

Bulletin of the British Myriapod Group 13 (1997)

PRELIMINARY ATLAS OF THE CENTIPEDES OF THE NETHERLANDS

M.P.BERG Communication EIS-Nederland no.78 (December 1995)

PRELIMINARY ATLAS OF THE MILLIPEDES OF THE NETHERLANDS

M.P.BERG Communication EIS-Nederland no.79 (December 1995)

These two volumes and the companion one by the same author on the terrestrial isopods (Communication no.77) are a welcome and valuable addition to our knowledge of these animals in the Netherlands.

C.A.W. Jeekel published an invaluable series of papers describing myriapods, from various parts of that country during the 1970s which culminated in his Voorlopige atlas van de verspreiding der Nederlandse duizendpoten (Chilopoda) and the corresponding one for miljoenpoten (Diplopoda) (1978), two of the earliest national atlases to be prepared. The present works include his records and others and those of a new working group on Myriapoda within the European Invertebrate Survey (EIS), Nederland active since 1990.

To the British worker their interest lies in the similarities and differences between the Dutch and the British myriapod fauna and the reasons for these and perhaps the most interesting comparison can be made of species from eastern England, notably Lincolnshire and east Yorkshire and those on the other side of the North Sea where one may assume some similarities in climate, etc. - or is it just me seeing *Lithobius variegatus* absent in both areas? To the east, the Dutch species merge into a more general European fauna with species which we lack whilst in the southernmost province, Limburg, we see species known as southern ones here.

Each atlas comprises a foreword, introduction, checklist, a note on the recording units (10km UTM grid), a brief introduction to the Netherlands, occurrence per province, distribution maps (46 centipedes, 46 millipedes), list of recorders, acknowledgements and references. There is also a set of transparent overlays provided covering distribution Holocene & Pleistocene (sea level), soils, phytogeographic regions, annual precipitation and mean daily temperature.

Species are mapped by dots but without records of different dates being distinguished. The total number of records, number of UTM squares and ranking in order of number of records are given.

Centipedes unfamiliar to British workers are *Lithobius dentatus*, *L. pelidnus*, *L. subtilis*, *L. agilis*, *L. erythrocephalus*, *L. lusitanus* and *L. aeruginosus* whilst missing are not only *Lithobius variegatus* but *L. borealis* and *Henia brevis*. Ranked number one, unsurprisingly, is *Lithobius forficatus* with 971 records from 241 UTM squares. *Henia vesuviana* has only one record as also *Lithobius lapidicola* *L. pilicornis* and

Scutigera. There are 26 for *Pachymerium ferrugineum*, not coastal, 8 for *Geophilus proximus* and 6 for *Brachyschendyla dentata*. Notable is the cluster of species mostly or almost entirely recorded from Limburg, *Cryptops parisi*, *Lithobius dentatus*, *L. muticus*, *L. tricuspis*, *L. agilis* and *L. aeruginosus*. There are only 10 records of *Lamyctes fulvicornis* but this could be due to its seasonality.

Millipedes include *Glomeris intermedia* (Limburg), *Seychellobolus dictynotus*, *Ommatoiulus rutilans* (Limburg), *Cylindroiulus appeninorum*, *Leptophyllum nanum*, *Microiulus laeticollis*, *Chromatoiulus projectus* (eastern) and *Detodesmus attemsi*. Not included are species such as *Chordeuma proximum*, *Melogona scutellare*, *Nanogona polydesmoides*, *Brachychaeteuma melanops*, *Cylindroiulus londinensis* and *Polydesmus gallicus*. *Ophiulus pilosus* has only 16 records from 5 squares all in Utrecht & Noord-Holland whereas *Julus scandinavicus* is ranked 1 with 483 records from 142 squares. *Stosatea italica* and *Unciger foetidus* are both deleted from the Netherlands list as there were no reference animals. Both were old records. The apparent absence of *Unciger* from Holland casts an interesting light on the *Unciger* colony in Norfolk as it was widely suggested that it came in with garden plants. The usual source of these is the Netherlands.

If there is one criticism, it is that the maps do not have any indication of the age of the record nor any habitat or other information. The 1978 maps did include comments on ecology and aspects of the species distribution - although for the non-Dutch speaker there was a language problem. Here it is difficult to know which are synanthropic or indoor records, information which would have been helpful for some of the species. For instance, there are 59 records of *Oxidus gracilis* from 17 squares when the usual habitat for this in northern Europe is glasshouses.

Despite this the atlas maps are a valuable indication of the distribution of species and make a most useful comparison with those for Britain and for other nearby parts of Europe and the quality of production is very high. Well worth looking at for anyone working in Britain or elsewhere in NW Europe.

The author and publisher are to be congratulated.

Copies are available from : Department of Ecology & Toxicology
Section Soil Zoology
Vrije Universiteit
De Boelelaan 1087
1081 HV Amsterdam

tel.: +31-20-4447004