Moriber, J.C. Morse, J.A. Nunez, V. Pallini, W.B. Parrish, P. Periti, M.E. Perotti, J.-P. Persijn, D.M. Phillips, F. Piantelli, J. Pochon-Masson, A. Raibaut, S.C. Reed, J.F. Reger, M. Renieri, J.G. Riemann, W.G. Robison, L.J. Romrell, F. Rosati, G.W. Rouse, V. Rousset, G. Selmi, D.M. Shahaney, L.I. Shinyaeva, H.P. Stanley, V. Storch, R.G. Summers, P. Talbot, B. Tandler, A.D. Tate, K.T. Tokuyasu, S.A. Thompson, T.E. Thompson, J. Turquier, J.J. Trimble, M. Vegni, J. Wahrman, M.H. Walker, F.D. Warner, G. Werner, R.F. Wilkinson, K.G. Wingstrand, U. Wirth, L. Zylberberg. Sadly, one must record the passing of E. Horstmann, S. Manton, H. Ōsaki, A. Szöllösi, A. Wilkes and G. Yasuzumi, whose illustrations are also included.

The following publishers gave permission for reproduction of the illustrations. These are listed here with the titles of journals or books from which they originated: Academic Press: Baccetti, *Comparative Spermatology*, Figs 1.7A-D, 1.7K, 3.3, 3.4, 3.27, 3.29, 4.2, 8.1, 8.2, 17.15; *Experimental Cell Research*, Figs 17.18, 17.19; Camatini, *Myriapod Biology*, Fig 3.1; *Journal of Ultrastructure Research*, Figs 1.4B, 1.7 L,M,N,P,R, 3.25, 6.3, 7.1, 9.9, 9.10, 10.4, 13.1, 17.6, 17.11, 17.13, 17.17, 18.2, 18.8; *Journal of Zoology, London*, Figs 1.1, 1.4R; Phillips, *Spermiogenesis*, Fig 18.1; Académie des Sciences, Paris: *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Séances de l'Académie des Sciences, Paris*, Fig 12.1; Alan R. Liss, Inc: *Gamete Research*, Fig 13.3; *Journal of Morphology*, Fig 18.12; Annual Reviews Inc: *Annual Review of Entomology*, Fig 4.1; Arachnological Society of East Asia: *Acta Arachnologica, Japan*, Fig 1.4 C, D; Biomedical Press: *International Journal of Invertebrate Reproduction*, Figs 1.8, 8.6; Academie Brasileira de Ciencias: *Anais da Academia Brasileira Ciencias*, Fig 19.2; Cambridge University Press: *Journal of Cell Science*, Figs 4.3, 4.4, 17.3; Clarendon Press, Oxford: *Quarterly Journal of Microscopical Science*, Fig 6.2; Istituto Sperimentale per la Zoologia Agraria: *Redia*, Figs 15.5, 17.16; Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab: *Danske Videnskabernes Selskab Biologiske Skrifter*, Figs 1.7 F, 1.9; Editrice Compositori Bologna: *Journal of Submicroscopic Cytology*, Figs 1.4 L, 3.5, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.13, 7.3, 9.6, 12.2, 13.2, 15.10, 17.14; Electron Microscope Society of America: *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Electron Microscope Society of America*, Fig 9.3; Entomological Society of America: *Annals of the Entomological Society of America*, Figs 18.11, 19.3; Grassé & Millot: *Annales des Science Naturelles, Zoologie, - Paris*, Figs 1.7 O, 3.18, 3.20, 3.21, 3.24, 15.9, 18.5; Kashiyo-Insatsu Co. Ltd.: Ando, *Biology of the Notoptera* Fig. 10.5; Macmillan Journals Ltd: *Nature*, Fig 12.7; Martinus Nijhoff Publishers: André, *The Sperm Cell*, Fig 17.1; National Research Council of Canada: *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, Fig 1.7 Q; *Canadian Journal of Genetics and Cytology*, Fig 19.1; Oliver and Boyd: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, Fig 15.6; Peralam-Kenoth, Karivellur, Kerala: Adiyodi, *Advances in Invertebrate Reproduction*, Fig 1.7 I; Pergamon Press : Afzelius, *The Functional Anatomy of the Spermatozoon*, Fig 15.3; *International Journal of Insect Morphology and Embryology*, Figs 8.3, 8.4, 9.8, 15.7, 17.2, 17.7, 17.20; *Zoologica Scripta*, Figs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4; Plenum Publishing Corporation: *Journal of Mechanochemistry and Cell Motility*, Fig 15.8; Presso l'Università degli Studi di Firenze: *Monitore Zoologico Italiano*, Fig 5.1; Sociedad Entomologica Del Peru: *Revista Peruana de Entomologica*, Fig 9.1; Société Française de Microscope Electronique: *Journal de Microscopie et Biologie Cellulaire*, Figs 1.4 Q, 1.6, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 14.1, 14.2, 14.3; Société Zoologique de France: *Bulletin de la Société Zoologique de France*, Fig 1.7 J; Springer Verlag: *Cell and Tissue*, Figs 4.5, 15.2; *Zeitschrift für Zellforschung*, Figs 1.7 E, 1.7 G-H, 3.10, 3.12, 3.28, 15.1; *Zoomorphologie*, Figs 1.4 E-H, 1.4 J-K; Swedish National Science Research Council: *Acta Zoologica (Stockholm)*, Figs 1.4 N, 5.2; The Faculty Press: *Cytobios*, Fig 15.4; The Rockefeller University Press: *Journal of Cell Biology*, Figs 5.3, 6.4, 6.5, 7.2, 8.7,

12.6, 14.4, 17.8, 18.9; Universiteit van Amsterdam, Commissie voor de Artis Bibliotheek: *Bijdragen tot de Dierkunde*, Figs 3.6, 3.11; Urban and Schwarzenberg Inc: Fawcett and Bedford, *The Spermatozoon*. Figs 3.2, 8.8, 12.3, 17.12; Van Nostrand Reinhold Company: Gupta, *Arthropod Phylogeny*. Figs 1.2, 6.1, 11.1, 3.22; VEB George Thieme: *Biologisches Zentralblatt*, Fig 17.5; VEB Gustav Fischer Verlag: *Zoologische Anzeiger*, Fig 1.4 I; *Zoologische Jahrbücher*, Fig 1.4 M,O,P; Verlag Paul Parey: *Verhandlungen der Naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins in Hamburg*, Figs 1.5, 3.15, 3.16, 3.19, 3.23, 3.26; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University: Robison, *Morphology and Systematics of Scale Insects*. No.9 - *Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Research Division Bulletin*, Fig 12.4.

Special thanks are due to Professor Baccio Baccetti and his team at Siena, without whose multifaceted works this book would be a mere shadow, and Dr. David Phillips whose unsurpassable micrographs, so kindly donated, greatly enrich it. I am grateful, too, to those who read and commented on part or the whole of the typescript: Professors Björn Afzelius, Colin R. Austin, Baccio Baccetti, Karl Heinz Glätzer, Volker Storch, Dr. Niels Kristensen and Dr. Hilke Ruhberg.

Mrs. Lina Daddow, Zoology Department histologist has given much invaluable technical assistance in my electron microscope work. Mr. R. Webb, Mr. G. Rouse, Mr. S. Foale, and Mr. C. Tudge, research assistants supported by Australian Research Grants Scheme funding, gave valued technical assistance. Figs. 4.2, 10.1, 15.7, 18.9 and 18.11 were prepared by Gregory Rouse, Figs. 7.2, 9.2, 9.3, 9.6, 13.3, 14.1, 14.2, 14.4, 15.3, 15.8, 15.9, 17.1, 17.13 and 18.5 by Christopher Tudge and Figs. 3.3, 3.4, 3.7, 3.10, 3.13 and 9.1 by Mrs. Lyn Pryor. All original drawings and phylograms are by the author. The generous financial support of the Australian Research Grants Committee was essential for the production of this book. Work could not have proceeded without the unfailing help of Miss Mary O'Sullivan and the staff of the Biological Sciences Library, University of Queensland. The University of Queensland, and particularly Professors Clifford Hawkins and Jiro Kikkawa, are thanked for providing facilities and support and for maintaining an environment for scholarly research. Much gratitude is also due to Professor Gabriel Horn, in the Zoology Department, University of Cambridge, and to the Master and fellows of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, for providing incomparable hospitality during crucial phases of preparation. The understanding, and help in so many respects, of my wife and daughters, in the long hours while I communed with my word processor, were essential ingredients to achievement of my goals. The confidence of my publishers, and particularly of Dr. Robin Pellew, in accepting and seeing through the press this offering is gratefully acknowledged.

Any errors of typography or citation are my own.

Brisbane, July 1986

B.G.M. Jamieson

REFERENCES CITED IN THE PREFACE

(See also Chapter 1)

- Afzelius, B.A. 1979. Sperm structure in relation to phylogeny in lower Metazoa. In Fawcett, D.W. and Bedford, J.M. *The Spermatozoon*. Urban and Schwarzenberg, Baltimore. 243-251.
- Anya, A.O. 1976. Physiological aspects of reproduction in nematodes. *Advances in Parasitology* 14: 267-351.
- Baccetti, B., Dallai, R., Grimaldi de Zio, S. and Marinari, A. 1983. The evolution of the nematode spermatozoon. *Gamete Research* 8: 309-323.
- Ehlers, U. 1984. Phylogenetisches System der Platyhelminthes. *Verhandlungen der Naturwissenschaftlichen Vereins in Hamburg* 27: 291-294.
- Franzén, A. 1977. Sperm structure with regard to fertilization biology and phylogenetics. *Verhandlungen der deutschen zoologischen Gesellschaft* 1977: 123-138.

- Harding, H.R., Aplin, K. and Shorey, C.D. 1986. Cladistic analysis of marsupial sperm structure: methodological perspectives. *Development, Growth and Differentiation* 28 Supplement: 62 (Abstract only).
- Hendelberg, J. 1986. The phylogenetic significance of sperm morphology in the Platyhelminthes. *Hydrobiologia* 132: 53-58.
- Hennig, W. 1966. *Phylogenetic Systematics*. University of Illinois Press, Urbana.
- Jamieson, B.G.M. 1983. Spermatozoal ultrastructure: evolution and congruence with a holomorphological phylogeny of the Oligochaeta (Annelida). *Zoologica Scripta* 12: 107-114.
- Jamieson, B.G.M. 1984a. A phenetic and cladistic study of spermatozoal ultrastructure in the Oligochaeta (Annelida). *Hydrobiologia* 115: 3-13.
- Jamieson, B.G.M. 1984b. Spermatozoal ultrastructure in *Branchiostoma moretonensis* Kelly, a comparison with *B. lanceolatum* (Cephalochordata) and with other deuterostomes. *Zoologica Scripta* 13: 223-229.
- Jamieson, B.G.M. 1985. The spermatozoa of the Holothuroidea (Echinodermata): an ultrastructural review with data on two Australian species and phylogenetic discussion. *Zoologica Scripta* 14: 123-135.
- Jamieson, B.G.M. 1986. Some recent studies on the ultrastructure and phylogeny of annelid and uniramian spermatozoa. *Development, Growth and Differentiation* 28 Supplement: 25-26.
- Jamieson, B.G.M., Erséus, C. and Ferraguti, M. 1987. Parsimony analysis of the phylogeny of some Oligochaeta (Annelida) using spermatozoal ultrastructure. *Cladistics* (In press).
- Schmidt, H. and Zissler, D. 1979. The sperm of the Anthozoa and their phylogenetic significance. *Zoologica (Stuttgart)* 44: 1-98.
- Swofford, D.L. 1984. *Phylogenetic analysis using parsimony*. Version 2.2. User's Manual. D.L. Swofford, Illinois Natural History Survey, 607 East Peabody Drive, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

The Hexapoda are characterized by a transversely hinged, all possess a swinging pair of anterior tentorial apodemes which abduct the mandibles. The Hexapoda also possess a sclerotized head capsule, differing in detail from that of the Myriapoda but with a similar segmental preoral composition. The Hexapoda have paroral, unjointed, primitively rolling mandibles, followed by maxillae 1 and 2, the latter pair fused to form a labium with different structure and muscular connections and support from that of the Symphyla. In hexapods two pairs of tentorial apodemes provide the head endoskeleton but they are rigid, usually fused and never cause mandibular abduction (Manton 1977).

In Chapter 2 evidence will be presented for the view that the Onychophora may be closer to the Rhabdellina (Annelida) than they are to the Uniramia, with which they, nevertheless, have close affinities.

Arthropod polyphyly

Studies of functional morphology and

Evolutionary relationships between the Onychophora and the Arthropoda for separate arachnomorph and crustacean phyla, with the reservation that if these two groups were shown to form a monophyletic entity they could be contained in the Schizoramia.

It has been proposed that the Onychophoran - myriapod - hexapod assemblage (the Uniramia) evolved from haemocoelic, lobopodial, metamorphically segmented invertebrates differing from all living annelids and radiating on land into the modern uniramians of which only the Onychophora retain the lobopodium (Tiers and Manton, 1958; Manton, 1977). Recently, from her long series of studies on functional morphology in conjunction with embryological evidence presented by Anderson (e.g. 1974), Manton has concluded that uniramian ontogeny could have descended from that of some yolk-egged annelid but not from that of any extant polychaete (Manton, 1979). It was stressed (Manton, 1967, 1973a) that the Uniramia could have nothing to do with the Polychaeta in origin because, *inter alia*, the parapodial mechanism could not, particularly in its reliance for strengthening