

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the original text directly from the copy submitted. Thus, some dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from a computer printer.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyrighted material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is available as one exposure on a standard 35 mm slide or as a 17" × 23" black and white photographic print for an additional charge.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. 35 mm slides or 6" × 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.



300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

Order Number 8820891

**Systematics and biogeography of the genus *Gambusia*
(Cyprinodontiformes: Poeciliidae)**

Rauchenberger, Mary, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1988

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

SYSTEMATICS AND BIOGEOGRAPHY
OF THE GENUS GAMBUSIA
(CYPRINODONTIFORMES: POECILIIDAE)

by

Mary Rauchenberger

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Biology in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of Doctor
of Philosophy, The City University of New York

1988

Abstract

SYSTEMATICS AND BIOGEOGRAPHY OF THE GENUS GAMBUSIA
(CYPRINODONTIFORMES, POECILIIDAE)

by

Mary Rauchenberger

Advisers: Dr. Donn Rosen, Dr. Gareth Nelson

The poeciliid genus Gambusia is a monophyletic group of 45 species. It has a sister-group relationship with the genus Belonesox, and these two in turn are related to the genus Brachyrhaphis. Gambusia vittata and the members of the rachowi species group, each previously assigned to monotypic genera, do possess the synapomorphies for the genus Gambusia, and are thus included. Three subgenera within Gambusia are defined: the subgenus Heterophallina, the subgenus Arthropallus, and the subgenus Gambusia. The subgenera Arthropallus and Gambusia are sister groups. Within the subgenus Heterophallina, the panuco and rachowi species groups are more closely related to each other than either is to G. vittata. In the subgenus Arthropallus, the nobilis and senilis species groups are sister taxa, and in the subgenus Gambusia, the puncticulata and punctata species groups are sister taxa. Relationships within species groups are also

described. This scheme of relationships, and the new classification it produces, is a product of cladistic analysis of morphological characters. A complete descriptive osteology of Gambusia hispaniolae is also included, for comparison and reference.

Biogeographic analysis of the species groups of Gambusia concentrates on three areas. In southern Texas and northern México, members of the affinis, nobilis, and senilis species groups overlap; their area cladograms are compared. The Río Pánuco basin of eastern México is a meeting point for members of the subgenus Heterophallina, the senilis species group, and the affinis species group. A repeated pattern indicates a relationship between the Pánuco basin and the Cuatro Ciénegas basin of northern México, with further ties to southern México. Finally, links between Central America and the Greater Antilles are explored through the distribution patterns and area cladograms of the nicaraguensis, puncticulata, and punctata species groups. Repeated patterns include a relationship between Nuclear Central America (specifically Belize) and the Antilles, between Cuba and the Cayman Islands, and between eastern Cuba, Hispaniola, and the Bahamas. While most of the Caribbean patterns do not strictly reiterate each other, the patterns are all consistent. It is inferred that they represent different

fragments of the complex history of Caribbean biogeography, and are compared with some published distributional information for other taxa.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project began under the guidance and inspiration of the late Dr. Donn Rosen, and I dedicate the final product to him; I wish he were here to see it. His enthusiasm, about systematics, biogeography, poeciliids, science in general and life in general was quite contagious, and I thank him for introducing me to how much fun this could all be. Similarly, Dr. Gareth Nelson, who filled in as my committee chairman, also maintains an excited attitude toward these types of studies. This has made my stay at the American Museum most stimulating.

I also owe thanks to Dr. Klaus Kallman, for discussions of poeciliids, an understanding of the genetic work in Xiphophorus he does, and field work in México. In the same vein, Dr. James Atz has been very generous with his knowledge of poeciliids, and Dr. Lynne Parenti with hers of atherinomorphs.

Graduate students at AMNH, through seminars and discussions, have helped me develop my understanding of fishes, systematics and biogeography. Thanks to Carl Ferraris, Chang-hwa Chang, and especially, Darrell Siebert.

Material was loaned to me from the Museum of Zoology of the University of Michigan; I thank Doug Nelson both for processing the loan and for gracious accommodations

while visiting the collection. Similarly, Dr. Richard Vari provided a welcome place to stay while visiting the United States National Museum. Dr. Barry Chernoff lent some materials from the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, and Ken Lazara provided live material from his trip to Hispaniola.

The Biology department of City College, of CUNY, has provided me with teaching support throughout my graduate career, and CUNY granted me a University Fellowship one year, and a Block grant for OTS study. The AMNH also has awarded me a half-year pre-doctoral fellowship. These forms of support have all been greatly appreciated.

Finally, I would like to thank my family, and especially my parents, for their encouragement and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Figures.....	xii
Introduction.....	1
Historical Review.....	3
Methods.....	11
Abbreviations.....	15
Materials Examined.....	19
Osteology.....	36
Cranium.....	36
Upper Jaw.....	41
Lower Jaw.....	43
Opercular Apparatus.....	46
Jaw Suspensorium.....	47
Hyoid Arch.....	49
Dorsal Gill Arches.....	54
Ventral Gill Arches.....	58
Vertebrae.....	61
Caudal Fin.....	64
Dorsal Fin.....	67
Pectoral Girdle and Fin.....	68

Pelvic Girdle and Fin.....	72
Female Anal Fin.....	73
Gonopodial Supports.....	74
Gonopodium.....	77
Systematics.....	85
Outgroup relationships.....	85
Delineation of the Genus <u>Gambusia</u>	88
Delineation of Subgenera.....	90
<u>Heterophallina</u>	90
<u>Arthrophallus</u>	92
<u>Gambusia</u>	94
Relationships Among Subgenera.....	96
Relationships Within the Subgenus <u>Heterophallina</u>	98
<u>G. vittata</u>	98
<u>panuco</u> Species Group.....	99
<u>rachowi</u> Species Group.....	100
Relationships Within the Subgenus <u>Arthrophallus</u>	102
<u>affinis</u> Species Group.....	103
<u>nobilis</u> Species Group.....	107
<u>senilis</u> Species Group.....	108
Relationships Within the Subgenus <u>Gambusia</u>	110
<u>nicaraguensis</u> Species Group.....	111
<u>puncticulata</u> Species Group.....	113
<u>punctata</u> Species Group.....	116

Biogeography.....	120
Distribution of the Subgenus <u>Heterophallina</u>	120
<u>G. vittata</u>	120
<u>panuco</u> Species Group.....	120
<u>rachowi</u> Species Group.....	121
Distribution of the Subgenus <u>Arthropallus</u>	122
<u>affinis</u> Species Group.....	122
<u>nobilis</u> Species Group.....	124
<u>senilis</u> Species Group.....	126
Distribution of the Subgenus <u>Gambusia</u>	128
<u>nicaraguensis</u> Species Group.....	128
<u>puncticulata</u> Species Group.....	129
<u>punctata</u> Species Group.....	132
Geographic Areas.....	134
Texas and Northern México.....	134
Río Pánuco Basin, México.....	135
Central America and the Antilles.....	137
Tables.....	143
Figures.....	154
Appendix.....	281
Literature Cited.....	291

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Proposed Classification of <u>Gambusia</u>	143
Table 2.	Classification of <u>Gambusia</u> , from Rivas, 1963, pp. 337-342.....	146
Table 3.	Classification of <u>Gambusia</u> , from Rosen and Bailey, 1963, pp. 92-107.....	148
Table 4.	Classification of Atherinomorphs, from Rosen and Parenti, 1981, p.23.....	149
Table 5.	Classification of Cyprinodontiforms, from Parenti, 1981, pp. 462-463.....	150
Table 6.	Classification of Poeciliids, from Rosen and Bailey, 1963, p. 10, with the Addition of <u>Scolichthys</u> , from Rosen, 1967.....	152

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1. Cranium of Gambusia hispaniolae.
 A. Dorsal view.
 B. Ventral view.....154
- Figure 2. Oblique dorsolateral posterior view of the
 cranium of G. hispaniolae.....156
- Figure 3. Lateral view of the ethmoid and orbital regions
 of G. hispaniolae.....158
- Figure 4. Upper jaw of G. hispaniolae.
 A. Dorsal view.
 B. Lateral view.....160
- Figure 5. Lower jaw of G. hispaniolae.
 A. Lateral view.
 B. Medial view.....162
- Figure 6. Opercular apparatus of G. hispaniolae, lateral
 view.....164
- Figure 7. A. Jaw suspensorium of G. hispaniolae,
 lateral view.
 B. Embryonic view of anterior half of
 jaw suspensorium, G. hispaniolae.....166
- Figure 8. Lateral view of hyoid arch of G.
hispaniolae.....168
- Figure 9. A. Anterior part of the hyoid arch of
G. hispaniolae, ventral view.

- B. Urohyal of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view.
- C. Urohyal of G. hispaniolae, lateral view.....170
- Figure 10. Dorsal gill arches of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view, right side only.....172
- Figure 11. Ventral gill arches of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view.....174
- Figure 12. Lateral view of the anterior vertebrae of G. hispaniolae. Only the first pleural and epipleural ribs are shown.....176
- Figure 13. Caudal skeleton of G. hispaniolae, lateral view. Only the right halves of the fin rays are shown.....178
- Figure 14. Dorsal fin skeleton of G. hispaniolae, lateral view. Only the proximal ends of the right halves of the fin rays are shown.....180
- Figure 15. Pectoral girdle and fin of G. hispaniolae.
- A. Lateral view, fin removed.
- B. Pectoral fin, lateral view. Modified extensions on rays 3-5 are stippled darkly.....182
- Figure 16. Pelvic girdle of G. hispaniolae.
- A. Ventral view. Only the outer two fin rays on the right side are shown.
- B. Lateral view.....184

- Figure 17. Anal fin skeleton of a female G. hispaniolae.
- A. Lateral view of hemal spines and proximal anal radials.
 - B. Closer lateral view of proximal, medial, and distal anal radials. Right side only shown for proximal radials and fin rays.....186
- Figure 18. Gonopodial suspensorium of G. hispaniolae, lateral view.....188
- Figure 19. Lateral view of the proximal part of the anal fin of G. hispaniolae, rays 1-7.....190
- Figure 20. Gonopodium of G. hispaniolae.....192
- Figure 21. Cladogram depicting interrelationships in the tribe Gambusiini.....194
- Figure 22. Lateral view of the gonactinostal complex of:
- A. Heterandria jonesi
 - B. Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis
 - C. Belonesox belizanus
 - D. Gambusia holbrooki.....196
- Figure 23. Gonopodia of:
- A. Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis
 - B. Belonesox belizanus.....198
- Figure 24. Median teeth of third pharyngobranchial toothplate:
- A. Gambusia vittata

- B. Gambusia yucatana
- C. Gambusia luma.....200
- Figure 25. Dorsal views of the cephalic sensory canal systems of:
- A. Gambusia senilis
- B. Gambusia pseudopunctata.....202
- Figure 26. Epibranchial 1:
- A. Gambusia regani
- B. Gambusia pseudopunctata.....204
- Figure 27. Anterior part of ventral gill arches, dorsal view:
- A. Gambusia panuco
- B. Gambusia yucatana
- C. Gambusia puncticulata.....206
- Figure 28. Ventral hypohyal and anterior ceratohyal, ventral view:
- A. Gambusia panuco
- B. Gambusia wrayi
- C. Gambusia punctata.....208
- Figure 29. Dorsal and caudal fin patterns:
- A. Gambusia alvarezi
- B. Gambusia pseudopunctata.....210
- Figure 30. Cladogram depicting relationships among subgenera.....212

- Figure 31. Sub-orbital bar, shown on Gambusia
holbrooki.....214
- Figure 32. Cladogram depicting relationships in the
subgenus Heterophallina.....216
- Figure 33. Gonopodia of members of the subgenus
Heterophallina:
- A. Gambusia vittata
 - B. Gambusia marshi
 - C. Gambusia panuco
 - D. Gambusia regani
 - E. Gambusia rachowi
 - F. Gambusia echeagayari.....218
- Figure 34. Cleithral process:
- A. Gambusia luma
 - B. Gambusia echeagayari.....221
- Figure 35. Cladogram depicting relationships among species
groups in the subgenus Arthropallus.....223
- Figure 36. Cladogram depicting relationships in the
affinis species group.....225
- Figure 37. Gonopodial suspensorium of Gambusia georgei.
Compare with Fig. 18.....227
- Figure 38. Gonopodia of members of the affinis species
group:
- A. Gambusia affinis
 - B. Gambusia holbrooki

C. Gambusia speciosa

D. Gambusia aurata

Note: G. lemaitrei also belongs to this group.

See Rivas (1963) for a figure of its

gonopodium.....229

Figure 39. Male pectoral fins. Modified parts of pectoral rays are stippled darkly:

A. Gambusia vittata

B. Gambusia holbrooki

C. Gambusia pseudopunctata

Note: Compare with Fig. 15B for

G. hispaniolae.....231

Figure 40. Cladogram depicting relationships within the nobilis species group.....233

Figure 41. Gonopodia of members of the nobilis species group:

A. Gambusia nobilis

B. Gambusia georgei

C. Gambusia heterochir

D. Gambusia krumholzi

E. Gambusia eurystoma

F. Gambusia sexradiata.....235

Figure 42. Cladogram depicting relationships within the senilis species group.....238

Figure 43. Gonopodia of members of the senilis species group:

- A. Gambusia senilis
- B. Gambusia gaigei
- C. Gambusia alvarezi
- D. Gambusia hurtadoi
- E. Gambusia amistadensis
- F. Gambusia geiseri
- G. Gambusia longispinis
- H. Gambusia atrora.....240

Figure 44. Caudal fin skeletons of:

- A. Gambusia luma
- B. Gambusia hispaniolae
- C. Gambusia atrora
- D. embryonic caudal skeleton of
 G. hispaniolae.....243

Figure 45. Cladogram depicting relationships among species groups in the sungenus Gambusia.....245

Figure 46. Cladogram depicting relationships within the nicaraguensis species group.....247

Figure 47. Gonopodia of members of the nicaraguensis species group:

- A. Gambusia nicarguensis
- B. Gambusia wrayi

Note: Gambusia melapleura also belongs to this

group; see Fink (1971a) for a figure of its
gonopodium.....249

Figure 48. Cladogram depicting relationships within the
puncticulata species group.....251

Figure 49. Gonopodia of members of the puncticulata
species group:

- A. Gambusia yucatana
- B. Gambusia hubbsi
- C. Gambusia baracoana
- D. Gambusia bucheri
- E. Gambusia puncticulata
- F. Gambusia oligosticta
- G. Gambusia caymenensis

Note: G. manni, G. monticola, and G. howelli
also belong to this group, but are not
figured. See Fink (1971b) for some of these
figures. See Fig. 20 for G. hispaniolae.....253

Figure 50. Cladogram depicting relationships within the
punctata species group.....256

Figure 51. Gonopodia of members of the punctata species
group:

- A. Gambusia luma
- B. Gambusia pseudopunctata
- C. Gambusia punctata
- D. Gambusia rhizophorae

E. Gambusia xanthosoma

Note: G. beebei also belongs to this group.

See Rivas (1969) for a figure of its

gonopodium.....	258
Figure 52. Distribution of members of the subgenus <u>Heterophallina</u>	261
Figure 53. Distribution of members of the <u>affinis</u> species group.....	263
Figure 54. Distribution of members of the <u>nobilis</u> species group.....	265
Figure 55. Distribution of members of the <u>senilis</u> species group.....	267
Figure 56. Distribution of members of the <u>nicaraguensis</u> species group.....	269
Figure 57. Distribution of members of the <u>puncticulata</u> species group.....	271
Figure 58. Distribution of members of the <u>punctata</u> species group.....	273
Figure 59. Area cladograms for groups found in Texas and northern México:	
A. <u>nobilis</u> species group	
B. <u>senilis</u> species group.....	275

Figure 60. Area cladograms for groups found in the Río Pánuco basin:

- A. subgenus Heterophallina
- B. affinis species group
- C. senilis species group.....277

Figure 61. Area cladograms for groups found in Central America and the Caribbean:

- A. nicaraguensis species group
- B. puncticulata species group
- C. punctata species group.....279

INTRODUCTION

Much attention was drawn to the poeciliid genus Gambusia Poey, with around 45 species, in 1963, when two independent works were published dealing with the systematics, and to a lesser extent, the biogeography, of this group (Rivas, 1963; Rosen and Bailey, 1963). Since that time, the conflicts between the two schemes have never been resolved, and describers of new species have had difficulty in classifying their new Gambusia (Miller, 1975). Systematic studies have emerged that focus upon higher (Parenti, 1981) and lower (Rivas, 1969; Fink, 1971a and b; Greenfield, 1984; Echelle and Echelle, 1986) systematic levels; this work aims to classify the entire genus, and to establish its close relatives, through the principles and methods of cladistic systematics.

Poeciliid taxonomy has traditionally focused on the specializations of the male's anal fin, the gonopodium, often to the exclusion of other characters. In fact, detailed descriptions of other parts of the anatomy of any poeciliid are generally not available, with some notable exceptions, such as Ramaswami's 1945 description of the chondrocranium of Gambusia affinis, and Weisel's similar account of the guppy, Poecilia reticulata in 1967. The osteological account included in the present work of the

members of the genus Gambusia, uses a male G. hispaniolae as an exemplar, but discusses the range of variation in the genus for all characters. It will serve both as an introduction to the characters important for systematic analysis of the genus, and as a general reference for the complete osteology of a poeciliid, valuable for higher level comparative work.

The species of Gambusia live in fresh water, and range from the eastern and southern United States through México and Central America, with a single species along the South American coast. Particularly interesting are the sixteen species found on islands in the West Indies. Speculations about how these fishes found their island homes, invoking phenomena such as land bridges, migration, and hurricanes, have abounded in the past, but developments in the science of biogeography have made it possible to critically assess distributional hypotheses. A necessary prerequisite for such a biogeographic analysis is a sound systematic hypothesis for the fishes involved. Only then can the nature of the relationship between the organisms and the areas they inhabit be determined. The major objective of this work, therefore, is to describe relationships within the genus, which are summarized in the proposed classification (Table 1), and to discuss their biogeographic implications.

Historical Review

The genus Gambusia was described by Poey in 1854. Although he realized that the two species he assigned to the genus (G. punctata, type species, and G. puncticulata) were poeciliids because of the presence of the male's gonopodium, he distinguished Gambusia from other genera of poeciliids that he encountered in his studies of Cuban fishes, on the basis of body shape, tooth structure, and carnivorous habit. Many more species now referred to the genus Gambusia were described in the years that followed, but there was much confusion in generic assignment. It was Regan, in 1913, who realized that "differences in structure of the intromittent organ are of great systematic importance" (p. 978), and he described Gambusia as being characterized by the spines on ray 3, elbow in ray 4a, and hooks on ray 4p and 5a of the gonopodium. He listed 17 species, eight of which he described as new.

Hubbs (1924, 1926) was the first to subdivide the genus. By this time, the heavy emphasis placed upon gonopodial structure was evidenced by the names assigned to subgenera. Subgenera Arthrophallus and Schizophallus, both monotypic, contained G. patruelis and G. holbrooki, respectively. Subgenus Heterophallina was created for three newly described species, G. vittata, G. regani, and G. panuco, and the remaining 11 species in the genus were placed in the subgenus Gambusia. Hubbs also created a

tribe, the Gambusiini, to contain allied genera - the monotypic Heterophallus and Belonesox.

By the time of the next review of the genus (1963), thirty species bore the name Gambusia. Rivas (1963) removed Hubbs' G. vittata to a monotypic genus Flexipenis in the tribe Gambusiini, primarily because it lacks the distinctive elbow on ray 4a of the gonopodium. He also listed four subgenera; while he synonymized Schizophallus with Arthropallus, a new subgenus, Orthophallus, was created for G. lemaitrei, from Colombia. Within the subgenus Gambusia, he described five species groups: the senilis species group, with 6 members; the nobilis species group, with 3 members; the nicaraguensis species group, with 5 members; the puncticulata species group, with 9 members; and the punctata species group, with 2 members (Table 2). The criteria he employed in grouping were gonopodial characters and geographic distribution.

Also in 1963, Rosen and Bailey published a review of the family Poeciliidae. Their tribe Gambusiini contained Brachyrhaphis, Belonesox, and Gambusia; their genus Gambusia listed 34 species, including two described as new. They also included Flexipenis vittata and Heterophallus rachovii in the genus Gambusia. While emphasizing the need for a thorough study of interrelationships in the genus, they recognized six species groups: affinis species group, 17 species; punctata species group, 4 species;

nobilis species group, 7 species; panuco species group, 3 species; vittata species group, monotypic; and rachowi species group, 2 species (Table 3). These groupings were based primarily on gonopodial specializations, but also considered such characters as pigmentation, vertebral number, and body and fin configuration.

Since these two treatments in 1963 were concurrent and incongruent, both in delineation of groups and assignment to groups. The overall status of relationships within the genus, or of generic limits, has not been addressed since.

Several studies have concentrated on relationships within species groups, following one scheme or the other. Rivas (1969) revised the punctata species group, describing two new species. Here he sharply disagreed with Rosen and Bailey's (1963) delineation of this group, and reiterated his belief that "only gonopodial characters (including the suspensorium) appear to be of value in recognizing and characterizing subgenera and species groups" (p. 779). In this revision, as in his 1963 work, Rivas did not explicitly describe relationships, although one is tempted to infer them from his classification.

Revisions of the nicaraguensis and puncticulata species groups, again as defined by Rivas, appeared in 1971 (Fink, 1971a, b). Referring to Rivas, Fink stated the "he used only gonopodial characters in defining his groups, and I believe that his system is both natural and practical"

(Fink, 1971b, p. 47). And, while clarifying the extent of variation within each of these groups, no schemes describing patterns of relationships were presented.

Further work on the puncticulata species group (Greenfield et al., 1982; Greenfield and Wildrick, 1984; Greenfield, 1985) has included other types of characters, such as pigmentation, body proportions, and electrophoretic analysis. One of these studies (Greenfield and Wildrick, 1984) did present a branching diagram to summarize its results, and its implications are discussed in the Systematics section. Unfortunately, these workers lacked an overall scheme of relationships for the genus, necessary for meaningful outgroup comparisons.

New species described since 1963 have sometimes been easy to classify, such as G. xanthosoma in the punctata species group (Greenfield, 1983) or G. amistadensis in the senilis species group (Peden, 1973b), but often, especially with taxa described from the southern Texas - northern México area, the new species simply did not fit neatly into either of the Rivas or Rosen and Bailey scheme. Hubbs and Peden (1969) felt that G. georgei might lie either in the affinis or nobilis species group. Minckley's (1963) G. krumholzi showed characters both of the nicaraguensis species group and the nobilis species group, and Miller and Minckley's (1970) G. aurata also

falls between the affinis and nobilis species groups. Miller, trying to place G. eurystoma in either the nobilis or punctata group, suggested that "species group of Gambusia be employed with caution until phyletic studies are completed" (1975, p.1).

The taxonomic problems that need to be addressed include an assessment of the limits of the genus. Hubbs, and later Rivas, tended to remove any anomolous fish from the main body of the genus, either to a monotypic genus, as with Flexipenis vittata, Heterophallus rachovii, and Dicerophallus echeagayari, or to a monotypic or a small subgenus, Orthophallus for G. lemaitrei, Arthrophallus for G. affinis, and Heterophallina for the three member panuco group.

If classification is not necessarily meant to reflect relationship, this tactic of sequestering odd fishes is an easy way to deal with them. However, I believe that classification should directly reflect ideas of relationship, and the sister-group relationships implied by that classification with the monotypic taxa have not been substantiated. Similarly, the delineation of subgenera and species groups must be arranged according to relationship, not convenience or geography.

The relationship of Gambusia to other poeciliids has not been addressed since 1963, when Rosen and Bailey allied the genus with Belonesox and Brachyrhaphis. Beyond

that, relationships among poeciliids are yet to be critically examined. The position of poeciliids within the order Cyprinodontiformes was recently reappraised by Parenti (1981), and her classification of the order is employed herein.

Interpretation of Gambusia distribution, particularly in the Caribbean, historically has been heavily influenced by a paper by Myers (1937) entitled "Fresh-water fishes and West Indian zoogeography." In this, he differentiated two kinds of freshwater fishes: primary division fishes, such as ostariophysans, that are "very strictly confined to fresh water" due to "an ancient physiological inability to survive in salt sea water" (pp. 342-3), inferred because nearly all members of such groups are never found in even brackish water; and secondary division fishes, including cyprinodontiforms, which are more tolerant to salt water conditions. "It is evident that many species of this secondary group might easily survive a short sea journey. This is borne out by distributional fact" (p. 345). Regardless of the fact that these fishes do not habitually migrate from island to island, such "colonizing flights," of the type so maligned by Croizat (1964), are exactly the mechanism invoked to explain the distribution of poeciliids in the Greater Antilles, simply because some members of the family do not die in salt water.

Biogeography has often, until recently, been relegated

to the last few pages of systematic revisions, and Gambusia revisers have tried to explain the distribution of the taxa in light of their systematic conclusions (Hubbs and Springer, 1957; Rosen and Bailey, 1963; Rivas, 1963, 1969; Fink, 1971a, b). Two obstacles have prevented this endeavor from being as fruitful as it might have been. First, because of the influence of Myer's judgement that random dispersal by poeciliids might not be that uncommon and of the prevailing notions of stabilist geography, related species were uncritically assumed to have achieved their current stations through migration. Secondly, often times notions of "geographical cohesiveness" were used to justify certain systematic arrangements, i.e., using geographic proximity to indicate close systematic relationship. This obviously leads to problems of circularity when one wishes to make general statements about biogeography based on systematics.

Croizat (1958, 1964) observed that groups of related organisms (even secondary freshwater fishes) are generally not distributed randomly; in fact, he documented an amazing degree of congruence in distribution patterns when surveying many groups. Rather than postulating that the distribution pattern of each group requires a separate explanation, as would be needed in a scenario based on chance dispersal, Croizat proposed that these congruent patterns (generalized tracks) have a single cause, that

"life and earth evolve together." Rosen (1975) applied Croizat's method to the problem of Caribbean distributions, and concluded that the distribution of Gambusia in the Antilles and Central America was but one example of a generalized track relating North America and the Caribbean.

Obviously, to discern the interdependence of organismic relationships and biogeographic relationships, the groups utilized must be natural units; that is, monophyletic groups. As expounded by Nelson and Platnick (1981), the employment of branching diagrams to portray levels of relationship is useful not only in systematics but also in biogeography. With such a tool, not only can one discern broad patterns of distributional congruence (Croizat's generalized tracks) but also finer patterns of congruence within the tracks, corresponding to components of the cladograms. The classic example of this method is found in Rosen (1979), also discussed in Nelson and Platnick (1981), Humphries and Parenti (1986), and many other sources. The method is underutilized, mostly because of the prerequisite for resolved cladograms of related taxa that are endemic to certain areas. The ultimate purpose of this work is to provide such cladograms, to be used in biogeographic analysis, for monophyletic groups within Gambusia.

Methods

The descriptive osteology follows the style of a similar work for a characin (Weitzman, 1962), and, as in that work, I have chosen a single specimen, a mature male Gambusia hispaniolae, to illustrate and describe. However, the description is also comparative, in the sense that those characters that vary in the genus are also discussed. The systematic implications of these characters are treated in the Systematics section.

With characters that do vary, I have tried to indicate the level of generality that they describe. For features that characterize higher groups that include Gambusia, I have relied on several sources - Rosen and Bailey (1963) for poeciliids, Rosen (1964) and Rosen and Parenti (1981) for atherinomorphs, and, particularly, Parenti (1981) for cyprinodontiforms. I have also noted those areas where my observations conflict with the predictions of those works. These apparent contradictions are due, in large part, to the probably necessary, but unfortunately wrong assumption, that a few poeciliids, say, Tomeurus or Xiphophorus, are representative of all poeciliids. While poeciliids are certainly well-corroborated as a monophyletic group, there is a great deal of diversity among them.

As noted in the introduction, few osteological treatises on poeciliids have appeared. Rosen and Bailey

(1963), of course, figured and discussed many gonopodia and gonopodial suspensoria. They also figured many dorsicrania and radiographs of whole fish, but left these undiscussed. The gonopodium has received much attention, with regard to its structure, vascularization, innervation, functional morphology (Rosen and Gordon, 1953), behavior (Rosen and Tucker, 1961; Peden, 1972b), and development (Turner, 1941, 1942a) and similar attention has focused on the other sexually dimorphic systems of poeciliids, such as the gonopodial suspensorium (Turner, 1942b; Rosen and Kallman, 1959), pectoral fin (Turner, 1942c; Hubbs and Reynolds, 1957), and female genitalia (Peden, 1972a, 1973a). Other areas have received relatively little attention, the only exceptions as follows. Cranial development in Gambusia affinis was examined by Ramaswami (1945), and in Poecilia reticulata by Weisel (1967). Hollister (1940) described the caudal skeletons of G. holbrooki and Mollienesia latipinna. And although de Beer (1937) included figures of G. affinis and Gregory (1933) figures of Belonesox belizanus in their respective treatises on fish skulls, neither is well described, nor, in Gregory's case, very accurate. Only works dealing with higher level groups have addressed other parts of the skeleton.

Osteological observations were made on cleared and stained specimens, following the method of Dingerkus and

Uhler (1977), where bone is stained with alizarin red and cartilage stained with alcian blue. Numbers of specimens prepared per lot are listed in the Materials Examined section; in general two males, two females, two juveniles, and embryos taken from gravid females were prepared, collection size permitting. Several Gambusia species were raised in the lab to provide ontogenetic series. Drawings are ink tracings of pencil renderings, using a camera lucida attached to a Leitz binocular dissecting microscope. Meristic, pigmentary, and sensory canal characters were observed on well-preserved alcoholic specimens.

Systematic analysis of character distributions follows the method of Hennig (1966) as set forth in that work and by Nelson and Platnick (1981). The aim is to discover and describe monophyletic groups, characterized by synapomorphies. Grouping by primitive characters, or the lack of derived characters, is not permitted. Determining the level of generality at which a particular character is to be considered derived, i.e., what group does it characterize? what group is it a synapomorphy of? is the most difficult and at the same time the most challenging part of systematics. Helpful in this effort are the techniques of outgroup comparison and ontogenetic investigation, both of which aid in discovering homologies (sensu Patterson, 1982). A common pitfalls involves too

heavy a reliance on a single outgroup, rather than surveying a wide range of taxa of ever-more-encompassing groups; I have tried to avoid this danger but have undoubtedly not avoided it completely.

Character distributions are not always congruent with each other; parsimony is the criterion employed to choose between rival schemes, in that the most parsimonious diagram requires the fewest ad hoc assumptions. Parsimony analysis was aided by Swofford's PAUP program (vers. 2.4.1), run on an IBM-PC. The classification presented in this work is a direct reflection of the systematic conclusions based on parsimony analysis, such that all taxa are monophyletic, and the convention of sequencing specifies interrelationships.

Biogeographic analysis uses the results of the systematic analyses, the cladograms of monophyletic taxa, as input data. Instead of simply implying relationships among taxa, these branching diagrams now also imply relationships among areas. A comparison of these area cladograms will reveal any congruence of distribution patterns among them, to the extent that the groups studied overlap in their areas of endemism. A simple interpretation is that congruence implies shared history, incongruence independent dispersal events. However, Rosen (1985) recently discussed the meaning of incongruence in area cladograms. If an area, such as the Caribbean, has

had a complex history, more than one generalized track may reflect that history. In terms of area cladograms, there will be incongruent components that nevertheless reflect the same history; however, each shows just a part of the complete picture, a part that may be temporally and/or spatially displaced from other parts.

A fuller use of these area cladograms for biogeographic analysis of the regions occupied by Gambusia species, therefore, will only come when cladograms are available for many other taxa that also occupy those areas; this work is a step toward that end.

Abbreviations

Institutional:

AMNH	American Museum of Natural History
ANSP	Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia
UMMZ	University of Michigan, Museum of Zoology
USNM	United States National Museum

Anatomical:

AAR	Anguloarticular
ACC	Accessory cartilage
APL	Autopalatine
ASC	Ascending process of premaxilla
BB2,3	Basibranchial 2, 3
BH	Basihyal
BOC	Basioccipital

BSR	Branchiostegal rays
CBl-5	Ceratobranchials 1-5
CBB4	Cartilaginous basibranchial 4
CH	Ceratohyal
CL	Cleithrum
CLP	Cleithral process
CMK	Coronomeckelian bone
COR	Coracoid
DEN	Dentary
DOR	Dorsal process of maxilla
DR	Distal radial
DSP	Dermosphenotic
EB1-4	Epibranchials 1-4
ECT?	Ectopterygoid?
ELB	Elbow
END	Endopterygoid
EP	Epural
EPI	Epioccipital
EPIP	Epioccipital process
EPR	Epipleural rib
EXO	Exoccipital
FM	Foramen Magnum
FR	Frontal
GP1-3	Gonapophyses 1-3
GPUN	Uncini of gonapophyses
GNA	Gonactinosts

HB1-3	Hypobranchials 1-3
HHC	Hypohyal cartilage
HYM	Hyomandibula
HYP	Hypural
HYPP	Hypural plate
IAC	Interarcual cartilage
IH	Interhyal
IOP	Interopercle
IPB2,3	Infrapharyngobranchials 2, 3
IPR	Inner processes
LAC	Lacrimal
LET	Lateral Ethmoid
LIG	Ligastyle
MAX	Maxilla
MES	Mesethmoid
MKC	Meckel's cartilage
MR	Medial radial
NAS	Nasal
NP	Neuropophysis
NS	Neural spine
OP	Opercle
PAR	Parietal
PAS	Parasphenoid
PC	Postcleithrum
PH	Parhypural
PMX	Premaxilla

POP	Preopercle
PQC	Palatoquadrate cartilage
PR	Pleural rib
PRO	Prootic
PRR	Proximal radial
PTE	Pterotic
PTT	Posttemporal
PU2	Pre-ural centrum 2
Q	Quadrate
RAD	Radials
RAR	Retroarticular
SC	Scapula
SCF	Scapular foramen
SCL	Supracleithrum
SER	Serrae
SOC	Supraoccipital
SOCP	Supraoccipital process
SOP	Subopercle
SP	Spines
SPH	Sphenotic
SYM	Symplectic
THC	Terminal half-centrum (PU1+U1+U2)
TP-IPB4	Fourth infrapharyngobranchial toothplate
UH	Urohyal
US	Urostyle
V	Vomer

VHH Ventral hypohyal

Materials Examined

For species of Gambusia examined, locality information is provided, and these are arranged according to the new classification proposed herein. Other comparative material is arranged alphabetically within hierarchical groupings; i.e. other poeciliids, other cyprinodontiforms, other atherinomorphs. Locality information is not provided for these materials. Number of specimens is indicated in parentheses, first the number of cleared and stained specimens, followed by total number in the lot. When only one number is given, the lot consists of only alcoholic specimens.

Gambusia:Subgenus Heterophallina:G. vittata:

AMNH 32391 (1/12). Río Soto La Marina system,
Tamaulipas, México.

AMNH 38498 (1/5). Río Axtla, Tamaulipas, México.

UMMZ 202820 (126). Río Choy, San Luis Potosí,
México.

AMNH 75822 (3/50). Río Mante, Tamaulipas,
México.

AMNH 75754 (6/79). Río San Rafael, Tamaulipas,
México.

panuco species group:

G. marshi:

AMNH 78130 (7/50). Cuatro Ciénegas, Coahuila,
México.

UMMZ 179167 (1) Holotype. Río Salado, 2 mi.
south Hermanos, Coahuila, México.

UMMZ 198934 (177). Río Mesquites, Cuatro
Ciénegas, Coahuila, México.

G. panuco:

AMNH 32390 (9/29). Río Soto La Marina system,
Tamaulipas, México.

AMNH 78131 (4/150). Río Coy, San Luis Potosí,
México.

UMMZ 198801 (143). Río Verde, San Luis Potosí,
México.

G. regani:

AMNH 78132 (7/100). Río Sabinas system,
Tamaulipas, México.

UMMZ 164734 (48). Arroyo del Encino, Encino,
Tamaulipas, México.

rachowi species group:

G. rachowi:

AMNH 78133 (4/15). México.

UMMZ 187761 (164). Río Chiquito, Tenochtitla,
Veracruz, México.

UMMZ 167098 (1) Holotype of G. atzi (= G.
rachowi). Jesus Carranza, Veracruz, México.

G. echeagarayi:

UMMZ 191731 (3/40). Palenque, Chiapas, México.

subgenus Arthrophallus:

affinis species group:

G. affinis:

UMMZ 122760 (3/349). Wheeler Reservoir, Alabama.

UMMZ 129784 (1580). Limola Lake, Brazos Co.,
Texas.

G. holbrooki:

AMNH 52245 (5/30). Green Cove Spring, St. John
Co., Florida.

AMNH 16255 (1/3). Cochibomba, Bolivia.

UMMZ 163475 (61). Jackson Co., Florida.

G. speciosa:

AMNH 77947 (4/30). Melchor Musquiz, Río Grande
drainage, Coahuila, México.

UMMZ 120320 (684). Devil River, Verde Co.,
Texas.

UMMZ 196738 (177). Arroyo La Salada, Coahuila,
México.

G. aurata:

AMNH 75821 (7/62). Nacimiento del Río Mante,
Tamaulipas, México.

UMMZ 188736 (1) Holotype. Río Mante,
Tamaulipas, México.

nobilis species group:G. nobilis:

AMNH 52233 (4/200). Dexter National Fish
Hatchery, Eddy Co., New Mexico.

UMMZ 179801 (681). Phantom Cave, Jeff Davis
Co., Texas.

UMMZ 132268 (27). Tunis Spring, Pecos Co.,
Texas.

G. krumholzi:

UMMZ 180322 (3/87) Paratopotypes. Río de Mara,
Coahuila, México.

UMMZ 180320 (1) Holotype. Nava, Coahuila,
México.

G. georgei:

UMMZ 187448 (3/43) Paratopotypes. San Marcos
River, Hays Co., Texas.

UMMZ 187447 (1) Holotype. San Marcos River,
Hays Co., Texas.

G. heterochir:

UMMZ 170937 (6) Paratopotypes. Clear Creek,
Menard Co., Texas.

UMMZ 170936 (1) Holotype. Clear Creek, Menard Co., Texas.

G. eurystoma:

UMMZ 184717 (3/260) Paratypes. Arroyo del Azufre, Teapa, Tabasco, México.

UMMZ 197600 (1) Holotype. Arroyo del Azufre, Teapa, Tabasco, México.

G. sexradiata:

AMNH 24529 (17/122). Río de la Pasion, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala.

AMNH 25615 (1/13). Río de la Pasion, Petén, Guatemala.

AMNH 32025 (5/57). Río de la Pasion, Petén, Guatemala.

AMNH 24516 (4/31). Río de la Pasion, Alta Verapaz, Guatemala.

UMMZ 102989 (1) Holotype (of G. nicaraguensis sexradiata). Río Papaloapan, Oaxaca, México.

senilis species group:

G. senilis:

UMMZ 209026 (3/270). Rancho Houmigas, Chihuahua, México.

UMMZ 166712 (135). Río San Juan, Río Concho, Chihuahua, México.

G. cf senilis:

UMMZ 211115 (3/891). Balnearia, San Diego,
Chihuahua, México.

G. gaigei:

UMMZ 84527 (1) Holotype. Río Grande at
Boquillas, Brewster Co., Texas.

G. hurtadoi:

UMMZ 211112 (3/255). Ojo (Hacienda) Dolores,
Chihuahua, México.

UMMZ 168975 (1) Holotype. Ojo (Hacienda)
Dolores, Chihuahua, México.

G. alvarezi:

AMNH 27492 (4/4). El Ojo de San Gregorio,
Chihuahua, México (cat. as G. gaigei).

UMMZ 211110 (3/295). El Ojo de San Gregorio,
Chihuahua, México.

UMMZ 168979 (1) Holotype. El Ojo de San
Gregorio, Chihuahua, México

G. amistadensis:

UMMZ 190407 (1) Holotype. Goodenough Springs,
Val Verde Co., Texas.

UMMZ 190408 (3/65) Paratopotypes. Goodenough
Springs, Val Verde Co., Texas.

G. geiseri:

UMMZ 120247 (3/130) Paratypes. San Marcos
River, Hays Co., Texas.

UMMZ 168974 (1) Holotype. San Marcos River,
Hays Co., Texas.

G. longispinis:

UMMZ 130382 (2/50). Cuatro Ciénegas, Coahuila,
México.

UMMZ 179620 (1) Holotype. Cuatro Ciénegas,
Coahuila, México.

G. atrora:

AMNH 40812 (30/728). Río Axtla, San Luis
Potosí, México.

UMMZ 179999 (1) Holotype. Río Axtla, San Luis
Potosí, México.

subgenus Gambusia:

nicaraguensis species group:

G. nicaraguensis:

AMNH 20849 (10/64). Great Corn Island,
Nicaragua.

AMNH 18830 (2/7). Guatemala.

AMNH 28612 (2/8). Rio Chágres, Panamá.

UMMZ 199461 (73). Port Royal, Honduras.

G. melapleura:

USNM 205559 (372). Shrewsbury River, Jamaica.

USNM 205555 (242). Bluefields River, Jamaica.

G. wrayi:

USNM 104338 (1/12). Roaring Stream, Jamaica.

AMNH 74080 (8/104). Kingston Lagoon, Jamaica.

UMMZ 196801 (4). 30 mi. east of Montego Bay,
Jamaica.

USNM 205578 (193). Patterson Spring, Kingston,
Jamaica.

G. gracilior:

USNM 206286 (36). Stony River, Chapelton,
Jamaica (cat. as G. wrayi).

puncticulata species group:

G. yucatana:

AMNH 32261 (9/79). Laguna Yaxja, Petén,
Guatemala.

AMNH 32364 (1/4). Naranjal Reservoir, Petén,
Guatemala.

AMNH 32389 (1/38). Laguna Yaxja, Petén,
Guatemala.

G. hubbsi:

AMNH 12455 (8) Paratypes. South Andros Island,
Bahamas.

AMNH 12979 (1/89). Long Island, Bahamas. (cat.
as G. puncticulata).

G. manni (cat. as G. manni, but more probably G. hubbsi):

AMNH 28804 (10/142). Grand Bahama, Bahamas.

AMNH 28680 (1/10). Berry Island, Bahamas.

AMNH 12459 (1/3). Andros Island, Bahamas.

AMNH 34353 (1/3). Conception Island, Bahamas.

UMMZ 64246 (5). Lake Kilkarney, New Providence Island, Bahamas.

UMMZ 72183 (1) Holotype. New Providence Island, Bahamas.

G. hispaniolae:

AMNH 37344 (8/37). Between Port-au-Prince and Lake Miragoane, Haiti.

UMMZ 136377 (11) Paratypes. locality mislabeled as Cuba.

AMNH 78134 (1/1). Source Trou Caiman, Haiti. Exemplar used in descriptive osteology.

AMNH 78135 (6/16). Aquarium material, descendants of fishes caught at Source Trou Caiman, Haiti.

AMNH 37346 (2/11). East of Port-au-Prince, Dominican Republic.

USNM 204865 (1) Holotype. Source Trou Caiman, Dept. de Oueste, Haiti.

G. bucheri:

UMMZ 143373 (3/6) Paratypes. Río Jicotea, Moa system, Oriente, Cuba.

USNM (1) Holotype. Río Jicotea, Moa system, Oriente, Cuba.

G. baracoana:

UMMZ 143375 (3/6) Paratypes. Río Miel, Baracoa, Oriente, Cuba.

USNM 203150 (1) Holotype. Río Miel, Baracoa,
Oriente, Cuba.

G. puncticulata:

AMNH 9192 (2/2). Santa Clara, Cuba.

UMMZ 103336 (191). Artemisa, Piñar del Río,
Cuba.

USNM 204402 (41). Río Jaimanitas, Havana, Cuba.

USNM 167691 (50). Cienfuegos Soledad, Santa
Clara, Cuba.

G. oligosticta:

USNM 104339 (2/8). Spanish Town, Jamaica.

UMMZ 190129 (92). Port Henderson, Jamaica (cat.
as G. puncticulata).

G. caymenensis:

USNM 089789 (2/7). Grand Cayman Island, British
West Indies.

UMMZ 213615 (20). Grand Cayman Island, British
West Indies (cat. as G. puncticulata).

G. howelli:

UMMZ 143374 (9) Paratypes. Punta del Este, Isle
of Pines, Cuba (cat. as G. puncticulata).

punctata species group:

G. luma:

AMNH 35061 (3/5). Río Sarstun system, Izabal,
Guatemala.

AMNH 35096 (1/29). Río Dulce, Izabal, Guatemala.

UMMZ 143565 (1) Holotype. Puerto Barrios,
Izabal, Guatemala.

G. beebei:

USNM 203162 (163). Lake Miragoane, Haiti.

USNM 203161 (1) Neotype. Lake Miragoane, Haiti.

G. pseudopunctata:

AMNH 78136 (1/1). Les Cayes, Haiti.

ANSP 158843 (31). Stream 2 km west Les Cayes,
Haiti.

UMMZ 208139 (25) Paratypes. Roseaux, Dept. de
Sud, Haiti.

USNM 203163 (1) Holotype. Roseaux, Dept. de
Sud, Haiti.

G. punctata:

AMNH 3081 (1/2). Santa Clara, Cuba.

USNM 203165 (1) Neotype. Havana, Cuba.

G. xanthosoma:

UMMZ 210200 (1) Paratype. West Bay, Grand
Cayman Island, British West Indies.

UMMZ 213616 (17). Grand Cayman Island, British
West Indies.

G. rhizophorae:

AMNH 52329 (1/3). Crawl Key, Monroe Co.,
Florida.

UMMZ 213650 (100). Monroe Co., Florida.

USNM 203223 (1) Holotype. Dade Co., Florida.

Other Poeciliids:

Alfaro cultratus (Regan, 1908) AMNH 20589 (2/6)

Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis (Meek and Hildebrand, 1913)

AMNH 37810 (1/43)

AMNH 28591 (4/12)

Brachyrhaphis episcopi (Steindachner, 1878)

AMNH 20592 (4)

Brachyrhaphis terrabensis (Regan, 1907)

AMNH 20503 (3/9)

Belonesox belizanus Kner, 1860 AMNH 32027 (1/22)

AMNH 27493 (5/5)

Carlhubbsia stuarti Rosen and Bailey, 1959

AMNH 35103 (6/83)

Cnesterodon sp.

AMNH 35367 (4/30)

Girardinus uninotatus Poey, 1860 AMNH 37749 (1/4)

Heterandria attenuata Rosen and Bailey, 1979 Paratypes
AMNH 32911SW (4/76)

Heterandria jonesi (Günther, 1874)
AMNH 36781SW (4/4)

Limia nigrofasciata Regan 1913 AMNH 37349 (6/82)

Neoheterandria umbritalis (Meek, 1912)
AMNH 37665 (4/20)

Phallichthys amates (N. Miller, 1907)
AMNH 20593 (2/6)

Poecilia caucana (Steindachner, 1880)
AMNH 28137 (19/99)

Poecilia latipinna (LeSueur, 1821)
AMNH 51452 (6/82)

Poecilia minor (Garman, 1895) AMNH 35359 (3/11)

Poeciliopsis gracilis (Heckel, 1848)
AMNH 24462 (3/20)

Priapella intermedia Alvarez, 1952
AMNH 78021 (5/40)

Priapichthys dariensis (Meek and Hildebrand, 1913)

AMNH 28601 (3/28)

Scolichthys greenwayi Rosen, 1967 AMNH 32887 (5/108)

Tomeurus gracilis Eigenmann, 1909 AMNH 72910 (5/31)

Xenodexia ctenolepis Hubbs, 1950 AMNH 24578 (5/187)

Xiphophorus alvarezi Rosen, 1960 AMNH 36800SW (4/148)

Xiphophorus couchianus (Girard, 1859)

AMNH 22644 (14/14)

Xiphophorus milleri Rosen, 1960 AMNH 27486 (15/15)

Other Cyprinodontiforms:

Adinia xenica (Jordan and Gilbert, 1882)

AMNH 21836SW (2/2)

Aphanius ginaonis (Holly, 1929) AMNH 28677SW (2/2)

Aplocheilichthys johnstoni (Günther, 1893)

AMNH 41591 (20)

Aplocheilus panchax (Hamilton-Buchanan, 1822)

AMNH 21957SW (4/4)

Cubanichthys cubensis (Eigenmann, 1903)

ANSP 60286 (1/1)

Cynolebias adloffii Ahl, 1922

AMNH 22148SW (1/1)

Cynolebias whitei Myers, 1942

AMNH 22168 (3/3)

Cyprinodon variegatus Lacepede, 1803

AMNH 28100 (1/1)

Fundulus grandis Baird and Girard, 1854

AMNH 21915 (1/1)

Girardinichthys viviparus (Bustamante, 1837)

UMMZ 192379 (55/55)

Kosswigichthys asquamatus Sözer, 1942

ANSP 89883 (1/1)

Megupsilon aporus Miller and Walters, 1972

AMNH 38405SW (2/10)

Orestias forgeti Lauzanne, 1981 AMNH 52113SW (1/4)

Pantanodon madagascarensis (Arnoult, 1963) Paratypes

AMNH 20526 (1/4)

Profundulus labialis (Günther, 1866)

AMNH 24567 (2/2)

Profundulus punctatus (Günther, 1866)

AMNH 24432 (2/2)

Rachovia sp.

AMNH 22477 (3/3)

Rivulus hartii (Boulenger, 1890) AMNH 8354 (2/2)

Skiffia bilineata (Bean, 1887) UMMZ 189050 (42/42)

Other Atherinomorphs:

Dermogenys sumatranus (Bleeker) AMNH 9584 (2/2)

Menidia beryllina (Cope) AMNH 35721SW (4/12)

Menidia menidia (Moenkhaus) AMNH 55066SW (2/2)

Oryzias latipes (Temminck and Schlegel)
AMNH 57106SW (8/8)

Parexocoetus brachypterus (Richardson)
AMNH 14133SW (1/2)

Strongylura timucu (Walbaum) AMNH 27409 (1/1)

OSTEOLOGY

The following descriptive osteology is based on AMNH 78134, a mature male Gambusia hispaniolae, standard length 32.0 mm., and all illustrations in this section are of this specimen except where noted.

Cranium (Figs. 1, A and B, 2, 3)

The large, cartilaginous mesethmoid block fills the front of the skull; a small disc-like ossification can be seen within. The paired lateral ethmoid bones are affixed to the lateral edges of the cartilage block. Dorsally, the cartilage projects anteriorly under the nasals and posteriorly along the underside of the roofing bones (frontals) at midline. Ventrally, the cartilage extends posteriorly on the dorsal border of the parasphenoid. Anteriorly, the ventral surface of the cartilage is covered by the vomer. The edentulous vomer is triangular, and although broad, the ossification is quite thin.

The lateral ethmoids are twisted, complex bones. On each, the posterodorsal extension meets the anterior edge of the supraorbital section of the frontal, curving underneath it. This section medially attaches to the mesethmoid block. An anteromedial projection of the lateral ethmoid, again along the median cartilage, serves as articulation point for the autopalatine. Two wings of

each lateral ethmoid expand anterolaterally, although these two are sometimes not separated completely.

The only elements corresponding to an infraorbital series in Gambusia are the lacrimal (infraorbital 1) and the dermosphenotic (infraorbital 6). The lacrimal is found lateral and anterior to the lateral ethmoid. Sensory nerve foramina are seen in its lateral surface; sometimes a distinct canal is present too. On its medial surface is a small transverse shelf, and posteromedially a small knob. The lateral posterior border attaches to tissues covering the eye. This border is sometimes broken into several sections.

The dermosphenotic is small and teardrop-shaped. It is found posterior to the posterolateral edge of the frontal, which ends in a notch, and anterior to a lateral projection of the sphenotic.

The skull is roofed by three pairs of dermal bones, the nasals, frontals, and parietals, and the median supraoccipital. The nasals are broad, flat, and roughly triangular. Nerve foramina can be seen along a median crest.

The frontals are very large, covering more than half of the skull. They overlap irregularly at midline, until they are separated by the supraoccipital. A bony tube, representing the sensory canal, runs in an anterior-posterior direction, dividing the anterior

portion of the frontal into lateral (supraorbital) and median sections. This bony tube also has nerve foramina piercing the frontal associated with it, just lateral to the tube on the supraorbital side. The lateral portion of the frontal is the dorsal border of the orbit; anterior to it is the lateral ethmoid, posterior the dermosphenotic. A large notch in the posterolateral section of the frontal accommodates the dermosphenotic. The bony tube and associated foramina are deflected from their straight path toward the dermosphenotic. Although the tube does not continue onto the dermosphenotic, more foramina are seen on this bone.

Parietals come and go in the family Poeciliidae; however, all species of Gambusia examined possess these thin, elongate bones. Incidentally, Belonesox also has well-developed parietals, although they are quite odd in form, being dumbbell-shaped. Gambusia parietals are found at the posterior edge of the frontals, which overlie their anterior edge. Medially, the parietals extend further than the frontals, onto the supraoccipital.

The supraoccipital dorsally covers the posterior half of the skull. Its anterior edges are underneath the frontals. Short processes of the supraoccipital project laterally at the anterior edges of the parietals, again ventral to the frontals. Two wing-like supraoccipital processes, joined medially, project posteriorly over the

end of the skull. The posterolateral extension of the supraoccipital contacts the epioccipital, and, although the supraoccipital does not participate in the border of the foramen magnum, a thin vertical plate extends down from the supraoccipital processes to contact the exoccipitals at the top of the foramen magnum.

The epioccipitals also send off elongate posterior processes, paralleling the supraoccipital processes but slightly below them. The epioccipital bulges posterolaterally, then slopes back in to contact the pterotic anteroventrally, the parietal anterodorsally, and the exoccipital ventrally and posteriorly. The upper arm of the posttemporal contacts the epioccipital near the lateral edge of the base of the epioccipital process.

The pterotic (autopterotic; there is no dermal component) forms a lateral shelf-like bulge. It is bordered anterolaterally by the sphenotic, anteromedially by the parietal, posteromedially by the epioccipital, and posteroventrally by the exoccipital in dorsal view. In ventral view, most of its medial border contacts the prootic. As a lateral shelf, the pterotic creates a shallow open fossa above it and a deeper, also open, fossa below it. An elliptical autopterotic fossa, the thin flange of bone separating the course of the horizontal semicircular canal, conspicuously traverses the pterotic also. Laterally, the posterior fork of the hyomandibula

contacts the pterotic. The anterior arm of the hyomandibula touches the sphenotic, which is wedged in between the pterotic, parietal, dermosphenotic, and frontal dorsally; in ventral view, the sphenotic is just anterior and lateral to the prootic.

The exoccipitals form most of the border of the foramen magnum, excluded only from the ventral portion at the basioccipital condyle. Ventrally, the exoccipitals are medially bordered by the basioccipital, laterally by the pterotics, and anteriorly by the prootics. A large jugular foramen is visible. There are no exoccipital condyles; however, the neurapophyses of the first vertebra attach laterally to the exoccipitals at the edges of the foramen magnum (see separate discussion of vertebrae).

The basioccipital ends posteriorly in a centrum-like condyle, which serves as articular point for the first vertebra and, in ventral view, is seen to narrow to a point anteriorly. The basioccipital forms a ventral dome for the basicranium. Its anterior edge is covered by a posterior extension of the parasphenoid.

The prootics are large domed bones, forming much of the floor of the basicranium. Ventrally, they contact each other posteromedially, but are covered and anteriorly separated medially by the parasphenoid. The anterior edge of the prootic is riddled with small notches and bridges of bone. The prootic laterally contacts the sphenotic and

pterotic, posteriorly the exoccipital, and posteromedially the basioccipital.

The parasphenoid ventrally covers the median portion of the basioccipital and prootics. Just anterior to the prootics, two small lateral tabs project dorsally. Anterior to this point, the parasphenoid is a thin median bar that angles dorsally to contact the mesethmoid block anterior to the lateral ethmoid, medial to the lacrimal, and just ventral to the nasals. This long anterior extension of the parasphenoid has a thin vertical laminar flange.

Upper Jaw (Fig. 4, A and B)

Two paired bones comprise the upper jaw, the maxillae and premaxillae. These overlap in both their dorsal and lateral aspects. Dorsally the ascending processes of the premaxillae are fairly long, broad, and triangular. They parallel each other along the midline; in most species each ascending process ends in a pointed tip. Some variation is seen, however; the ascending processes may be rounded, squared, or medially pointed. Rounded ascending processes are seen in Brachyrhaphis and Heterandria (Belonesox, because of its elongate jaws, is quite apomorphic for premaxilla structure, and is not particularly useful as an outgroup for this character.)

Capping the ascending process is the dorsal process of the maxilla, which has both dorsal and ventral components. The dorsal component is a thumb-shaped laminar sheet of bone, anteromedially directed, that usually partially covers the ascending process. The ventral component runs below the ascending process, is much narrower than the dorsal component, and usually more medially directed, approaching its fellow along the midline. The posteromedial junction of the dorsal and ventral components forms a large bump; just lateral to this bump is a depression, and just lateral to the depression, on the posterior side of the maxilla, one head of the autopalatine articulates. No rostral cartilage was seen in any poeciliid examined.

The thumb-shaped dorsal process of the maxilla is characteristic of the superfamily Poeciliodea. This group is part of a larger group, Sept 2, characterized in part by short and narrow ascending processes (see Table 5, from Parenti, 1981). Although some poeciliids do have short and narrow ascending processes (e.g. Xiphophorus), all Gambusia species have ascending processes that are well developed.

In lateral view, the alveolar process of the premaxilla bears teeth back to the level where the maxilla crosses it. Posteroventral to this point, the premaxilla is roughly rectangular, varying from this rectangular shape sometimes to form an S-shape (thought to be primitive for cyprinodontoids; Parenti, 1981) by drawing out the posterodorsal corner

posteriorly, the posteroventral corner ventrally, and the anteroventral corner curving anterodorsally.

The maxilla laterally covers the premaxilla. It varies from being a straight bar in two points. First, where it crosses the end of the tooth-bearing portion of the premaxilla, there is an anterior swelling, usually rounded in profile but sometimes pointed. Ventral to this swelling, the maxilla narrows again, until the point where it crosses the ventral margin of the premaxilla. Here there is another widening, more pronounced in some species than in others. The anteroventral tip is usually drawn out ventrally to a point. The dorsal extension of the maxilla is also said to characterize the superfamily Poeciliodea (Parenti, 1981).

Upper jaw teeth consist of an outer row of large recurved teeth and several inner rows of smaller pointed teeth. They are found on the premaxilla from the anterior edge back along the alveolar process to just where the maxilla laterally crosses the premaxilla. Tooth structure is constant for the genus and immediate outgroups, although a wide range of tooth morphologies are observed among poeciliids.

Lower Jaw (Fig. 5, A and B)

The lower jaw is quite robust, consisting of dentary, angulo-articular, retroarticular, and coronomeckelian (sesamoid articular) bones. Two areas of Meckel's cartilage are prominent: the long thin mentomeckelian cartilage,

surrounded by the dentary anteriorly and the angulo-articular posteriorly; and the cone-shaped articular cartilage, which is mostly surrounded by the retroarticular but is dorsally covered by the angulo-articular. The articular ossification of Meckel's cartilage is presumed to be fused to the angular, as is general for clupeocephalans (Nelson, 1973), hence the name angulo-articular. Within the retroarticular, the cartilage is usually completely replaced with ossified tissue, leaving a hollow cone in the bone. Sometimes, however, a cone of cartilage persists in the adult.

The dentary bears teeth quite similar to the upper series; an outer row of large recurved teeth and several irregularly spaced inner rows of smaller teeth. Teeth continue posteriorly on the dentary to the beginning of the coronoid process. The coronoid process reaches posteriorly nearly to the posterior border of the premaxilla, which overlies it laterally. A prominent foramen is seen just below the tooth row, and a sensory canal runs below the level of Meckel's cartilage. A small posterior projection of the dentary carries the sensory canal posteriorly, between the two limbs of the angulo-articular and usually onto the lower limbs of the angulo-articular. Below the sensory canal, the dentary is angled medially. In a medial view (Fig. 5A), it can be seen that this ventral portion of the dentary forms a fossa into which Meckel's cartilage neatly fits. In this view it can also be seen that the dentary expands slightly at the

anterior midline symphysis.

The angulo-articular dorsally reaches as high as the coronoid process on the dentary. Anteriorly it is forked; the dorsal, larger limb runs medial to the dentary, and it is this limb that surrounds the mentomeckelian cartilage. A smaller ventral limb also extends towards the medial process of the dentary, but is not overlain by it. The ventral portion of the angulo-articular also angles medially, similar to the dentary, continuing the fossa for Meckel's cartilage. The posteroventral corner of the angulo-articular forms a fossa for the articulation with the condylar head of the quadrate. The retroarticular is not involved in the joint surface, but the dorsal edge of the articular cartilage abuts the ventral margin of the joint.

In medial view, the posterior end of the mentomeckelian cartilage is surrounded by a cup of bone, an anteromedial extension of the angulo-articular. Just anterior to this cup is a small sesamoid bone, the coronomeckelian bone, which lies dorsally on the mentomeckelian cartilage.

The retroarticular, as noted above, ossifies about the ventral portion of the articular cartilage. It is wedge-shaped, fitting into the posteroventral corner of the angulo-articular, and is moderately sized.

Opercular Apparatus (Fig. 6)

The opercle is a large, fairly flat bone with no spines or serrations. It articulates with the lateral side of the hyomandibula, just below the posterior fork on the dorsal part of that bone. The articulation is effected by a raised knob on the opercle.

Lying ventral and medial to the opercle is the subopercle, which projects beyond the limits of the opercle in both its posterior and ventral aspects. It is also a flat unserrated bone.

The dorsal limit of the preopercle is near the anterior fork of the hyomandibula. Its posterior margin parallels the anterior margin of the opercle, and then it swings forward, narrowing anteriorly. Its anterior extension fits into the medial face of the quadrate, just short of the quadrate - angulo-articular joint. The preopercle also has an entire margin, and carries a distinct sensory canal, running dorsoventrally near the posterior margin of the bone, then turning at a right angle to run anteriorly to the end of the preopercle.

The interopercle is found closely appressed to the medial side of the preopercle, although it slightly exceeds the borders of the preopercle in its posterior and ventral aspects. Anteriorly, the interopercle narrows, crosses the preopercle dorsomedially, and via ligament is connected to the retroarticular.

Jaw Suspensorium (Fig. 7)

The palatoquadrate cartilage of the embryo ossifies in two centers, the autopalatine dorsally and the quadrate ventrally. The dorsal end of the autopalatine is hammerhead-shaped. The larger anterior projection of the hammerhead is cartilage-capped and articulates with the maxilla. The hammerhead is somewhat twisted in the middle, so that the posterior head also faces slightly medially. It articulates with a facet on the lateral ethmoid. This facet either lies against the lateral edge of the cartilaginous mesethmoid, or is a small lateral projection from the same position.

There is no dermopalatine, and according to many authors, there is no ectopterygoid (Parenti, 1981; Ramaswami, 1945). However, there is a laminar extension of bone along the anterior edge of the palatoquadrate arch, running from the dorsal tip of the arch ventrally to cover most of the anterior surface of the autopalatine and quadrate. This is considered to be an extension of the autopalatine by Parenti (1981), a characteristic of cyprinodontoids. This anterior flange of bone, however, does not preform in cartilage (determined by examination of cleared and stained embryos); its development mirrors that of the endopterygoid. However, whether this flange of bone represents an ectopterygoid closely appressed,

ankylosed, or fused to the autopalatine (a line between them is visible, but they are neither separable nor independently movable), or whether it represents a laminar perichondral ossification of the autopalatine could not be determined.

The endopterygoid (=mesopterygoid) begins at the posterior head of the autopalatine, and runs along the posterior edge of the palatoquadrate cartilage, investing far into the medial face of the quadrate. A projection of the endopterygoid just ventral to the autopalatine heads is connected via ligamentous tissue to the lateral ethmoid. At its posteroventral edge, the endopterygoid is expanded, projecting past the quadrate to the symplectic.

The quadrate has two sections, the dorsal part that ossifies endochondrally in the palatoquadrate cartilage, reaching towards the autopalatine cartilage, and a ventral section that extends posteriorly under the symplectic. The anteroventral corner of the quadrate forms a condylar head, articulating with the angulo-articular. The anterior ends of the symplectic and preopercular, both rod-like, terminate along the medial face of the ventral part of the quadrate. Ossification of the palatoquadrate cartilage is never complete; in adults, cartilage can still be seen between the autopalatine and the quadrate and between the quadrate and the symplectic.

The hyosymplectic cartilage ossifies into two bones, the hyomandibula and the symplectic; no dermal bones are associated with this region of the suspensorium. The symplectic, as mentioned above, ends in a rodlike cartilage-capped terminus along the medial face of the quadrate, near the articular condyle. Posterior to the quadrate and endopterygoid, a thin dorsal flange is developed on the symplectic, narrowing again as it approaches the cartilage-capped junction with the hyomandibula. Also articulating at this hyosymplectic juncture is the interhyal.

At its ventral edge, the hyomandibula also bears a cartilage-capped head to articulate with the symplectic and interhyal. Dorsally, the hyomandibula is forked, again with two cartilage-capped heads. The anterior head articulates with the sphenotic, the posterior with the pterotic. A facet to receive the operculum is ventral to the posterior fork.

Hyoid Arch (Figs. 8, 9, A, B, and C)

The small ossified interhyal is connected via cartilage tips to the hyomandibula dorsally and to the posterior end of the ceratohyal ventrally. The large ceratohyal can be visualized in three sections, each roughly one-third of its length. The posterior section (posterior ceratohyal; posterohyal of Nelson, 1969; epihyal of many authors

including Rosen, 1964 and Weitzman, 1962) serves as the attachment site for the last of the branchiostegal rays along its lower lateral surface. It is separated from the anterior section (anterohyal of Nelson, 1969; ceratohyal of many authors) by a deep cartilaginous intrusion.

Dorsally, however, the anterior and posterior sections of the ceratohyal are firmly joined by a bridge of bone. The anterior portion of the ceratohyal is discussed in two sections. Its posterior half (that connected to the posterior part of the ceratohyal) is wide, and bears three branchiostegal rays along its lateral surface. The third of these rays actually articulates sometimes on the cartilage that separates the anterior and posterior sections of the ceratohyal. The anterior half of the anterior section of the ceratohyal narrows sharply, then widens to form a cup around the cartilage of the hypohyal. Two slender branchiostegals articulate medially along this narrowed section; sometimes they merely approach the anterior ceratohyal at its ventral margin, articulating neither medially nor laterally.

According to Parenti (1981), cyprinodontoids have no dorsal hypohyal, and no ossified dorsal hypohyal was found in poeciliid materials examined. However, the hypohyal region is occupied by a large block of cartilage, which is posteriorly delimited by the anterior ceratohyal. An ossification around the anterior, anteroventral,

anteromedial, and anterolateral aspects of this cartilage is interpreted as the ventral hypohyal. Among Gambusia species, the extent of the ventral hypohyal ossification is variable. Some species show the ventral hypohyal ossification covering most of the ventral surface, meeting the anterior ceratohyal in a relatively straight line; fishes of the subgenera Heterophallina and Arthrohallus show this condition. In other species, it is the anterior ceratohyal that covers most of the ventral surface of the hypohyal cartilage, projecting an anteriorly directed ventrolateral lobe and a smaller anteromedially directed lobe. This bilobed head of the anterior ceratohyal is a more conventional arrangement, reminiscent of the situation in many other fishes, where the anteromedially directed lobe contacts the dorsal hypohyal. However, these fishes have no dorsal hypohyal. The dorsal aspect of this region reveals a large expanse of cartilage with only the anteromedial portion ossified as the medial section of the ventral hypohyal. When the anterior ceratohyal extends forward thus, the ventral hypohyal is sometimes reduced to a triangular shape, not covering the anterolateral corner of the hypohyal cartilage. This condition typifies the nicaraguensis species group. Other members of the subgenus Gambusia have the ventral hypohyal covering the anterolateral corner of the cartilage.

A group containing poeciliids, procatopines, Fluviphylax, and Pantanodon is defined by Parenti (1981) in part by the ventral hypohyal forming a cap of bone over the end of the anterior ceratohyal (see her Fig. 28C, p. 399). This condition is found in Tomeurus; however, Gambusia and other poeciliids examined possess cartilage where the dorsal hypohyal would be, so that the ossifications appear more similar to her Fig. 28B, the condition found in most cyprinodontoids.

In ventral view, the ventral hypohyals face each other anteromedially in distinct cup-shaped condyles. These are connected to each other by tough connective tissue in which a median ovoid cartilage or ossified bone sometimes appears. This is most probably an adventitious structure, as its appearance is not constant within species, and is seen on occasion throughout cyprinodontiformes.

The anterior end of the urohyal lies between the posterior ends of the two ventral hypohyals, and is somewhat expanded relative to its posterior shaft. The anterior head varies from being broadly triangular to more commonly being slightly cleft, with a median keyhole and two slightly angled heads, each ligamentously connected to a ventral hypohyal. Posteriorly, the urohyal extends to the level of basibranchial 4. Thin laminar plates extend slightly in a lateral plane.

Laterally the urohyal is seen as a broad median plate, wider posteriorly. Anteriorly is a posterodorsally directed spike, which has a small knob that approaches the anterior end of basibranchial 2, and a usually spatulate extension posterior to that knob which runs under basibranchial 2 and is approached by the anterior forks of the first hypobranchials. In some Gambusia species, this extension is bifid, each side associated with its respective hypobranchial 1 anterior fork.

The basihyal is a long triangular bone, comparable in length to the sum of the rest of the basibranchial series. Its narrow posterior end articulates with basibranchial 2, and it is ossified for only one-half to one-third of its length, the broader anterior end remaining cartilaginous.

The branchiostegal rays, as alluded to earlier, are consistently six in number, with two thin anterior rays that attach to (or approach) the narrow part of the anterior ceratohyal, and four larger rays attached to the lateral face of the wide part of the ceratohyal. Although the dorsal heads of these four rays are roughly identical, the rays expand in width ventral to those heads, appearing to have an anterior bulge. This is slight in the first of these rays and most pronounced in the more posterior rays.

Dorsal Gill Arches (Fig. 10)

There are no suprapharyngobranchials, as is true of most modern teleosts. There is also no first infrapharyngobranchial; its absence is the general condition for Division II atherinomorphs - Beloniformes and Cyprinodontiformes (Rosen and Parenti, 1981). Infrapharyngobranchials 2 and 3 are ossified and have toothplates fused to them. There is no fourth infrapharyngobranchial in atherinomorphs, but there is a fourth pharyngobranchial toothplate.

Infrapharyngobranchial 2, with its associated toothplate, is rather small, partially overlain by infrapharyngobranchial 3. It has two cartilage-tipped articular heads, one on the lateral side that is approached by epibranchial 2, and a usually larger one on the anterolateral corner of infrapharyngobranchial 2, which is approached by a similar process on infrapharyngobranchial 3. The recurved teeth of the infrapharyngobranchial 2 toothplate face slightly more anteriorly than those of the infrapharyngobranchial 3 toothplate, which are more ventrally directed.

The large infrapharyngobranchial 3's and their toothplates are the major elements in the dorsal gill arches. Infrapharyngobranchial 3 has three cartilage-tipped articular heads. Anteriorly, one approaches its counterpart on infrapharyngobranchial 2.

Near the posterolateral edge of infrapharyngobranchial 3, a small articular head contacts epibranchial 3. Finally, the posterior edge of infrapharyngobranchial 3 is dominated by a broad articular head that receives the equally broad epibranchial 4. On the infrapharyngobranchial 3 toothplate, the large teeth curve medially. In Gambusia, but not in immediate outgroups, these teeth are bicuspid or serrate along their inner edge. The medial teeth in members of the subgenus Heterophallina are exaggeratedly deformed from a simple curved cone; they have a serrate bump or pad along the medial side of the tooth.

The infrapharyngobranchial 4 toothplate is fairly small, beginning at the posterior edge of infrapharyngobranchial 3 and extending just slightly beyond epibranchial 4. Its teeth are smaller than those associated with infrapharyngobranchial 3.

There are four epibranchials. Generally in cyprinodontiformes, epibranchial 1 has no distinct uncinata process (Parenti, 1981). Rather, the base of this element is broadened, and its posterior edge serves as articular point for the interarcual cartilage. This type of epibranchial 1 is seen in the outgroups studied and many Gambusia species as well. However, members of the subgenus Heterophallina and of the nobilis species group of the subgenus Arthropallus regularly have

uncinate processes on their first epibranchials. Other members of the subgenus Arthrophallus do not usually have such an uncinata process. And, more confusingly, while most members of the subgenus Gambusia do not typically have these uncinata processes, they occasionally do, even varying from the left and right sides of the same fish. A distinct uncinata process on epibranchial 1, leading to the interarcual cartilage, can be considered a derived condition at this level, but the character is variable in the subgenus Gambusia. The orientation of epibranchial 1 is interesting also. It does not run parallel to the other epibranchials, but points almost directly anteriorly. This condition is common to many cyprinodontiformes.

The interarcual cartilage, when present, arises near the posteromedial edge of epibranchial 1 when epibranchial 1 has no uncinata process, or near the uncinata process of epibranchial 1 when present. The general acanthomorph condition is for the interarcual cartilage to run from the uncinata process of epibranchial 1 to the cartilage-tipped process of infrapharyngobranchial 2. In cyprinodontoids, the interarcual cartilage is reduced in size, and rarely approaches infrapharyngobranchial 2. In Gambusia, the maximum length of interarcual cartilage seen is roughly one-third of the length of epibranchial 1. Often it is reduced to a small ball of cartilage, and sometimes it is

absent altogether.

Epibranchial 2 is a slender, slightly twisted bone that medially approaches infrapharyngobranchial 2. It never has an uncinata process in Gambusia; the generality of that lack is unclear, as it is absent in cyprinodontiforms and some other atherinomorphs, but not in beloniforms.

Epibranchial 3 is similarly slender, but it does bear an uncinata process, fairly close to its base. (In fact, this bone looks quite similar to epibranchial 1 when it bears an uncinata process.) The medial tip of epibranchial 3 contacts a small cartilage-tipped process on infrapharyngobranchial 3. The uncinata process, which is directed posterodorsally, approaches the uncinata process of epibranchial 4.

Epibranchial 4 is much larger than the other epibranchials, forming the major support for the dorsal gill arch elements, as is the general condition for atherinomorphs (Rosen and Parenti, 1981). Its broad medial head contacts infrapharyngobranchial 3 and the toothplate of infrapharyngobranchial 4. The uncinata process arises from the anterior side of the bone, pointing dorsolaterally towards the uncinata process of epibranchial 3. Lateral to the uncinata process, the bone extends a thin flange, then tapers to contact the ceratobranchials.

Ventral Gill Arches (Fig. 11)

Ceratobranchials 1, 2, and 3 are slender, rod-like elements running from their respective hypobranchials ventrally to their respective epibranchials dorsally. They are heavily adorned with gill rakers.

Ceratobranchial 4 contacts epibranchial 4 dorsally, but as there is no hypobranchial 4, ventrally it approaches the cartilaginous fourth basibranchial. The medial head of ceratobranchial 4 is cartilage-tipped. Just distal to this is an anterolaterally directed flange. In all species of Gambusia examined as well as Belonesox, Brachyrhaphis, and some other poeciliids, there are teeth on ceratobranchial 4, most heavily concentrated near the medial head but extending along one-third of the bone's length. These teeth have been hypothesized to represent fused gill rakers (Nelson, 1969; Gosline, 1963). This is a character of spotty distribution within poeciliids, within cyprinodontiforms, and within atherinomorphs.

Ceratobranchial 5 is a much larger bone, bearing only teeth, no gillrakers. Anteriorly, the cartilage-tipped head approaches the medial head of ceratobranchial 4. The two ceratobranchial 5's are triangular shaped and, although they are separate bones, they are close together along the midline, until each curves dorsolaterally towards its respective side. Ceratobranchial 5 is covered with small to moderately sized conical teeth, and larger,

somewhat recurved teeth are found along the inner curve of the bone. Posteriorly, ceratobranchial 5 tapers to a cartilage-tipped point which approaches epibranchial 4. On the medial side of this point is a posteriorly directed process, shaped like a small shark's tail. Ventrally, each ceratobranchial 5 has a large median flange, extending directly ventrad, with a hook at the anterior end.

There are three pairs of hypobranchials. There is a good deal of variability in the form of hypobranchial 1. It can be described as having two parts: a medial triangular part, which points laterally so that the broad flat base of the triangle articulates with a narrow part of basibranchial 2, and lateral to this triangle, a square or diamond-shaped base. Such a form of hypobranchial 1 is found in many species of Brachyrhaphis and Heterandria. Other species of these genera, as well as most species of Gambusia, have hypobranchial 1 modified in that the triangular part is mesially cleft, resulting in a forked hypobranchial 1 with two medial articular heads. The posterior, usually wider, head articulates with the constricted part of basibranchial 2. The anterior head is angled somewhat ventrally, and approaches the dorsal, ventrally directed flange of the urohyal. Variation occurs with respect to the depth of the cleft, the degree of separation of the two heads, and the relative sizes of

the two heads, compared to each other.

In addition, there is variation in the lateral part of hypobranchial 1. Some species of Gambusia, of the subgenus Gambusia, have an anteriorly directed process along the lateral edge of hypobranchial 1. In other species, and outgroups examined, this process is indistinct or absent.

Forked first hypobranchials are not unique to Gambusia or its close relatives. Some, but not all, poeciliids have them, and I have noticed the character in some other cyprinodontoids (Aphanius, Cubanichthys; Orestias, in Parenti, 1984), some aplocheloids (Rachovia, Rivulus), and atherinoids such as Atherinella (Chernoff, 1986). However, the forked hypobranchial 1 with a distinct lateral process seems to be unique to Gambusia.

Hypobranchial 2 is similarly composed of a lateral box and a medial triangle, but these shapes are less distinct, and the element is neither forked nor does it have a lateral process. Hypobranchial 2 medially articulates with a constricted part of basibranchial 3.

Hypobranchial 3 is closer to being a simple rectangle in shape. Medially it articulates with a second narrowing in basibranchial 3 at the end of its ossified portion. All three pairs of hypobranchials primarily stain blue, although clear red ossified portions are seen along the lateral and anterior edges.

Cyprinodontoids have two ossified basibranchials. Parenti (1981) hypothesizes that this represents a loss of basibranchial 1, rather than a fusion event. Therefore, basibranchial 2 anteriorly contacts the basihyal, and is posteriorly flared where it contacts basibranchial 3. Similarly, the anterior head of basibranchial 3 is flared, then the bone narrows at the spot where the second hypobranchials articulate with it. Just beyond that point, the bone flares out laterally, forming wings. These wings are a characteristic of the subgenus Gambusia; other subgenera in the genus have a relatively straight basibranchial 3. Posterior to its articulation with hypobranchial 3, basibranchial 3 extends further back, ventral to basibranchial 4 and ceratobranchial 4, but is only cartilaginous in this region.

A cartilaginous basibranchial 4 occupies a central position to the third hypobranchials anteriorly and the fourth ceratobranchials posteriorly. Its shape is variable among species, ranging from diamond to hexagon to octagon to spade. Dense, blue-staining connective tissue often connects the two third hypobranchials, basibranchial 4, and the two fourth ceratobranchials into one unit.

Vertebrae (Figs. 12, 13, 17A, 18)

Total vertebral number in the genus ranges from 29 to 33, usually 30 or 31, with 12 to 14 precaudal vertebrae

and 15 to 19 caudal vertebrae (not counting the terminal half-centrum of the caudal skeleton).

The centrum of the first vertebra fits neatly against the centrum-like basioccipital condyle; like other poeciliids, Gambusia has no exoccipital condyles. The neurapophyses of the first vertebra are applied to the lateral sides of the skull near the centrum. As the neural arch continues dorsally, the neurapophyses of each side retreat from the skull, meeting at midline. Once joined, the neural arch is now directed sharply forward, pointing anterodorsally, to again contact the skull. This projection of the first neural arch lies on top of the exoccipitals at the dorsal border of the foramen magnum. This intriguing form of the first vertebra is found in all members of the tribe Gambusiini and some of the Heterandriini; however, other groups of poeciliids have a completely different form of the first vertebra.

The second, third, and fourth vertebrae have neural spines that are greatly expanded in the anterior-posterior plane. The parapophyses are found rather high on these anterior vertebrae, although the parapophyses gradually move to a more ventral position in subsequent vertebrae. A pleural rib articulates along the posterior edge of each parapophysis. The first pleural rib is borne upon the second vertebra, a uniting feature of cyprinodontiforms (Rosen, 1964; Parenti, 1981). Epipleural ribs, extending

posterolaterally from each pleural rib, also begin here, and are found through to about the ninth or tenth vertebra.

The neural arch of the fifth vertebra is sometimes slightly expanded, but usually it and always the sixth vertebra assume a more conventional form, seen throughout the precaudal vertebrae. The neural prezygapophyses rise anterodorsally and meet in midline, forming a complete arch. The elongate neural spine, angled posteriorly, forms when neural arch material from each side of the centrum extends dorsally to midline, then lengthens as a single unit. A small neural postzygapophysis is usually present also.

A few anterior caudal vertebrae, i.e. those vertebrae bearing hemal arches (and spines, here), also bear pleural ribs. In males, these vertebrae are modified for gonopodial support, discussed separately. In females, these vertebrae are also unconventional; they are discussed in conjunction with the female anal fin.

The form of the caudal vertebrae posterior to the anal fin can be seen in Figure 13. The neural arches and spines are generally as described for the precaudal vertebrae, although the neural prezygapophyses do not usually extend far enough to meet in midline; rather, they approach the postzygapophyses of the preceding vertebra. The hemal arch and spine mirror the neural side, although with smaller zygapophyseal processes. A hemal canal,

beginning at the first caudal vertebra (not before) runs through the hemal arches.

Caudal Fin (Fig. 13)

The terminal half-centrum, representing the first pre-ural centrum plus the first two ural centra, is fused to the single hypural plate, a fusion of hypurals 1-5. The half centrum curves dorsally, and in some small specimens it extends a short way along the dorsal edge of the hypural plate. There seems to be some neural arch material (presumably of the first ural vertebra) incorporated here at the posterodorsal edge of the half-centrum in embryos; this suggests possible homology with the urostyle of many other fishes (also noted by Hollister, 1940). However, in most fully formed adults, the "urostyle" material is completely incorporated into the hypural plate, and the half-centrum ends abruptly, with a small hook projecting posterolaterally on each side. Anteriorly on the half-centrum, neural arch material (presumably of the first pre-ural vertebra) forms a dorsal projection on each side; these usually meet at the midline. No extension into a neural spine is seen.

All hypurals arise from the half-centrum. Varying degrees of fusion of the hypurals to each other are seen in the genus; however, within any particular species, the pattern observed is fairly constant. Belonesox belizanus

has two symmetrical hypural plates, the lower plate presumed to represent hypurals 1 and 2, the upper hypurals 3, 4, and 5. The medial edges of the two plates are straight and parallel. Gambusia luma exhibits a pattern common in the genus, where there are two hypural plates, as in Belonesox, but their medial edges are not straight. Instead, there is an indented notch, starting at the half-centrum and extending about two-thirds of the length of the hypural plate. These symmetrical notches look like a keyhole. The two plates are separate distal to the keyhole. This pattern is typical of most of the subgenus Gambusia, but appears occasionally elsewhere in the genus. Gambusia hispaniolae shows the other popular pattern for Gambusia. Here, the keyhole notch is present, but the hypurals are fused distal to the keyhole, forming a single hypural plate with a hole in it. Sometimes there is a small notch in the posterior edge of the plate, directly distal to the keyhole. The size of the keyhole also varies. The final pattern seen occasionally in Gambusia has no keyhole at all; instead a solid hypural fan is fused to the half-centrum. This is found only in several derived members of the senilis species group.

While these varying degrees of fusion might easily be envisioned as a transformation series, the polarity of such a series is not clear. All four states described above are found throughout the Poeciliidae, and though

Belonesox has the unfused state, species of Brachyrhaphis exhibit all states of fusion. Ontogeny offers some help, as embryos generally have two separate hypural plates. The shape of these two early plates (Fig. 44D) is common to most species of Gambusia, but does not represent any of the adult stages. No species has been observed to pass through several different stages to reach the adult state; instead, the adult state is formed directly from the embryonic state.

The parhypural articulates with the terminal half-centrum, but is not fused with it. It ends posterodorsally with the hypurapophysis.

The single epural dorsally mirrors the position of the parhypural; however, it does not articulate with the neural arch of the terminal half-centrum. The form and development of this epural suggest that it represents a detached neural spine, presumably of the first pre-ural vertebra, serially homologous to the neural spines (not arches) of preceding centra. A similar relation between the parhypural and the preceding hemal spines is also suggested, although the fate of the hemal arch material for the first pre-ural vertebra is unclear.

Pre-ural vertebra 2 bears a full neural arch and spine, as well as a full hemal arch and spine. The neural and hemal spines of the second and third pre-ural vertebrae have thin laminar extensions, as do the epural and

parhypural.

Principal fin rays are borne on the hypural plate, the epural, the parhypural, and the neural and hemal spines of the second, third and often fourth pre-ural vertebrae. The neural and hemal spines of the fourth and fifth pre-ural vertebrae are also involved in the support of procurrent fin rays. Lying between the distal tips of the hemal spines of the sixth and fifth, fifth and fourth, and fourth and third pre-ural vertebrae are small blocks of accessory cartilages that are also involved in fin ray support. Three blocks of accessory cartilage are also found between the distal tips of the neural spines of the same vertebrae.

Dorsal Fin (Fig. 14)

The number of rays in the dorsal fin ranges from seven to ten in the genus. In a young specimen, each fin ray is supported by a long proximal radial and a small round distal radial. In the adult fish, a medial radial has separated off from the distal end of each of the proximal radials except the first. The proximal and medial radials often remain connected by intervening cartilage.

The proximal radials extend between the neural spines, sometimes abutting their dorsal tips. When this happens, the dorsal part of the neural spine often becomes cup-shaped, sometimes with a median hole in the cup.

The first proximal radial has an enlarged anterior keel. Subsequent proximal radials have thin laminar flanges also, but not as extensive as the first.

There is an extra element at the posterior end of the dorsal fin (the "end piece" of Weitzman, 1962). Rarely does it completely ossify. Its proximal end is finger-like, mimicking a small proximal radial. It is found close to the medial radial of the last dorsal fin ray; sometimes it is inseparable from it. Its serial homology is unknown.

Gambusia, and all other cyprinodontoids, have no rudimentary rays anterior to the first dorsal fin ray; i.e. anterior to the ray that is associated with the first proximal and distal radials. Parenti (1981) states this character as "loss of first dorsal fin ray"; strictly speaking, the character should be described as "loss of ray(s) anterior to the first dorsal fin ray", although the groups defined by these two characters are the same.

Pectoral Girdle and Fin (Fig. 15, A, B, and C)

The posttemporal is forked. The longer dorsal arm contacts the epioccipital anteriorly; the lower arm, which points anteroventrally, is about half the length of the upper arm, and does not contact the skull. The lower arm is often reduced or fragmented, but always present in this genus. The ventral base of the posttemporal laterally

covers the dorsal part of the supracleithrum.

The small supracleithrum is shaped like an upside-down teardrop, and is sandwiched between the posttemporal laterally and the cleithrum medially.

The cleithrum consists of an anterior face, a lateral wing, a medial wing, and a medial face. The anterior face is roughly diamond-shaped. The lateral and medial edges of the anterior face are raised and thickened, and the ventral extension of this face meets its fellow at the midline. The lateral wing begins dorsally at the top of the anterior face, and extends laterally almost to the scapular foramen. It narrows abruptly ventral to the scapula. The medial wing mirrors the lateral wing but extends further - dorsally to the posttemporal and supracleithrum, and ventrally to the coracoid. The medial face is firmly affixed to the medial side of the scapula and upper part of the coracoid, and together with the scapula it forms most of the border of the scapular foramen. The dorsal extension of this face meets the dorsal part of the medial wing, the supracleithrum, and the posttemporal. Posteriorly, the dorsal edge of the medial face forms a thumb-shaped projection. This is similar in shape and position to the "scapular process" of Cyprinodon, although not as large. Similar projections are seen in Profundulus, some aplocheloids, and most poeciliids. This cleithral projection is particularly

elongate in the rachowi species group, of the subgenus Heterophallina.

The scapula is anteriorly affixed to the lateral edge of the medial face of the cleithrum. It is a roughly triangular flat bone, its most acute angle posteriad. The scapular foramen is oval, with its long axis running anterior-posterior. When the pectoral girdle is fully formed, the scapular foramen is confined to the anterior third of the scapula. However, in juveniles, the foramen more closely resembles a cleft, running posteriorly almost to the border of the scapula. The medial face of the cleithrum also participates in the border of the scapular foramen; this usually signals the posterior limit of the cleithrum.

Ventrally, the scapula is bordered by the coracoid. Its major flat surface is comma-shaped, running from the scapula to meet the ventral tip of the cleithrum. A second surface, projecting laterally, runs from the anteroventral edge, about three-quarters of the way up along the coracoid.

Four radials fit neatly into a recess in the posterior edge of the borders of the scapula and coracoid. The dorsal three radials are roughly cube-shaped; the fourth is somewhat larger than the others and more irregularly shaped.

An elongate postcleithrum arise along the medial side of the coracoid, just anterior and ventral to the radials. Parenti (1981) labelled this as postcleithrum 3, following Weitzman (1962). It tapers posteroventrally, often abutting the first rib. There is no first postcleithrum in poeciliids, although most other cyprinodonts have this scale-shaped bone just posterior to the thumb-shaped process of the cleithrum. No cyprinodont has a bone in the position of Weitzman's (1962) postcleithrum 2, and, as is true for all neoteleosts, there is no mesocoracoid.

The pectoral fin of females is quite conventional, with twelve to fourteen pectoral fin rays, the top three and bottom three unbranched. In males, however, the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sometimes sixth pectoral fin rays are modified, presumably to support the gonopodium during copulation (Hubbs and Reynolds, 1957). The second, third, fourth, and fifth fin rays, particularly, are elongated, and their distal third curves upwards. This curve becomes quite pronounced in some species, most spectacularly in G. heterochir. There is a bit of variation in the degree of modification along these rays, but the basic pattern is for each segment in the middle third of the fin ray to thicken and produce a laminar dorsal extension. Sometimes the extension of each segment is kept separate, giving the fin ray a scalloped

appearance; other times, these extensions, and sometimes the segments themselves, anastomose. Turner (1942c) describes the morphogenesis of the pectoral fin modification in the male of Gambusia affinis, as well as partial induction of the character in females when treated with androgenic hormones. This pectoral fin modification is seen in all species of Gambusia, including G. vittata, although its development is very weak in G. luma. It is not seen in any other poeciliid. According to Turner (1942c), the final length of the elongated pectoral fin rays 2, 3, 4, and 5 is dependent at least in part on the length of time that male reproductive hormones are maintained at proper concentrations. This, in turn, depends on the size at which the fish matures, as a fish that matures at a small size matures much more rapidly than a fish that matures at a larger size.

Pelvic Girdle and Fin (Fig. 16, A and B)

The two pelvic bones lie parallel to each other, with their posteromedial extensions overlapping. In ventral view, the long anterior extension of the bone has a bony tube in its center. A vertical flange projects ventrally from this tube on the anterior third of the bone. At the posterior terminus of the tube is a tab-like projection, near which the ventral half of the lateralmost pelvic ray articulates. The dorsal half of that ray articulates near

a notch in the posterolateral border of the bone. The other five pelvic fin rays articulate along the posterior border of the bone; this area is angled slightly dorsally. No radials were observed, nor was a significant ischial process noted.

In lateral view, the posterodorsal portion of the bone rises in a dorsal process. The shape of this process is variable, sometimes angled anteriorly or posteriorly, sometimes flat or squared. The aforementioned tab is also evident in this view, at the posteroventral corner.

Female Anal Fin (Fig. 17, A and B)

The proximal radials of the first five anal fin rays are anterior to and lean on the hemal arch and spine of the fourteenth vertebra. This vertebra also bears a parapophysis and pleural rib. The next caudal vertebra also bears a parapophysis; sometimes a small rib articulates with it too. Parenti (1981) notes that many poeciliids and some of their relatives show this condition.

There are eleven anal fin rays. Except for the first and last, each ray is supported by proximal, medial, and distal radials. The proximal and medial radials are always joined by a large ball of cartilage; the medial radial never completely separates off. The ventral ends of the proximal radials often develop small anterior and posterior wings to grab the cartilage. The distal radial

is a small ball of cartilage that has not been seen ossified. It is at least partially obscured by the anal fin ray, as it is held between the anterodorsal tips of the two halves of the fin ray.

The first anal fin ray lacks any ossification of a medial radial, as also does the last. The proximal radial of the last anal fin ray is reduced, irregular in shape, and often not completely ossified.

Gonopodial Suspensorium (Fig. 18)

The skeletal support of the gonopodium involves modification of two types of bones. The hemal arches and spines of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth vertebrae are changed into gonapophyses, and the anterior proximal radials of the anal fin are modified into the gonactinostal complex.

The first gonapophysis projects anteroventrally from the anteroventral edge of the centrum of the fourteenth vertebra at approximately a 45 degree angle. Near its base, on each side, a small parapophysis extends backwards, almost always bearing a small rib. The first gonapophysis extends anteriorly the length of three centra, where it meets the gonactinostal complex. This gonapophysis is sometimes thickened along its posteroventral edge, and sometimes bowed.

The second gonapophysis extends forward just behind the first. It often has a small parapophysis, but usually does not bear a rib. In Gambusia luma, the second gonapophysis is identical to the first, but in all other species, the second gonapophysis develops posteriorly directed uncini on each side. (The lack of such an uncinate process on the first gonapophysis is a synapomorphy of the genus.) The ventral outline of the second gonapophysis, from the anterior extension to the end of the uncini, varies from being softly rounded to almost horizontal. In some taxa, particularly in G. hispaniolae, the posterior ends of the uncini are slightly forked.

Some Gambusia species usually have only these two gonapophyses; this condition unites the nobilis and senilis species groups. Most, however, develop a third, again with uncini, although the uncini of the third gonapophysis are usually not as long as those of the second. The anterior projection of the third gonapophysis is bowed slightly dorsally, while the first and second gonapophyses are bowed slightly ventrally. The third gonapophysis does not generally bear parapophyses.

Turner (1942b) describes the formation of the gonapophyses in development, and the partial induction of gonapophyses in females following hormone treatment. Rosen and Kallman (1959), in a series of experiments,

investigate the possibility of an inductive relationship between the gonactinosts and the gonapophyses.

The gonactinostal complex is of constant form in the genus and in its sister taxon, Belonesox. The first proximal anal radial is not involved and rather reduced. The second, third, and fourth proximal anal radials grow together and elongate, forming a column. The column has a small anterior wing, and expands dorsally to form a cup, open at the top. The fifth proximal anal radial is also elongate but separate. It lies along the posterior edge of the column, and then projects into the dorsal cup. In other poeciliids, the fifth proximal anal radial is incorporated into the gonactinostal complex and does not stand freely.

From the dorsal tip of the fifth radial, a ligament connects the gonactinostal complex to the ventral side of the tenth vertebra (the fourth vertebra anterior to the first gonapophysis). In this ligament is a small bone called the ligastyle, which varies from being a long thin splint, to a teardrop, to a round ball, or it may be absent altogether.

Turner (1942b) has shown that the thirteenth vertebra is, in fact, the first caudal vertebra, upon which a hemal arch and spine form. The hemal arch is subsequently histolyzed, and the hemal spine of the thirteenth vertebra becomes associated with the ligament that attaches to the

anterior vertebra as the ligastyle. He also showed that the same process of histolysis of the first hemal arch occurs in females also, and a small remnant of the hemal spine is sometimes seen in small females. However, the female "ligastyle" never becomes associated with a suspensatory ligament or migrates forward; in fact, in larger females, it too is completely histolyzed.

The sixth and seventh proximal anal radials parallel the gonactinostal complex, but are dorsally limited by the first gonapophysis. Similarly, the second gonapophysis provides the dorsal border for the eight and ninth proximal anal radials.

The medial radials of the anal fin are also modified for gonopodial support. The medial radials of the second, third, and fourth anal fin rays are fused to the proximal radials, as part of the columnar gonactinostal complex. The medial radials of the fifth, sixth, and seventh anal fin rays, however, are separate units and highly developed. Each produces an anterior spike, aimed anterodorsally, and expanded lateral processes, facing posterodorsally.

Gonopodium (Figs. 19, 20)

The main units of the gonopodium are anal fin rays 3, 4, and 5, which, at the onset of sexual maturity, elongate, thicken, and differentiate. The first anal fin

ray is reduced to a small nubbin, and the second, although thickened at its base, is also relatively short. The thickening at the base of ray 2, however, is unique to Gambusia. The sixth, seventh, and, to a lesser degree, eighth anal fin rays, while they do not elongate, are specialized at their distal tips. These branched rays become thickened and swollen, due to increased segmentation distal to the branching point. There is sometimes a bit of anastomosis of these segments, making these fin rays tips look scalloped or paddle-like.

The third ray is very thick, from its base to just before the terminal specializations. This is not a branched fin ray. At the distal tip of the gonopodium, segments of the third ray develop spines along the lateral (anterior) edge. (A note on directional terminology: when the gonopodium is being used, the male swings it around so that ray 3 is relatively anterior, ray 5 posterior. This anterior-posterior labelling is used in differentiating positions on the gonopodium, whether it is in use or resting.) The number of spines varies from eight to seventeen; high spine number characterizes the panuco species group, while very low spine number is a feature of the senilis species group. The length of the spines also varies, from quite short and stubby to long and thin, or long and strap-like. In most groups, these spines are directed primarily toward the distal tip, with

only the panuco and rachowi groups possessing many recurved spines. In all species, however, the most proximal spine may be recurved. The outline of the spines, and thus the anterior outline of the gonopodium, varies among the species groups: fan-like (panuco species group); pointed mediolaterally (vittata, affinis species group, nicaraguensis species group); rounded (nobilis and puncticulata species groups); pointed anterodistally (senilis species group); or lobe-like (punctata species group).

The segments of ray 3 that bear spines may be further modified to develop proximally directed inner processes along their posterior (medial) edges. Inner processes are most often associated with long spines, as in the nobilis and senilis species groups of the subgenus Arthropallus, and in the puncticulata and punctata species groups of the subgenus Gambusia.

The fourth anal fin ray is relatively unmodified near the base of the anal fin, but the termini of its two branches (ray 4a and ray 4p) are highly specialized. Ray 4a has an anteriorly directed swelling, termed the elbow, which is possessed by all Gambusia species except G. vittata and by no other poeciliid; G. vittata and Belonesox belizanus do exhibit a swollen, ankylosed ray 4a which is bent anteriorly at the spot where an elbow would be, and this is interpreted as being homologous to the

elbow, characteristic of the genera Gambusia and Belonesox. The shape of the elbow varies among groups; it is most commonly falcate; the subgenus Gambusia is distinguished by a triangular elbow, and the punctata species group of that subgenus modifies the simple triangle into a spatulate form. It may be composed of a single segment, or up to eight segments. It often has small lateral processes arising from its sides (in the affinis and puncticulata species groups). Distal to the elbow, ray 4a is sometimes quite constricted, sometimes foreshortened, such that ray 4a does not reach the end of the gonopodium, or sometimes rather curved, due to an increased number of segments distal to the elbow. Proximal to the elbow, ray 4a is also sometimes constricted, forming a distinct notch in the ray (in the nobilis and senilis species groups).

Ray 4p has segments that bear posteriorly directed serrae. Serrae on ray 4p are common to most poeciliids. Characteristics of the serrae vary within the genus, however. The number varies from as few as three to as many as eight. High serrae numbers are found in the panuco species group, and unusually low serrae numbers in the senilis species group. Their position relative to the elbow varies - distal, opposite, or proximal; generally among poeciliids, the serrae are not very close to the distal tip, therefore, species with serrae opposite the

elbow (the nobilis species group) or distal to the elbow (the rachowi species group, and within the affinis species group) are considered to be specialized in this trait.

The shape of the serrae in most poeciliids is for them to be pointing sharply proximally. This general shape is modified in some groups to serrae that project horizontally from the segment (such as in the puncticulata species group) to highly antrorse recurved serrae (as seen in G. sexradiata and G. eurystoma of the nobilis species group).

Just distal to the serrae on ray 4p, some groups in Gambusia are characterized by an enlarged segment or two, as in the puncticulata and punctata species groups. Beyond this, the ray is narrow, with small segments. Distally, a hooked terminus is common to the genus. It may end in a rounded hook, curved posteriorly, which is composed of a single segment. It is sometimes further distinguished by being either a rather weak hook, pointing posterodistally, or by being enlarged and claw-shaped. Alternatively, the terminal modification of ray 4p might be acuminate, the anterior point reaching towards (or even touching) the distal tip of ray 4a, and the posterior tip hooked toward ray 5a. Acuminate hooks are found in the subgenera Arthropallus and Gambusia, although some members of those groups have the more general rounded hooks. The sharpness of the distal point varies; it might

sometimes be softened, and in G. wrayi is recurved. The acuminate tip to ray 4p is often multisegmented; hooks with several distinct segments are found in the affinis species group, and in some members of the puncticulata species group.

Ray 5 is also a branched ray, but ray 5p does not extend all the way to the tip of the gonopodium, and therefore is not involved in the terminal specializations. At the proximal end of the anal fin, ray 5 has a prominent bulge, characteristic of this genus alone. Distal to this bulge, ray 5 is split, open posteriorly, with serrate edges. Ray 5p ends just before the level of the serrae on ray 4p. Ray 5a continues, often rather straight but sometimes curving sharply anteriorly, to end in a posteriorly directed hook, found also in the sister group to the genus, Belonesox. Like the hook on 4p, this may be rather weak, pointing posterodistally, or enlarged and clawlike. Most often, however, it is simply rounded, although a small knob sometimes appears in its anterodistal edge. The terminal segment of ray 5a sometimes has a long base, suggesting that it has fused with the penultimate segment. The spotty distribution of this character, however, has limited its usefulness.

The interpretation of gonopodial characters is discussed in the systematic section. In general, outgroup

comparison is less helpful here than with other types of characters because outgroups simply do not possess comparable specializations. Ontogenetic criteria can be employed, but with a degree of caution. Turner (1941) described the morphogenesis of the gonopodium of Gambusia affinis, concentrating on a comparison of segmentation, bifurcation, growth, and ankylosis of segments between males and females. In a later work (1942a), he described gonopodial formation in terms of developmental fields, with a growth period followed by a differentiation period. During the growth period, fields corresponding to the specializations of rays 6, 7, and 8, the proximal bump of ray 5, and the thickening of ray 3 are active, followed by the appearance of spines on ray 3. In the differentiation period, first the serrae of ray 4p appear, followed by the terminal hooks of ray 4p and ray 5a, and lastly, the elbow. This order of appearance seems stereotyped in the genus, as I observed the same thing in many species. Beyond this ordering, the gonopodium, like most fin rays, develops along a proximal to distal gradient. Therefore, while it is observed that, in the hook at the end of ray 4p, for example, the single-segment, posteriorly directed hook is ontogenetically prior to the multisegment, anteriorly directed part of the acuminate hook, this may simply be a consequence of the fact that the anteriorly directed hook

is distal to the posteriorly directed hook. A similar discussion can be construed for the single segment elbow versus the multisegment elbow. I have considered ontogenetic information where possible, given this caveat, and ultimately incorporated it into an overall parsimony argument.

SYSTEMATICS

In the discussion of characters pertinent to the study of relationships that follows, each character is followed by a number in brackets [], and all characters are numbered consecutively. The systematic results of each section are summarized with branching diagrams, and the character numbers are placed on these diagrams. These cladograms were derived using PAUP; the character matrices (using the same numbering system for the characters) and tree statistics are included in the Appendix.

Outgroup Relationships (Fig. 21)

Tables 4, 5, and 6 show the placement of Gambusia within a hierarchical classification. Following Rosen and Parenti (1981), atherinomorphs are the sister group to the other group of acanthopterygians, the percomorphs. The Series Atherinomorpha contains two divisions. It is within Division II that the order Cyprinodontiformes lies, with the order Beloniformes as its sister group. Parenti's (1981) classification of the order Cyprinodontiformes is presented in Table 5. Following convention, I refer to members of the order vernacularly as cyprinodontiforms, and of the suborder Cyprinodontoidei as cyprinodontoids. Parenti expanded the membership of the family Poeciliidae to include procatopines,

Pantanodon, and Fluviphylax, and the fishes vernacularly referred to as poeciliids now constitute the subfamily Poeciliinae, as it was originally defined by Regan (1913). While I accept her classification, I have continued to use the vernacular term poeciliid to refer to members of this subfamily.

A classification of poeciliids is presented in Table 6, based primarily on Rosen and Bailey (1963) with the addition of a more recently described tribe (Rosen, 1967). While this classification does not imply sister-group relationships as the two previous tables do, there is evidence that the tribe Gambusiini is a monophyletic group. Its sister group, however, remains unknown. Members of the tribe Gambusiini are similar in many ways to members of the tribe Heterandriini, but it has not been determined if these similarities are primitive or derived.

Members of the tribe Gambusiini - Brachyrhaphis, Belonesox, and Gambusia - share specializations of the gonactinostal complex. In Figure 22A, Heterandria jonesi shows the general condition for many poeciliids. The first five gonactinosts are united by a laminar plate in the anterior-posterior plane. The gonactinosts are spread out on this plate like spokes in a fan. The plate divides and curves posterior to the fourth gonactinost, extending as lateral wings. In Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis

(Fig. 22B), the anterior part of the plate is somewhat reduced but still present. The lateral wings are modified towards embracing gonactinost 5. Gonactinost 5 stands freely, rather than being incorporated into the plate, and projects dorsally through the lateral wings [1].

Belonesox belizanus (Fig. 22C) and all Gambusia species (G. holbrooki in Fig. 22D; also see G. hispaniolae in Fig. 18) also have a free gonactinost 5, projecting dorsally through the modified superior lateral wings. In these two genera, the anterior plate is much reduced, and gonactinosts 2, 3, and 4 form a column. The dorsal part of this column (the "collar" of Turner, 1942b) represents the lateral wings, which are expanded to form a cup [2]. This distinctive form of the gonactinostal complex is quite consistent in Belonesox and all of Gambusia; it is known nowhere else.

These three genera share some pigmentation characters, particularly an axillary blotch, anterodorsal to the the pectoral fin insertion [3]. Hildebrand (1938) and Rosen and Bailey (1963) have commented on the striking resemblance in body form and pigmentation that exists between Brachyrhaphis and Gambusia, particularly in the anal fin area of the female. Brachyrhaphis species have a very dark band of pigment at the base of the anal fin. Anal fin pigment is not quite as dark in Gambusia; it ranges from very dusky to very faint, usually heaviest on

the first few rays. Females in both genera have dark pigment around the genital opening, its expression varying from species to species and dependent upon the female's physiological state [4]. Belonesox shows no anal pigment, either around the genital opening or on the anal fin, and these pigments are only rarely seen elsewhere in the subfamily.

Gambusia and Belonesox share some gonopodial features, in particular, a well-formed hook on ray 5a [5] (Figs. 20, 23). While the termini of rays 4p and 5a do curve over in some Brachyrhaphis species, no hook is formed. The pointed anterior tip of the Belonesox hook is seen in several Gambusia species (see G. nobilis, Fig. 40A) although most are more rounded. Belonesox does not have an elbow on ray 4a; however, this ray is modified from the straight ray that is seen in Brachyrhaphis, to be thickened, somewhat coalesced, and with a sharp anterior bend at the point where the elbow would be [6]. The same sort of ray 4a is seen in Gambusia vittata (Fig. 33A), and all the other Gambusia species, although they have well-formed elbows, also show these coalesced segments and anterior bending to some degree.

Delineation of the Genus Gambusia

The genus Gambusia, as defined here, includes G. vittata, G. rachowi, and G. echeagayari, fishes that have

each been assigned to monotypic genera by some authors. A series of derived characters place these species within Gambusia, and therefore their banishment from the genus is unwarranted, as that classification would not reflect sister-group relationships.

Males of all species of Gambusia have modified pectoral fins [7], as described in the Osteology section (Fig. 15B), and, contrary to claims by Hubbs and Reynolds (1957) and others, this modification is not seen, to any degree, in Belonesox, or, in fact, any other poeciliid. Details of this modification and its degree of development vary within the genus.

The proximal part of the male anal fin (Fig. 19) shows two synapomorphies for the genus, a thickening of ray 2 at its base [8], and a prominent bump in ray 5 [9]. Again, these characters are consistent within the genus, and not found elsewhere.

In the gonopodial suspensorium, there are several reductive trends in the form of the gonapophyses. Although there are some poeciliids that have no gonapophyses at all, the most common condition is for there to be three gonapophyses, each with full uncinata processes. Within the genera Gambusia and Poecilia, there are subgroups that have only two gonapophyses; on all other bases, these two genera do not seem to be very closely related. In all members of Gambusia, there is no

uncinate process on the first gonapophysis [10]. This process is quite prominent in Belonesox and Brachyrhaphis; however, as with the reduction in number of gonapophyses, this reductive character is seen in some distantly related poeciliids.

In the gonopodium, all Gambusia species except G. vittata have an elbow in ray 4a [11]. Because G. vittata does possess the other synapomorphies for the genus [7-10] and those for its subgenus, its lack of a well-formed elbow implies the retention of a primitive character, which is not a basis for grouping.

Delineation of Subgenera

As shown in Table 1, I recognize three subgenera - Heterophallina, Arthropallus, and Gambusia. Each of these names has been proposed for a subgenus before, by Hubbs in 1926. Note, however, that although the designated type species for each subgenus, of course, remains within it, the constituency of each subgenus is changed from that originally proposed.

Heterophallina: Hubbs (1926) used this name for a new subgenus to include three newly described species, G. vittata, G. panuco, and G. regani, designating G. regani as the type species. At the time, he knew G. vittata only from females, and when he later obtained G. vittata males, he removed it from Gambusia altogether (in Rivas, 1963).

However, I have reinstated vittata to Gambusia, and placed it in the subgenus where it was originally described. In addition to G. vittata, this subgenus also includes two species groups - the panuco species group and the rachowi species group. Rivas (1963) used the subgenus name Heterophallina only for the members of the panuco species group. Gambusia rachowi, of the rachowi species group, has often been assigned to a monotypic genus, Heterophallus. The subgenus name, Heterophallina, was chosen by Hubbs to indicate that he felt there was some degree of affinity between the groups.

Gambusia vittata and the members of these two species groups share a gonopodial specialization (see Fig. 33). The hooks on rays 4p and 5a are distinctively shaped [12]. They are rounded anteriorly, and the posterior point does not hook over completely but rather points out at an angle. The hooks are also small in size, each consisting of only a single segment. This distinctive shape is considered a derived condition for this subgenus, rather than a primitive state, because the hooks of Belonesox show a different shape, tending toward anterior points. The hypothesis that the Belonesox state is primitive for the genus is supported by the fact that it does appear occasionally in some members of the other subgenera of Gambusia.

A unique morphology of the median teeth of the toothplate of the third infrapharygnobranchial also characterizes this group [13]. These large teeth are recurved at their tips, as they are in several of the species of Gambusia, but on the medial surface of the tooth, below the tip, is a serrate lump or pad (Fig. 24). In other subgenera, these median teeth are usually smooth along their inner borders, or have just a slight hint of a shoulder along the medial edge.

Arthropallus: Hubbs (1926) created this subgenus for G. patreulis, a name often synonymized with G. affinis (see discussion by Geiser, 1923, and here on pp. 102-105 about the confusion over these names). Arthropallus has page priority over Schizophallus, another Hubbs (1926) subgenus, this one created for G. holbrooki, which is also sometimes synonymized with G. affinis. Rivas (1963) retained Arthropallus as a monotypic subgenus.

As defined below, the subgenus Arthropallus is not monotypic; rather, it contains three species groups - the affinis species group (including, among others, both G. affinis and G. holbrooki), the nobilis species group, and the senilis species group. The cephalic sensory canal system provides a consistent synapomorphy for this subgenus [14]. Rosen and Mendelson (1960) surveyed cephalic sensory canals in a range of poeciliids, noting that the carnivorous top-feeding species, e.g.

Brachyrhaphis, Belonesox, and Gambusia, have open grooves rather than closed canals, with the following sets of neuromasts: supraorbital (1, 2a; 2b, 3, 4a), infraorbital, posterior section only (4b, 5, 6a; 6b, 7), preopercular (7 neuromasts), preorbital (7 neuromasts), and mandibular (4 neuromasts). Of interest here is the infraorbital section. In Brachyrhaphis, Belonesox, and gambusiins in the subgenera Heterophallina and Gambusia, the two sections of this canal (4b, 5, 6a and 6b, 7) are joined into one continuous groove (Fig. 25A). In all members of the subgenus Arthrophallus, there is a distinct break, with two discontinuous grooves (Fig. 25B). At this level, this must be considered a synapomorphy of this group; it is completely consistent within the group. The generality of this character - continuous versus discontinuous - above this level, for example, among all poeciliids, was not examined. It was not discussed by Rosen and Mendelson (1960), and unfortunately their figures do not clearly distinguish the two conditions.

Karyotypes are known for several members of this subgenus (G. affinis of the affinis species group, G. nobilis of the nobilis species group, and G. hurtadoi of the senilis species group, for examples) (Campos and Hubbs, 1971; Chen and Ebeling, 1968). The species mentioned have a diploid number of 48, with a moderate to large metacentric chromosome in females only [59]. This

is a different karyotype than that known for Belonesox, for members of the subgenus Gambusia (G. luma, G. rhizophorae, G. xanthosoma - Wildrick et al, 1985), and for members of the subgenus Heterophallina (G. vittata, G. regani; G. marshi is autapomorphic with a reduced number of chromosomes). Except for the subgenus Arthrophallus, the general karyological condition seems to be a diploid number of 48, with no metacentric chromosomes.

A subgroup of the punctata species group, in the subgenus Gambusia, has a different karyotype, with one pair of metacentric and two of submetacentric chromosomes in both sexes, but this is inferred to be a separate character. The metacentric chromosomes in females only is inferred to be a synapomorphy of the subgenus Arthrophallus, but this is only tentative, and must be tested by karyotyping more species.

Gambusia: Seven characters [15-21] delineate the subgenus Gambusia. The only gonopodial character refers to the shape of the elbow of ray 4a. In the other two subgenera, the elbow is distinctly falcate and hooked. In the subgenus Gambusia, the proximal surface of the elbow is flat; rather than falcate, the elbow is triangular in shape [15]. In the punctata species group, the triangular shape is further modified to a more spatulate outline; these fish still have a flat, not arched, proximal surface to the elbow.

In the dorsal gill arches, the first epibranchial has no uncinata process [16] (Fig. 26). While this represents a reversion to the condition general for atherinomorphs, the rest of the genus does have such a process. In the ventral gill arches, the members of the subgenus Gambusia possess very well developed anteriorly directed lateral prongs on the first hypobranchials [17] (Fig. 27). Such processes are sometimes seen in the other subgenera, but merely as thickenings, not prongs. The third basibranchial is also modified in this group, from the relatively straight rod that is seen in the other subgenera to an hourglass shaped bone (Fig. 27). The bone is slender at the point where the two second hypobranchials articulate with it, but just posterior to this point the bone flares out in lateral wings [18].

The ventral aspect of the ventral hypohyal is distinctive in this group as well. As discussed earlier (p. 50-51), a group containing poeciliids is defined in part by a ventral hypohyal that contacts the anterior ceratohyal squarely, in a straight line. This condition is seen in the other two subgenera. In the subgenus Gambusia, the anterior ceratohyal sends forward an anterior lobe that invades much of the space of the ventral hypohyal; therefore, the juncture between these two bones is not at all square (Fig. 28) [19].

The pattern of hypural fusion in the genus is complex. Generally, adults in the other two subgenera have a single hypural plate, usually with a keyhole near the base. Most members of the subgenus Gambusia have two hypural plates, as shown for G. luma (Fig. 44), also with the keyhole opening [20]. This condition is seen occasionally in the other subgenera, for example, the rachowi group, but best characterizes this level.

Another character that fits best at this level but is not completely consistent has to do with pigment patterns on the dorsal and caudal fins. Most (but not all) members of the other subgenera have a basal row of spots on these fins, with dusky to very dark fringe at the edge of the fins. In the subgenus Gambusia, the fin pattern consists of three or four rows of spots along these fins (Fig. 29). This spotted pattern is seen occasionally in the other subgenera (e.g., G. holbrooki of Arthrophallus, and G. panuco of Heterophallina) [21].

Relationships Among Subgenera (Fig. 30)

The subgenera Arthrophallus and Gambusia are sister groups, with the subgenus Heterophallina as the sister group to that assemblage. Members of both Arthrophallus and Gambusia have a sub-orbital bar [22], which varies from being just a few melanophores running in a curved line below the eye to a very dark streak in the same

location (Fig. 31). The degree of expression of the suborbital bar also varies, depending upon the age, sex, and physiological state of the organism. In the gonopodium, members of these two subgenera develop an acuminate terminal hook on ray 4p, drawn out distally and sometimes arching anteriorly [23]. In many cases, the acuminate hook is multisegmented. This condition is thought to be more specialized than the single-segment, rounded hook because during the morphogenesis of the gonopodium, the proximal segment of the hook forms first, and it much resembles a rounded hook; it is not yet acuminate. The distal portion is next formed, producing the acuminate tip. This ontogenetic sequence, however, also reflects the general proximal-to-distal direction of specialization.

Peden (1973a) described some differences among species in the form of the anal spot in the female. Members of the panuco species group, as well as Brachyrhaphis species, have a median anal spot. Members of the subgenera Arthrophallus and Gambusia that he described have instead paired crescent-shaped spots around the anus and genital pore [24], except for three members of the senilis species group, whose median spots are considered derived at that level. While this synapomorphy seems straightforward enough based on Peden's work, the character could not be examined in the many species that

he did not cite in that paper, because, as he pointed out, the anal spot is often not seen at all in preserved specimens (all of his observations were of live material).

Relationships Within the Subgenus Heterophallina (Fig. 32)

The panuco and rachowi species groups together form a monophyletic group. Three gonopodial peculiarities unite them (Fig. 33): retrorse spines on ray 3, as opposed to all spines basically pointing forward [25]; an increase in the number of segments to six or more in ray 4a distal to the elbow, with a concomitant reduction in the size of said segments [26]; and a similar increase in the number of segments distal to the serrae of ray 4p often up to nine or more [27]. The normal range in the number of these segments in the genus is from four to eight, usually four or five.

G. vittata: As noted earlier, this species lacks the well-formed elbow on ray 4a of the gonopodium. It is also remarkable in that it is the only Gambusia, of those for which stomach content analyses have been performed, that is reported to eat much algae (specifically filamentous Spirogyra), which accounted for up to 50% of the stomach contents. The remainder consisted of arthropod parts, a more conventional diet for a Gambusia (Darnell, 1962).

panuco Species Group: The three members of the panuco species group, G. marshi, G. panuco, and G. regani, have a quite distinctive gonopodium (Fig. 33B-D); this group has been recognized at some level as a cohesive unit by all previous students of the genus. There is a high number of slender spines on ray 3, typically 14-17 [28]; the number of spines on ray 3 in other groups usually ranges from 8-13. Some members of the punctata species group have up to 15 spines, but these are broad, straight spines with long inner processes. In the panuco species group, the spines curve like a fan, and their distal tips do not end pointedly, but gently merge into the membrane of the gonopodial margin [29]. Spines in other groups have distinct pointed edges. The terminal segment of ray 5a in this group, which bears the hook at its distal tip, is proximally elongated, covering the distance of two segments [30]. The terminal segment may have fused with the penultimate one; however, no evidence of fusion was seen. This particular character is found occasionally in other groups in the genus.

Within the panuco species group, G. panuco and G. regani are more closely related to each other than either is to G. marshi. Gambusia marshi, however, is polymorphic with regard to pigmentation pattern and morphometrics (Minkley, 1962 and pers. comm.); it may represent a complex of species, but variation at that level was not

investigated here. The gonopodia of G. panuco and G. regani have more serrae on ray 4p than anywhere else in the genus [31]. These two species have eight or nine serrae, G. marshi usually five, the rachowi species group and G. vittata two to four, and other groups in the genus typically four to six. The serrae in these two species extend directly perpendicular from ray 4p [32]. This modification is seen again in some other groups (see puncticulata group, and within the nobilis group) but must be considered a more advanced condition than the retrorse serrae that are common not only in the genus but to most poeciliids. Gambusia panuco and G. regani can be distinguished from each other on meristic (G. regani has fewer dorsal fin rays) and pigmentary (G. regani has no spotting on the body) grounds. Otherwise, these sister species are very close.

rachowi Species Group: This group contains two species that previously have been assigned to two monotypic genera. Heterophallus rachovii was inadvertently redescribed (invalidly, of course) as Gambusia atzi by Rosen and Gordon (1951); while recognizing its differences from the other members of Gambusia, they stressed commonalities, especially the elbow of ray 4a in the gonopodium. Dicerophallus echeagayari was described in a Spanish language article (Alvarez, 1952). The author, Alvarez, had not seen G. rachowi; the two species are

actually quite close and do not belong in separate genera. Rosen and Bailey (1963), following Rosen and Gordon (1951), retained both of these species within Gambusia, as the rachowi species group, as I have done here. Rivas (1963), however, recognized the monotypic taxa and described them as "allied genera."

These two species do have a very strange gonopodium that clearly designates them as a monophyletic group (Fig. 33). There are no forward pointing spines on ray 3 [33]. There is an odd buckling of ray 4a [34], distal to the elbow, which results in the elbow, which is quite prominent and falcate, being displaced proximally. A fleshy palp grows laterally from the gonopodium between ray 3 and 4a, just distal to the elbow [35]. Present in both species, this palp is developed to a greater degree in G. echeagayari. Both species are very slender fish, as are all members of this subgenus, but these two narrow to a steep ventral keel; all other species are more rounded ventrally [36]. Finally, these two fish have a caudal fin skeleton that consists of two unfused hypural plates [20]. Within this subgenus, all other fishes have hypurals fused into one plate, with a keyhole in the middle. This condition is not unique within the genus, however; the subgenus Gambusia is also characterized by two unfused hypurals in the caudal skeleton. Finally, these two species have a cleithral process that extends

further posteriorly than in any other fish of the genus (or allied genera) (Fig. 34). Rather than being a simple rounded process, it is more like a drawn-out ellipse [37].

Relationships Within the Subgenus Arthropallus (Fig. 35)

The nobilis and senilis species groups form a monophyletic unit. In their gonopodium, ray 4a has a distinct notch proximal to the elbow [38]. While obviously all species with elbows narrow in ray 4a just proximal to the elbow, in these groups, this narrowing soon widens and ray 4a resumes its normal width, with the transition from narrow to wide being rather abrupt. In other groups, ray 4a also widens, but does so gradually, with no noticeable demarcation of narrow and wide zones (compare Figs. 41 and 43 with those of other groups, e.g. Figs. 33, 47, 49, 51). These two groups also share long spines on ray 3, with well developed inner processes [39]. This particular character, as just described, will also characterize a monophyletic subunit of the subgenus Gambusia (see pg. 111). However, the width, shape, and outline of the spines and inner processes are different in the two groups. Most members of these two species groups have typically only two gonapophyses (Fig. 37), instead of the more general number of three, often with a slight swelling on the third hemal spine being the only indication of a third gonapophysis [61]. Also, the

members of these groups have no uncinuate process on the first epibranchial [16]. The difficulty in interpreting the generality of this character was discussed earlier (p. 55); while it may or may not be a synapomorphy, it does describe the condition found in these two subgroups and is congruent with other synapomorphies.

affinis Species Group (Fig. 36): This constitution of this group is the most novel proposition of this work. Although Rosen and Bailey (1963) designated an "affinis species group", theirs was a rather uncharacterizable assemblage of some of the fishes not only of this subgenus but also some of the subgenus Gambusia. The group as here defined contains five members (1), sharing the following

(1) A nomenclatural digression is necessary to clarify the status of some of the members of this group. Baird and Girard (1853) described two Texas mosquitofishes as Heterandria affinis and H. patreulis, differing slightly in head shape and dorsal fin ray number. After Poey's 1854 description of the genus Gambusia, Girard (1859a) referred these two species to the new genus, adding G. holbrooki of Florida (1859b), which he cited as being described by Agassiz in the genus Heterandria, and later G. speciosa of the Río San Juan in Nuevo León and G. gracilis of Matamoras (1859c). Jordan and Copeland (1876) listed G. holbrooki and G. affinis as valid, with patreulis, gracilis, and speciosa as doubtful species. However, Jordan and Gilbert (1886) recognized G. patreulis with G. gracilis now synonymized under this name. Evermann and Kendall, however, synonymized G. patreulis, G. gracilis, and G. speciosa under the name G. affinis, and in 1896, G. holbrooki was also placed in this synonymy (Jordan and Evermann, 1896).

However, Regan (1913) recognized three valid species, G. holbrooki, G. patreulis, and G. affinis, the latter containing speciosa as well, differentiated again by slight variations in dorsal fin ray number. Geiser (1923)

specializations (Fig. 38). The elbow of ray 4a of the gonopodium consists of many segments, up to ten, which are coalesced along their anterior borders [40]. Elbows in other groups are most often unisegmental, or consist of at most three segments. The spines of ray 3 are small and stout, and their distal tips are bifid [41]. The small size might be considered a retention of the condition

demonstrated that G. holbrooki is gonopodially distinct from all other species under question, being the only species in the genus to have denticulations on the posterior edges of the ray three segments proximal to the spines. He recommended full species status for holbrooki, with all other forms named affinis.

For added confusion, Hubbs (1926) decided to limit the name G. affinis to a new species, related to G. senilis, from San Marcos, Texas, and to use the name G. patreulis for the widespread species usually called affinis. Under G. patreulis, he included G. speciosa, G. modesta, and G. myersi (the latter two names proposed by Ahl for a fish of the Panuco region in eastern Mexico). As a separate subgenus, Hubbs recognized G. holbrooki, following Geiser. Hubbs and Springer (1957), after being able to examine the co-types for Heterandria affinis, described the San Marcos mosquitofish as G. geiseri, and the widespread fish was again renamed G. affinis, this time the name G. patreulis finally disappearing.

Krumholz (1948), C. L. Hubbs (1955), C. Hubbs (1957), and Hubbs and Springer (1957) have all cited two unpublished manuscripts that reported natural introgression between G. affinis and G. holbrooki, and therefore have recognized these forms as only subspecifically different. (Hubbs et al. (1953) also listed G. affinis speciosa, from Comal Springs.)

However, the ability to interbreed is a primitive character (Rosen, 1979), and shared primitive characters are not valid for describing groups, even if the level of the group is a single species. Furthermore, natural hybrids occurs elsewhere in the genus: between G. nobilis and G. affinis (Hubbs, 1955); G. heterochir and G. affinis (Hubbs, 1957); G. georgei and G. affinis, G. nobilis and G. geiseri, and G. hurtadoi and G. heterochir (the last in artificial pools) (Hubbs and Peden, 1969). Clearly if the

found in Belonesox and Brachyrhaphis, whose spine-bearing segments of ray 3 do not have true spines but are slightly drawn out anteriorly. However, these "spines" are not bifid. A further peculiarity of this group is a lateral bulge at the anteroproximal tip of the elbow [42]. It is usually more pronounced on one side of the gonopodium than the other, so that in the resting gonopodium, ray 4a is displaced slightly toward one side. A lateral projection

interbreeding criterion does not apply in these cases, it need not apply in the affinis-holbrooki case either. Like any symplesiomorphy, the ability to interbreed is certainly indicative of relationship at some (higher) level. All reported cases of natural hybridization occur within the subgenus Arthrophallus, and therefore this ability, although lost in some apomorphic taxa, characterizes this large group.

Gambusia speciosa, as a valid species, has appeared on two recent checklists, without comment as to its status (Miller, 1986; Smith and Miller, 1986). Examining new material, I have found it to be gonopodially distinct from other forms of Gambusia, and therefore also treat it herein as a full species; a formal revisional treatment of the "affinis" problem will appear in a later manuscript, after I have located and examined the relevant type material.

The final nomenclatural gnarl in this group is associated with the fish now known as G. aurata, and is recounted at length in the description of that species (Miller and Minckley, 1970) and briefly summarized here. A Gambusia from the Pánuco region was described by Ahl as G. modesta, a preoccupied name later replaced with G. myersi. A yellow Gambusia from the Río Mante, mentioned as G. sp. by DarneII (1961), was thought perhaps to be G. myersi by Rosen and Bailey (1963), but when Miller and Minckley reported on Ahl's types, it turned out that G. myersi was a junior synonym of G. affinis, which is also found in the Río Mante, and the yellow fish was described as G. aurata.

It is common in the literature to see two spellings of the trivial name of this species, holbrooki and holbrookii. The confusion stems from the official

from the gonopodium is seen in the rachowi species group, but in those species, the projection is a large, fleshy palp, dissociated from (or not associated with, at any rate) the elbow. In the affinis species group, the lateral projection is a bony prominence on the elbow. Finally, these fishes all have a particularly impressive pectoral fin in males, with a unique modification [57]. The fifth pectoral ray has a distinct scalloped portion near its distal tip, which is something more than the blade which is developed above this ray in most species of the genus (Fig. 39). Except for the autapomorphic G. heterochir of the nobilis species group, the members of this species group have the most pronounced pectoral fin modifications in the genus.

Gambusia aurata and G. lemaitrei both have very high serrae on ray 4p of the gonopodium, extending to distal to the elbow [43]. In these two species, ray 3 is somewhat foreshortened, such that it does not reach the distal tip of the gonopodium [44]. And in G. affinis and G. holbrooki, the gonopodia are exaggeratedly drawn out at their distal tip, coming to a much more acute point than in any other species of the genus [62].

description, where Girard (1859b) described Gambusia holbrooki but referred to an Agassiz manuscript (apparently never published) that had earlier described the fish as Heterandria holbrookii. Girard changed the ending from -ii to -i without comment, or even as a mistake, but G. holbrooki stands now as the valid name.

nobilis Species Group (Fig. 40): A group called the nobilis species group was implied in a key by Hubbs in 1926, and in 1929 he formalized that group with the description of G. gaigei. He grouped G. nobilis, G. senilis, and "G. affinis" with this new species, but the characters defining the group actually are applicable to larger groups in Gambusia. Hubbs and Springer (1957) clarified that the "G. affinis" of Hubbs (1926, 1929) was not G. affinis, but a new species, G. geiseri. They added another two species to the group, G. alvarezi and G. hurtadoi. Their group definition again consisted primarily of primitive characters, although their group composition corresponds roughly to the combination of the nobilis and senilis species groups as described herein. The same applies to the Rosen and Bailey (1963) nobilis species group; they also added G. heterochir, G. longispinis, and G. atrora. Rivas (1963) did distinguish the nobilis and senilis species groups; however, his nobilis species group is again not defined by derived characters, but rather by the lack of the derived characters of the senilis group.

Indeed, members of the nobilis group do share several derived characters with the senilis group, indicating a sister group relationship between these species groups (see pg. 101). However, the nobilis group can be characterized by the position of the serrae on ray 4p,

being opposite the elbow rather than proximal to it [43], and by the rounded gonopodial outline [47], unique to this species group within the subgenus (Fig. 41).

Gambusia nobilis, G. heterochir, G. georgei, G. krumholzi, G. eurystoma, and G. sexradiata comprise this species group. Within the group, G. eurystoma and G. sexradiata are clearly sister taxa, sharing recurved serrae on ray 4p of the gonopodium [32], spotted dorsal and caudal fins [21], continuous grooves in the posterior section of the infraorbital laterosensory canals [14], and three gonapophyses [61]. No other resolution of relationships within this group was possible, however. Each of the four remaining species does have certain autapomorphies, for example the exaggerated pectoral fin modification of G. heterochir males, but no synapomorphies uniting any subgroup of these were discernable.

senilis Species Group (Fig. 42): The senilis species group was first proposed by Rivas (1963), to contain G. senilis, G. geiseri, G. gagei, G. alvarezi, and G. hurtadoi. To his list I add G. longispinis of his nobilis species group, G. atrora and G. amistadensis. Three gonopodial features distinguish this group (Fig. 43). Ray 4a is foreshortened distal to the elbow, such that it does not extend to the end of the gonopodium [45]. Consequently, there are very few segments in ray 4a distal to the elbow. There is also a reduced number of spines on

ray 3, typically eight [46]. Finally, these fishes have a very distinctive gonopodial outline [47]; the furthest extension of the gonopodial tip is drawn out to a point on the anterior edge, and the medial distal edge actually dips a little proximally before being drawn out to that tip.

This species group can be divided into two monophyletic subgroups. One, containing G. senilis, G. gaigei, G. alvarezi, G. hurtadoi, and G. amistadensis, is characterized by a median anal spot in females (Peden, 1973a), rather than the paired crescents more common in the subgenera Arthrophallus and Gambusia [24], and a transversely enlarged segment on ray 4a distal to the serrae [48]. Transversely enlarged segments are seen also in the puncticulata and punctata species groups of the subgenus Gambusia, but in those fish, the segments extend primarily toward ray 4a, and in these members of the senilis species group, the extension is toward ray 5a only. Furthermore, these senilis-type species usually have only one expanded segment, with an abrupt transition to more narrow segments just distal to it. In the puncticulata and punctata species groups, there are often two, three, or four expanded segments that gradually narrow distally. Within this small group, G. hurtadoi and G. amistadensis share a small lateral projection on the elbow of ray 4a [42], and G. alvarezi shares with these

two a similar hypobranchial 1 shape [60]. However, it should be emphasized that all five members of this clade are very close.

The sister clade to this group consists of G. geiseri, G. longispinis, and G. atrora. These three are united by a reduction in the number of serrae on ray 4p, to fewer than four [31], no sub-orbital bar [22], and a form of hypural fusion unique within the genus (Fig. 44). There is only one hypural plate, a complete fusion of the hypural elements into a fan, with no keyhole remaining [20]. Gambusia atrora and G. longispinis are sister species within this clade, as these two species have three gonapophyses, while other members of the senilis and nobilis species groups typically have only two [61].

Relationships Within the Subgenus Gambusia (Fig. 45)

Within this subgenus, a group consisting of the puncticulata and punctata species groups can be described. These fishes share several synapomorphies in gonopodial structure. In ray 4p, just distal to the serrae, one or two segments are transversely enlarged [48], in all species except G. luma. As in the nobilis and senilis species groups, the spines of ray 3 are elongate and develop inner processes [39]. However, the inner processes of this group are wider and flatter at their proximal edges. In the nobilis and senilis species

groups, the inner processes tend to curve anteriorly as they extend proximally, and they narrow to finger-like proximal edges. Similarly, the shapes of the spines, and particularly the outlines of the gonopodia as formed by the spines, are distinctive for each species group. These two groups are further separated from the nicaraguensis species group by the fact that their serrae on ray 4p are straight, not retrose [32].

nicaraguensis Species Group (Fig. 46): Rivas (1963) described a nicaraguensis species group to contain G. nicaraguensis, G. wrayi, G. melapleura, G. gracilior, and G. dominicensis, but did not use derived characters to define it. Fink (1971a) revised Rivas' group, adding G. hispaniolae. He also discussed the status of G. dominicensis, described by Regan from "Haiti", which has never subsequently been collected there or anywhere. I have not examined Regan's syntypes, which are in London, but Fink's figure clearly indicates that the common Gambusia of Hispaniola, which is often identified as G. dominicensis, is actually G. hispaniolae, and that, as Fink supposed, Regan's locality information for G. dominicensis is probably incorrect. Fink (1971a) also synonymized G. gracilior under G. wrayi, after examining Regan's syntypes of both, again in London, and concluding that the proportional differences cited by Regan (1913) were indistinct. Not having examined these syntypes

myself, I accept the synonymy, but cautiously. Material I have examined of G. wrayi shows a dimorphism in gonopodial structure, with a unique recurved form of the terminal hook on ray 5a, and also a distinctive pelvic girdle in these same samples. This particular gonopodial innovation is not shown in either Fink's (1971a) or Regan's (1913) figures; however, Regan's gonopodial drawings are more stylized than accurate, and Fink's are rather small.

The nicaraguensis species group, as herein delimited, contains G. nicaraguensis, G. wrayi, and G. melapleura; G. hispaniolae belongs to the puncticulata species group (Fig. 47).

These fish have a more triangular ventral hypohyal than that found elsewhere in the genus [19]. In Fig. 28, different conditions of the ventral aspect of the ventral hypohyal are portrayed. The general condition for the genus is for the ventral hypohyal to be roughly square, meeting the anterior ceratohyal in a straight line. In the subgenus Gambusia, the anterior ceratohyal sends forward a lobe, so that the the connection of the two bones is no longer square. In the puncticulata and punctata species groups, however, the anterolateral edge of the ventral hypohyal is still squared. In the nicaraguensis species group, the anterolateral corner of the ventral hypohyal is no longer squared, rather the edge of the bone cuts directly from the anteromedial edge to

the posterolateral edge, leaving a triangular bone.

Gambusia wrayi and G. melapleura have odd segments in ray 4a distal to the elbow, each segment with two or three serrations in its anterior edge [63].

puncticulata Species Group (Fig. 48): The puncticulata species group of Rivas (1963) was revised by Fink (1971b). In that work, he synonymized the eight forms in the group under the name G. puncticulata, with G. puncticulata puncticulata representing the former G. puncticulata, G. oligosticta, G. caymenensis, G. hubbsi, and G. howelli. Gambusia manni, G. bucheri, G. baracoana, and G. yucatanana were reduced to subspecific status, along with G. puncticulata monticola. This study was primarily based on meristics, pigmentation, and gonopodial counts and measures, and the rationalization for combining all these forms under one species name was that they were not gonopodially distinct. Additionally, the forms combined in the nominal subspecies had overlapping ranges for all of the characters studied.

Greenfield and Wildrick (1984) reexamined the group, using additional characters, including electrophoretic analysis. They proposed that G. yucatanana be reinstated to full species rank, and that that species is the sister group to all other members of the group. In fact, subspecies, G. yucatanana yucatanana and G. yucatanana australis were later described (Greenfield, 1985). The island

members of the species group were divided into two sections: one containing G. puncticulata from Cuba, G. howelli, G. caymenensis, and G. oligosticta; the other with G. puncticulata from the Bahamas (= G. hubbsi), G. manni, G. bucheri, G. baracoana, and G. monticola. These groups were found to be electrophoretically distinct from each other and from G. yucatanana.

The morphological characters of my study concur with the arrangement of Greenfield and Wildrick (1984); I however also include G. hispaniolae in this species group, which was placed in the nicaraguensis species group in its original description (Fink, 1971a). Because of the scarcity of specimens of some of the endemic taxa (i.e., G. bucheri, G. baracoana, G. monticola, and G. manni, as restricted by Fink, 1971b), I have not been able to study variation at the level necessary to try to make some judgement about the taxonomic ranks these forms deserve. However, the implications of the cladogram (Fig. 48) clearly dictate that the nomenclatural actions of Fink (1971b) must be reconsidered, since, for example, his "G. puncticulata puncticulata" does not seem to be a monophyletic group. As this is a study of relationships rather than a formal revision, I shall at this time simply indicate which taxa form groups.

As described herein, the members of the puncticulata group (Fig. 49) all have a lateral thickening along the

proximal base of the elbow in ray 4a of the gonopodium [42], reminiscent of the lateral knob of the affinis species group. However, in that group, the lateral projection is a knob projecting from the anteroproximal tip of the elbow, while in this group the thickening is all along the flat proximal edge, seeming more like a shelf than a knob. The members of this species group also share a somewhat different pectoral fin modification. In other groups, the blades developed on rays 2 through 5 are developed primarily on the dorsal side of the ray. In this species group (Fig. 39), the blades are equally well developed on both the dorsal and ventral sides of these rays [58].

Greenfield and Wildrick (1984) unite all species in the group except G. yucatanana by several electrophoretic characters. They also note that all island species of this group show red and yellow coloration in the dorsal and caudal fins, especially in breeding males [49].

Gambusia yucatanana shows no such colors. Another character they use at this level is the longer serrae on ray 4p possessed by the island species as compared to G. yucatanana; while this is true, the sister group of the puncticulata species group, the punctata species group, also has long serrae.

Gambusia hubbsi, G. manni, G. hispaniolae, G. baracoana, G. bucheri, and G. monticola constitute a

monophyletic group, corresponding (except for the addition of G. hispaniolae) to the "hubbsi group" designated by Greenfield and Wildrick (1984). Within the group, G. hubbsi and G. hispaniolae have hypurals fused into a single hypural plate, with a keyhole [20]. Gambusia bucheri, G. baracoana, and G. monticola share an increased number of lateral line scales and vertebrae [50]. Fink (1971b) documents the range of variation in these meristic characters for the species group; he considers the high meristics of these three species to be the result of independent isolation events, but a common origin is a more economical inference.

In Greenfield and Wildrick's (1984) "puncticulata group", consisting of G. puncticulata, G. oligosticta, G. caymenensis, and G. howelli, the anteriorly directed lateral prongs of the first hypobranchials in the ventral gill arches, characteristic of the subgenus Gambusia, are reduced to very small bumps [17] (Fig. 26C). This group is also characterized by a permanent median anal spot in the females [24]; they report no anal spot either in G. yucatanana or in the hubbsi forms, although Peden (1973a) indicates that some of these forms have paired crescents.

punctata Species Group (Fig. 50): This species group was recognized by both Rivas and Rosen and Bailey, although these authors disagreed about a few members. The gonopodium is quite distinctive (Fig. 51), with a

spatulate elbow [15]. The hooks on both rays 5a [51] and 4p [52] are enlarged and scythe-like. The spines on ray 3 are very long and strap-like [39], as are their inner processes, which reach far in, almost touching ray 4a. These spines form a lobe-like outline to the gonopodium, not pointed at all [47]. In the ventral gill arches, the wings on the third basibrachial are reduced [18], in all species examined in this group except G. pseudopunctata; this character was not examined in G. xanthosoma or G. beebei.

As defined above, this species group includes six members: G. luma, G. beebei, G. pseudopunctata, G. punctata, G. xanthosoma, and G. rhizophorae. All of these species except G. luma have the sub-orbital bar reduced or absent [22], and several morphometric and meristic characters described by Greenfield (1983) apply at this level, such as a more anterior placement of the dorsal fin and higher dorsal fin ray counts. All members of this species group except G. luma have a unique pectoral fin modification [57] in males, where the blade on ray 2 thickens abruptly near its proximal end, and the segments are anastomosed in this area. Gambusia luma does not have the transversely enlarged segments on ray 4p just distal to the serrae, but otherwise its placement in this group is obvious, contrary to the arguments of Rivas (1969).

Except for the sub-orbital bar of G. luma and the post-ocular bar which is prominent in all species of this group, pigmentation is very plain in G. luma and G. beebei. The other four species of the group are united by a well-developed pigmentation pattern, of four to six rows of large dark spots along the sides of the body [53], a striking pattern which earned G. punctata its name.

Gambusia punctata, G. xanthosoma, and G. rhizophorae have especially pronounced enlargements of the posterior edges of the segments just distal to the serrae on ray 4p of the gonopodium. These extensions fill the space between ray 4p and ray 5a completely, sometimes with small anterior projections from ray 5a filling in the gaps [48].

Gambusia xanthosoma and G. rhizophorae share a unique karyotype, reported by Wildrick et al. (1985). One pair of metacentric chromosomes and two pairs of submetacentric chromosomes are found in both sexes [54]. Gambusia luma was also karyotyped by the same authors; it has no metacentrics or submetacentrics in either sex, which is inferred to be the general condition for the genus (see discussion, p. 92-93). Gambusia beebei, G. pseudopunctata, and G. punctata were not tested, so it is unclear how large a group this character might specify. In the gonopodium of G. xanthosoma and G. rhizophorae, ray 4a distal to the elbow curves in an S-shape anteriorly over the first of the ray 3 spines [55]. These two

species also share a pigmentation character, the development of a distinct mid-lateral stripe, and they are both the normal small size of most gambusias. Other members of this species group attain large sizes, with G. beebei at up to 59 mm standard length (Rivas, 1969) being the largest species of the genus. Gambusia rhizophorae and G. xanthosoma are the only species of the species group that thrive in brackish water; they are both found associated with mangrove swamps.

BIOGEOGRAPHY

Distributional information presented herein is compiled from various sources, including the materials examined, the original descriptions of the species, Geiser (1923), Hubbs and Springer (1957), Rosen and Bailey (1963), Rivas (1963, 1969, 1971), Fink (1971a, b), and Greenfield et al. (1982), as well as other sources mentioned below.

Distribution of the Subgenus Heterophallina (Fig. 52)

Members of this subgenus are known only from strictly freshwater habitats, most often the headwaters and swiftly flowing streams that flow from the Sierra Madre Oriental.

Gambusia vittata: This species is limited to the Río Pánuco - Río Tamesí systems of Tamaulipas and San Luis Potosí, México. It is sympatric with G. aurata and G. affinis in the Río Mante, and with G. atrora in the Río Axtla system. It is also sympatric with G. panuco throughout much of its range; although G. vittata is not found in the Río Ojo Frio system, G. vittata is found in Pánuco tributaries further east and south than G. panuco (Río Atlapexco). It may extend south into the Río Tuxpan system.

panuco Species Group: Two of the species of this group are confined to the Río Pánuco - Río Tamesí system;

the third is isolated from them in northern México. All three species in this group are allopatric with respect to one another.

Gambusia marshi is widespread in the Río Salado system and in parts of the Cuatro Ciénegas basin in Coahuila, México. It shares the Cuatro Ciénegas area with G. longispinis, and may be sympatric in part of the Salado drainage with G. speciosa.

Gambusia panuco, as described above under G. vittata, is widespread throughout the Pánuco valley. It is found in the Río Tamesí system, except at the extreme headwaters of the Río Sabinas, where it is replaced by G. regani. In the Río Pánuco system, it is the only Gambusia in the Río Ojo Fric system, and it coexists with both G. atrora and G. vittata in the Río Axtla. It is found as far south as the Río Calabozo, but drops out after that. It is also found in headwater areas of the Río Soto La Marina, to the north.

Gambusia regani is confined to the headwaters of the Río Sabinas system, Río Tamesí drainage, Tamaulipas, México. While some other localities in the Tamesí and Soto La Marina systems are catalogued in some collections as G. regani, these are in fact G. panuco.

rachowi Species Group: Each of the two species of this small group is known only from the area of the type locality, both in southeastern México. Both are sympatric

with G. sexradiata.

Gambusia rachowi is found at Jesus Carranza, Veracruz, in the Río Coatzacoalcos system.

Gambusia echeagayari inhabits a small stream near the town of Palenque, Chiapas, which drains into the Río Usamacinta system.

Distribution of the Subgenus Arthrophallus

This subgenus is distributed over continental and coastal habitats, from eastern North America to southern México, with a single species in South America. It has no members either in lower Central America or the Antilles; the greatest diversity of taxa occurs in Texas and northern México.

affinis Species Group (Fig. 53): This species group is the most far-ranging of the genus, both as a group, from New Jersey to Colombia, and as individual species, as G. affinis and G. holbrooki are quite widespread taxa. These two species have been introduced worldwide to control mosquitos. These efforts have had some limited success; Gambusia apparently prefers to eat larval fish when available, and the introduction of these species has often had devastating effects on the native fish fauna, including other species of Gambusia. It is difficult to know certainly the natural ranges of these two taxa, but careful compilations and record-keeping allow a reasonable

approximation.

Gambusia holbrooki is found in fresh water along the eastern seaboard of the United States, from the southern tip of New Jersey through to the Florida Keys, and in western drainages from Georgia into the Gulf of México. It is replaced by G. affinis further west; the exact dividing line or the nature of a zone of intergradation was not studied here. It is broadly sympatric with G. rhizophorae in extremely southern Florida.

Gambusia affinis, in addition to the Gulf drainages of Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas, ranges further north in the United States (to Illinois) and is common throughout the Río Grande and Pecos drainages. It is also reported to occur in Gulf drainages along the east coast of México as far south as Tampico. However, such reports were not checked by the author, and some of these southern localities may be referable to G. speciosa. In Texas, G. affinis is sympatric with many members of the nobilis and senilis species groups.

Gambusia speciosa was described from the Río San Juan, in Nuevo Leon, and has also recently been found at Melchor Muzquiz, in a stream of the Río Salado - Río Grande drainage, in Coahuila. The full extent of the range of this species also needs further study. As with G. affinis and G. holbrooki, locality records for this species are confusing because of the years of

nomenclatural confusion.

Gambusia aurata resides in the Río Mante, of Río Tamesí drainage, in Tamaulipas, México. It has been taken, both in the nacimiento and canals through Ciudad Mante, with three other Gambusia species: G. affinis, G. panuco, and G. vittata. Darnell (1962) and Miller and Minckley (1970) describe the microhabitats of these four sympatric species.

Gambusia lemaitrei offers the oddest distributional note in the genus. Known only from Totumo, Colombia, it is the only South American representative of the genus. However, it is not well collected, and no further details of its distribution are available.

nobilis Species Group (Fig. 54): Most of the species of this group are endemic to freshwater springheads. The precarious nature of these habitats, in the face of development, has warranted three of these species to be federally listed as endangered: G. nobilis, G. heterochir, and G. georgei. The Mexican G. krumholzi is limited to a small area, but is not threatened; G. eurystoma is also a strict endemic whose status is still safe. Only G. sexradiata of this group presently has a widespread distribution, and it is the only member found in other than a strictly freshwater situation.

Gambusia nobilis is endemic to the Pecos River drainage in Texas and New Mexico, found primarily in small

springs and sinkholes. Geographic variation among the isolated springhead populations was recently studied by Echelle and Echelle (1986), who concluded that subspecific designations were unwarranted. Historical records indicate that the species was previously both more abundant and widespread.

Gambusia georgei, of the upper San Marcos River, Hays County, Texas, is sympatric with G. geiseri, of the senilis species group, and G. affinis, of the affinis species group. According to Hubbs and Peden (1969), these three species partition the environment, with G. geiseri most common in mid-water, G. affinis in shallow vegetated areas, and G. georgei restricted to shallow areas with no vegetation. This rare species also hybridizes somewhat with G. affinis reported (Hubbs and Peden, 1969).

Gambusia heterochir is restricted to the headwaters of Clear Creek, Menard County, Texas. Clear Creek flows into the San Saba River, where G. affinis occurs, and hybridization between the two species, in Clear Creek, has been reported by Hubbs (1957).

Gambusia krumholzi is known only from the type locality, the Río de Nava, which is a small stream in the Río Grande drainage, of Coahuila, México (Minckley, 1963).

Gambusia eurystoma was described from a sulphurous, spring-fed stream, Arroyo del Azufre, at Baños de Azufre, 10 km west of Teapa, Tabasco, México, and is found only at

that locality.

Gambusia sexradiata, first described as a subspecies of G. nicaraguensis, inhabits the coastal drainages of México from the Río Nautla south to the Yucatan peninsula. It is also found throughout the Usumacinta drainage of Guatemala. In these areas, it is a primarily freshwater form. In Belize, however, Greenfield et al. (1984) report that it is also found in brackish and sea water. In Belize, G. sexradiata shares its habitat with G. luma and G. yucatanana.

senilis Species Group (Fig. 55): As with the nobilis species group, many members of this group are strictly limited to small, threatened springhead habitats.

Gambusia hurtadoi, G. gaigei, and G. amistadensis are listed as endangered; G. amistadensis may well be extinct.

Gambusia senilis is most common in the Río Conchos system of Chihuahua and Durango, México, but also occurs in the Devil's River of Texas. It inhabits clear springs, turbid water, and irrigation ditches, and although widespread, much of its habitat dries up periodically.

Gambusia gaigei, the Big Bend Gambusia, was described from Boquillas Spring, Rio Grande drainage, Brewster Co., Texas. Hubbs and Brodrick (1963) report that the population was extirpated at the type locality, but that the fish was introduced at Croton Springs, on Graham Ranch, near the type locality, and is found in an

artificial pool in Big Bend National Park.

Within the range of G. senilis are two isolated areas, each containing an endemic species. Gambusia alvarezi is known only from El Ojo de San Gregorio and adjacent creeks. Gambusia hurtadoi is described from El Ojo de la Hacienda Dolores, which is a warm spring, and associated irrigation ditches. Both are in Chihuahua, México.

Gambusia amistadensis was described from Goodenough Spring and its outflow to the Río Grande in Val Verde County, Texas (Peden, 1973), based on material collected in April 1968. In July of that same year, the construction of the Amistad Reservoir caused permanent flooding of the spring, destroying the habitat necessary for this species. Although some stocks were maintained in artificial aquaria, Peden (1973b) surmises that the indigenous population of this species is extinct.

Gambusia geiseri is found in several systems in Texas, always near the emergence of cold clear springs. It occurs in the San Marcos, Guadalupe, Conchos, and Devil's River, and is sympatric with G. affinis. Hubbs and Springer (1957) suspect that it is native only to the San Marcos Springs and Comal Springs and introduced at the other Texas springs, based on earlier collection records.

Gambusia longispinis is restricted to the Cuatro Ciénegas basin of Coahuila, México. Gambusia marshi, of

the subgenus Heterophallina, also found in this area, is more widespread, occurring in parts of the Río Salado system.

Gambusia atrora is rather far removed from the remainder of the species group. It is found in the Río Axtla and its tributaries, in the Río Pánuco drainage, San Luis Potosí, México. It is sympatric here with G. panuco and G. vittata.

Distribution of the subgenus Gambusia

Each of the species groups in this subgenus is primarily Caribbean, but each also has one mainland member, in Central America.

nicaraguensis Species Group (Fig. 56):

Gambusia nicaraguensis is found in Atlantic coast drainages of Central America, as far south as the Río Chágres, Panamá. It is generally found in fresh water in lower Central America, where it is the only Gambusia present, although Belonesox and Brachyrhaphis are common here; in the northern extremity of its range, in Belize, it is most often found in high salinity river mouths or in full strength sea water. In Belize, it is sympatric with G. luma, but G. luma prefers less saline waters; in saline waters, G. nicaraguensis sometimes occurs with G. yucatanana. As with G. yucatanana (see below), slender- and deep-bodied forms of this species can be described, with

deeper-bodied forms occurring at more inland, fresh water localities (Greenfield et al., 1982).

Gambusia wrayi, as redescribed by Fink (1971a), is common in the freshwater drainages of Jamaica, most populous in the southern drainages. In brackish and salt waters, it is replaced by G. oligosticta of the puncticulata species group.

Gambusia melapleura is restricted to the type locality, freshwater springs of the Shrewsbury River, Bluefields, Jamaica.

puncticulata Species Group (Fig. 57): Gambusia yucatanana, the only mainland member of this species group, is found in México, Guatemala, and Belize. Greenfield (1985) distinguishes two subspecies, G. yucatanana yucatanana from the northern Yucatan peninsula, and G. yucatanana australis further south, based on multivariate analysis of morphometric data. The species dwells in a variety of habitats, from inland freshwater lakes to brackish coastal streams to nearly full strength sea water. Greenfield (1985) also notes that, in both subspecies, the freshwater inland forms are more slender-bodied than their coastal counterparts. Gambusia yucatanana is sympatric with members of three other species groups, G. luma, G. nicaraguensis, and G. sexradiata.

The group corresponding to Greenfield and Wildrick's (1984) puncticulata group has members throughout Cuba and

the Isla de la Juventud (Isle of Pines), Grand Cayman Island and Cayman Brac, and Jamaica. Gambusia puncticulata (sensu stricto) is quite common across Cuba, sympatric with both G. punctata and G. rhizophorae, but G. puncticulata prefers more brackish water than G. punctata. Gambusia howelli, the form from the Isla de la Juventud, is not readily distinguishable from the species of the main island based on materials available, and should probably remain in synonymy with G. puncticulata. Gambusia caymenensis is found on Grand Cayman, Little Cayman, and Cayman Brac. Gambusia oligosticta, of Jamaica, is occasionally found with G. wrayi, but in general G. oligosticta occupies brackish water and G. wrayi fresh.

The "hubbsi group" also has members in Cuba, but these are restricted to purely freshwater habitats, narrowly endemic to localities on the extreme east end of the island. Other members are found in the Bahamas and Hispaniola. In Cuba, G. monticola inhabits a swift mountain stream, the Río Yao, Río Cauto system, Province of Oriente; G. baracoana is described from a freshwater pond at the mouth of the Río Miel, near Baracoa, Oriente, and G. bucheri is found in Jicotea Creek, Moa system, also in the Province of Oriente. Each of these is known only from the type locality. Another narrow endemic in this group is G. manni, whose distribution Fink (1971b) limits

to two freshwater lakes on New Providence Island in the Bahamas, Lake Cunningham and Lake Kilkarney. Other Bahamian Gambusia specimens are often referred to as G. manni in many collections, but Fink (1971b) relegated the much more common Bahamian form to G. puncticulata puncticulata, which was originally known as (and herein referred to as) G. hubbsi. Rosen and Bailey (1963), feeling that populations from South Andros Island, from where G. hubbsi was described (Breder, 1934), and populations from other Bahamian islands were indistinguishable, and synonymized G. hubbsi under G. manni. However, if the name G. manni applies only to the fishes of the two lakes of New Providence Island, the name G. hubbsi should be used for the other Bahamian populations.

Gambusia hispaniolae is common in both fresh and brackish water habitats throughout Haiti and the southern Dominican Republic. Fink (1971a) calls it the dominant Gambusia of the island; it has been taken sympatrically with introduced G. holbrooki, but otherwise its widespread distribution does seem to restrict the other Gambusia species of the island, which are narrowly endemic (G. pseudopunctata), rarely caught (G. beebei), or virtually unknown except for the type series (G. dominicensis).

punctata Species Group (Fig. 58):

Gambusia luma ranges through Belize and Guatemala, from Río Hondo in the north to Puerto Barrios and the Belize River in the south; it is primarily coastal but is found inland throughout Lago de Izabal. It is both sympatric and syntopic with G. sexradiata throughout the northern part of the range; G. luma, however, prefers rivers and streams while G. sexradiata is more likely to be found in standing water. When together, G. luma is often in the middle of streams, in open water, while G. sexradiata is near shore, amid vegetation (Greenfield et al., 1983). In southern Belize, G. luma is sympatric with G. nicaraguensis, but G. nicaraguensis is usually in more brackish water than G. luma. In the northern part of its range, a similar relationship exists with G. yucatana, which may be found occasionally in full strength sea water (Greenfield, et al., 1982). Although not commonly found in salty waters, Carter (1981) has shown that G. luma does have the physiological tolerance to adapt to saline conditions.

Gambusia beebei is endemic to Lake Miragoane, Haiti, on the Tiburon peninsula. Apparently a rare fish, it is known in U.S. collections only from the neotype and "neoparatype" series designated by Rivas in 1969. Several recent collections in Haiti have recovered only G. hispaniolae from Lake Miragoane; however, a more thorough

study of that lake is needed to assess the status of this species.

Gambusia pseudopunctata is also endemic to Haiti, again on the Tiburon peninsula. It is known from the type locality, springs at Roseaux, as well as several nearby springs, but it is not widespread. As Fink (1971a) speculated, G. hispaniolae may well have confined both G. beebei and G. pseudopunctata to their limited ranges.

Gambusia punctata is known from many localities across Cuba and the Isla de la Juventud; it is common and abundant, and may be found up to elevations of 2000 ft. (Rivas, 1969). The type locality is from the moats of the Jardín Botánico in the city of Havana. As is true for G. beebei and G. pseudopunctata, G. punctata is not at all salt tolerant; in brackish areas it is replaced by G. puncticulata. It is sympatric but not syntopic with G. rhizophorae along the northwest coast of the island.

Gambusia rhizophorae, unlike the previous species, shows a great deal of salt tolerance. As the trivial name implies, it lives in mangrove swamps, sometimes in full strength sea water. It occurs only in such swamps, along the northwest coast of Cuba, extreme southern Florida and the Florida Keys.

Gambusia xanthosoma, a distinctive yellow species, is confined to Grand Cayman Island, which it shares with a member of the puncticulata species group, G. caymanensis.

The type locality is a brackish-water mosquito control ditch, adjacent to a mangrove swamp.

Geographic Areas

Texas - Northern Mexico (Fig. 59): Members of the nobilis and senilis species groups overlap in this area, although their members occupy different areas of endemism, making direct comparison of their distribution patterns impossible. In each of these groups, however, one species is fairly widespread (G. nobilis in the nobilis species group, although its range is currently restricted and diminishing; G. senilis and G. geiseri in each of the subclades of the senilis species groups), and all others are restricted to endemic habitats, usually springheads. The recurrent pattern, such as it is, finds the widespread species as a sister group to a number of endemic species, or, failing that, as a basal member of its clade. In other words, a widespread species does not appear to be more closely related to a particular endemic species than are the other endemic species of the group. Hubbs and Springer (1957) had suggested that the endemic species of these groups are differentiated relicts of formerly widespread species, isolated due to desert conditions and competition with G. affinis. The cladograms for these groups, superimposed with distributional information, do not contradict their interpretation, as, in each case,

endemics are (often derived) members of a group that includes a widespread member. Such a scheme of peripheral isolation might also account for the lack of resolution in these groups.

Río Pánuco basin, México (Fig. 59): Although physically not very distinctive from similar river basins in eastern México, the Río Pánuco basin is something of a focal point in Gambusia biogeography, as members of three species groups, and G. vittata, overlap there. Two sister species of the panuco species group, G. panuco and G. regani, are endemic there, with G. panuco being fairly widespread in the system and G. regani endemic in a northern tributary. These two taxa are, in turn, related to G. marshi, of the Cuatro Ciénegas basin. A relationship between the Pánuco basin and the Cuatro Ciénegas area is repeated in the senilis species group, where G. atrora (Río Axtla-Río Pánuco) and G. longispinis (Cuatro Ciénegas) are sister species. These two, however, are related to G. geiseri, of central and eastern Texas. The panuco group is related to the rachowi group, which inhabits drainages further south in México (Río Coatzacoalcos, Río Usamacinta). The sister group to that entire assemblage, G. vittata, is again a Pánuco endemic.

A very similar track is exhibited by the poeciliid genus Xiphophorus, which has members in Cuatro Ciénegas and Northern México, much diversification in the Pánuco

basin, and representatives southwards, through the drainages mentioned above to Guatemala. Cladistic relationships within the genus have been proposed (Rosen, 1979) and are in the process of being updated, with the incorporation of newly discovered taxa; when complete, the degree of congruence between Gambusia and Xiphophorus patterns can then be explored.

A most curious member of the Pánuco basin fauna is G. aurata, endemic to the Río Mante, in the northern Tamesí drainage, which is also the home of another endemic poeciliid, Poecilia latipunctata. Gambusia aurata is a member of the affinis species group, whose namesake, G. affinis, is a widespread species that reaches just to the Pánuco basin. However, by virtue of gonopodial evidence, G. aurata seems to be most closely related not to G. affinis but to another member of the species group, G. lemaitrei, from northern Colombia! Clearly the affinities of the Pánuco basin, seemingly related on one hand to Cuatro Ciénegas, northern México and Texas, on another hand to Cuatro Ciénegas and points south in México, and on yet a third hand to South America, are complex. Seemingly unintelligible tracks, however, should not be dismissed simply because they do not agree with our preconceived notions, and simply because there is incongruence does not mean that these tracks are uninformative. To me, these tracks imply that the Pánuco basin is a more complex area

than one might expect at first glance, and, as in the Caribbean, no one group of species will provide the entire story, just as in systematic analysis no one character can be relied upon to resolve all problems of relationship. This area will be an exciting one for future research; in addition to Gambusia, Xiphophorus, and Poecilia, already mentioned, groups of minnows and cichlids also show endemic patterns in the Pánuco basin.

Central America - Antilles (Fig. 61): Perhaps the most interesting generalizations about biogeographic patterns within Gambusia might be drawn from an examination of the tracks of the three species groups that have members in the West Indies and a comparison of those tracks to each other and to other published distributional records. The nicaraguensis species group, although it contains three members, is of limited usefulness as an area cladogram. Gambusia wrayi and G. melapleura are sister species, and since they both inhabit the island of Jamaica, the area cladogram for the nicaraguensis species group is reduced to a two-taxon statement: a relationship between Central America, specifically the area from Belize to Costa Rica, and Jamaica. However, it is intriguing to note that one of the generalized tracks documented by Croizat in the Caribbean portrays the same relationship. His Fig. 110 (p. 782, 1958, I) summarizes the distributions of the bird genera Mimus and Nesomimus,

stretching from Central America, at the Honduras-Nicaragua bulge, to Jamaica. Some of the taxa he includes in this generalized track also have representatives in the Galapagos.

The other two species groups of the subgenus Gambusia, the puncticulata and punctata species groups, offer more detailed information about the interrelationships among the Antillean islands and Central America. Within the puncticulata species group, a sister-group relationship between G. yucatana and all other members of the group implies the same relationship between Nuclear Central America (specifically the Yucatan Peninsula, Guatemala, and Belize; Rosen, 1975) and the major Antillean islands. Within the Antillean clade are two monophyletic subgroups. The "puncticulata forms", which include many of the taxa synonymized by Fink in 1971 (1971b), show a relationship between Cuba, the Isla de la Juventud, the Cayman Islands, and Jamaica. Relationships within this clade were not resolved, and perhaps the synonymy of these under the name G. puncticulata would be appropriate. The second Antillean clade of this species group, the "hubbsi forms", however, shows a different pattern, with a greater degree of resolution. The members of this clade inhabit the Bahamas, eastern Cuba, and Hispaniola. The three Cuba taxa, G. monticola, G. bucheri and G. baracoana, forming a monophyletic group, are each

confined to restricted habitats on the extreme eastern portion of Cuba. Instead of being related, as previously thought (Fink, 1971b), to the widespread Cuban species, G. puncticulata, these taxa are instead part of a group encompassing the Bahamas (G. hubbsi and G. manni) and Hispaniola (G. hispaniolae). Within this group, G. hispaniolae and G. hubbsi are closely related, implying the same relationship between the Bahamas and Hispaniola, with these two related to eastern Cuba.

The puncticulata species group, therefore, lends some evidence to notions of a hybrid Cuba, as the extreme eastern part of the island acts as a separate area of endemism, different from the actions of the species widespread throughout the island and its western adjunct (Isla de la Juventud).

The distribution of G. puncticulata across Cuba is repeated by G. punctata, which is also widespread in Cuba and the Isla de la Juventud. Another repeated pattern is the sister group relationship between a species inhabiting Guatemala and Belize (G. luma) and the the species of the Antilles. Details of the relationships within the Antilles for the punctata species group, however, reveal another facet of the complex story of Caribbean biogeography. Gambusia punctata, G. rhizophorae and G. xanthosoma, a monophyletic clade, depict the relationship between Cuba (with the Isla de la Juventud), the Florida

Keys, and Grand Cayman Island. This relationship is reminiscent of the relationship portrayed by the "puncticulata forms", particularly in terms of the affinities of the Cayman Islands. The next two sister taxa for this group, G. pseudopunctata and G. beebei, indicate a relationship between these areas just mentioned above and southwestern Hispaniola (the Tiburon Peninsula), to which these two strictly endemic species are confined. Such a relationship can be interpreted in two ways. On one hand, this pattern is not incongruent with the pattern described by the puncticulata species group, where a group with Cuba-Cayman Island members is related to a group including a Hispaniolan species. Following this view, one would predict that any member of the punctata group discovered in the future in extreme eastern Cuba or the Bahamas might be likely to be more closely related to the Hispaniolan species than to G. punctata and its close associates. On the other hand, the distributional data for the Hispaniolan Gambusia species also supports the possibility of a hybrid Hispaniola. The two members of the punctata species group are only found on the Tiburon Peninsula, while the puncticulata species group representative seems to be widespread across the island. Biogeographic patterns, therefore, can be proposed as evidence for certain scenarios of historical geology. However, it must be cautioned that, if this is the aim,

then notions of particular historical scenarios should be used to justify or dictate distributional patterns. The organisms speak for themselves; we should first listen and compare before trying to explain.

One place to compare the patterns displayed by Gambusia is, of course, in the compendia of Croizat (1958, 1964). His Fig. 37 (p. 146, 1964) of the distribution of certain liverworts indicates two tracks: one connecting Jamaica with Cuba (as in the puncticulata species group); and a separate track uniting Belize with southeastern Hispaniola (as in the punctata group). And, his Fig. 96 (p. 687, 1958, I) portrays a relationship between Hispaniola and the Bahamas (as in the puncticulata species group) for a lizard genus, Aristelliger, and a passeriform, Loxigilla. This relationship is again reflected in his Fig. 35 (p.141, 1964) for the genus Lycium. Finally, the relationship between Cuba, the Cayman Islands, and the Florida keys is reiterated in his Fig. 86 (p. 633, 1958, I) for species of the bird genus Columba. This selective list of examples is provided merely to testify to the fact that the distribution patterns of Gambusia in the Caribbean are not peculiar simply to Gambusia, but are merely instances in a larger scheme.

Rosen (1985), in an attempt to synthesize current ideas of historical geology in the Caribbean, derived a series of four taxon area cladograms that would be consistent with that history. He predicted that groups of organisms with Antillean endemics should produce area cladograms congruent with his derived from geology. The close relationship of the puncticulata species group members of Hispaniola, eastern Cuba, and southern Bahamas is evident in his scheme, as is the relationship between Cuba and Jamaica. By examining predicted relationships based on progressive slices of geological time, he showed that eighteen different four-taxon statements are consistent with this historically complex area. As other groups are studied, their information will add, as that of Gambusia has done, to a greater understanding of the area.

TABLE 1

Proposed classification of Gambusia.Genus GAMBUSIA Poey, 1854

Gambusia Poey, 1854, p. 382 (type species Gambusia punctata Poey, by subsequent designation by Jordan and Copeland, 1876, p. 142)

Heterophallus Regan, 1914, p. 66 (type species Heterophallus rachovii, by monotypy)

Flexipenis Turner, 1940, p. 89 (nomen nudem for Gambusia vittata Hubbs, which was subsequently designated as the type species of Flexipenis, by C. L. Hubbs, in Rivas, 1963, p. 334)

Dicerophallus Alvarez, 1952, pp. 95-97 (type species Dicerophallus echeagayari, by original designation)

Subgenus Heterophallina Hubbs, 1926, p. 26 (type species G. regani, by original designation)

G. vittata Hubbs, 1926

panuco species group:

G. marshi Minckley and Craddock, in
Minckley, 1962

G. panuco Hubbs, 1926

G. regani Hubbs, 1926

rachowi species group:

G. rachowi (Regan, 1914)

G. echeagarayi (Alvarez, 1952)

Subgenus Arthropallus Hubbs, 1926, p. 38 (type

species Heterandria patreulis Baird and Girard, a subjective synonym of Heterandria affinis Baird and Girard; by original designation)

affinis species group:

G. affinis (Baird and Girard, 1854)

G. holbrooki Girard, 1859b

G. speciosa Girard, 1859c

G. lemaitrei Fowler, 1950

G. aurata Miller and Minckley, 1970

nobilis species group:

G. nobilis (Baird and Girard, 1854)

G. heterochir Hubbs, 1957

G. krumholzi Minckley, 1963

G. georgei Hubbs and Peden, 1969

G. eurystoma Miller, 1975

G. sexradiata Hubbs, 1936

senilis species group:

G. senilis Girard, 1859c

G. gaigei Hubbs, 1929

G. alvarezi Hubbs and Springer, 1957

G. hurtadoi Hubbs and Springer, 1957

G. amistadensis Peden, 1973b

G. geiseri Hubbs and Hubbs, in Hubbs and Springer, 1957

G. longispinis Minckley, 1962

G. atrora Rosen and Bailey, 1963

Subgenus Gambusia

nicaraguensis species group:

G. nicaraguensis Günther, 1866

G. melapleura (Gosse, 1851)

G. wrayi Regan, 1913

puncticulata species group:

G. yucatan Regan, 1914

G. hispaniolae Fink, 1971

G. manni Hubbs, 1927

G. hubbsi Breder, 1934

G. bucheri Rivas, 1944

G. baracoana Rivas, 1944

G. monticola Rivas, 1971

G. puncticulata Poey, 1854

G. oligosticta Regan, 1913

G. caymenensis Regan, 1913

G. howelli Rivas, 1944

punctata species group:

G. luma Rosen and Bailey, 1963

G. beebei Myers, 1935

G. pseudopunctata Rivas, 1969

G. punctata Poey, 1854

G. xanthosoma Greenfield, 1983

G. rhizophorae Rivas, 1969

TABLE 2

Classification of Gambusia, Based on Rivas, 1963.

Genus Flexipenis

F. vittata

Genus Heterophallus

H. rachovii

Genus Dicerophallus

D. echeagayari

Genus Gambusia

Subgenus Orthophallus

G. lemaitrei

Subgenus Arthrophallus

G. affinis

Subgenus Heterophallina

G. panuco

G. regani

G. marshi

Subgenus Gambusia

senilis species group

G. geiseri

G. senilis

G. gaigei

G. hurtadoi

G. alvarezi

G. longispinis

nobilis species group

G. nobilis

G. heterochir

G. sexradiata

nicaraguensis species group

G. melapleura

G. nicaraguensis

G. wrayi

G. gracilior

G. dominicensis

puncticulata species group

G. bucheri G. puncticulata G. howelli
G. baracoana G. manni G. hubbsi
G. oligosticta G. caymanensis G. yucatanana

punctata species group

G. punctata G. beebei

TABLE 3

Classification of Gambusia, Based on Rosen and Bailey,
1963, pp. 92-107.

Genus Gambusia

affinis species group

<u>G. nicaraguensis</u>	<u>G. aestiputius</u>	<u>G. lemaitrei</u>
<u>G. affinis</u>	<u>G. melapleura</u>	<u>G. wrayi</u>
<u>G. gracilior</u>	<u>G. dominicensis</u>	<u>G. myersi</u>
<u>G. yucatanana</u>	<u>G. puncticulata</u>	<u>G. howelli</u>
<u>G. baracoana</u>	<u>G. bucheri</u>	<u>G. manni</u>
<u>G. oligosticta</u>	<u>G. caymanensis</u>	

punctata species group

<u>G. sexradiata</u>	<u>G. luma</u>
<u>G. punctata</u>	<u>G. beebei</u>

nobilis species group

<u>G. atrora</u>	<u>G. longispinis</u>	<u>G. nobilis</u>
<u>G. senilis</u>	<u>G. gaigei</u>	

panuco species group

<u>G. panuco</u>	<u>G. regani</u>	<u>G. marshi</u>
------------------	------------------	------------------

vittata species group

<u>G. vittata</u>

rachowi species group

<u>G. rachowi</u>	<u>G. echeagayari</u>
-------------------	-----------------------

TABLE 4

Classification of Atherinomorphs, from Rosen and Parenti
1981, p. 23.

Series Atherinomorpha

Division I

Family Atherinidae

Family Bedotiidae

Family Isonidae

Family Melanotaeniidae

Family Phallostethidae

Family Telmatherinidae

Division II

Order Cyprinodontiformes

Order Beloniformes

Suborder Adrianichthyoidei

Family Adrianichthyidae

Suborder Exocoetoidei

Superfamily Exocoetoidea

Family Hemiramphidae

Family Exocoetidae

Superfamily Scomberesocidae

Family Belonidae

Family Scomberesocidae

TABLE 5

Classification of Cyprinodontiformes, from Parenti, 1981,
pp. 462-463.

Order Cyprinodontiformes

Suborder Aplocheiloidei

Family Aplocheilidae

Family Rivulidae

Suborder Cyprinodontoidei

Section 1

Family Profundulidae

Section 2

Division 1

Family Fundulidae

Division 2

Sept 1

Family Valenciidae

Sept 2

Superfamily Poecilioidea

Family Anablepidae

Subfamily Anablepinae

Subfamily Oxyzygonectinae

Family Poeciliidae

Subfamily Poeciliinae

Subfamily Fluviphylacinae

Subfamily Aplocheilichthyinae

Superfamily Cyprinodontoidea

Family Goodeidae

Family Cyprinodontidae

TABLE 6

Classification of Poeciliids, from Rosen and Bailey, 1963,
p. 10, with the Addition of Scolichthys from Rosen, 1967.

Family Poeciliidae (=Subfamily Poeciliinae of Parenti)

Subfamily Tomeurinae

Tomeurus

Subfamily Poeciliinae

Tribe Poeciliini

Alfaro

Priapella

Poecilia

Xiphophorus

Tribe Cnesterodontini

Phallotorynus

Phalloptychus

Phalloceros

Cnesterodon

Tribe Gambusiini

Brachyrhaphis

Gambusia

Belonesox

Tribe Girardinini

Girardinus

Quintana

Carlhubbsia

Tribe Heterandriini

Priapichthys

Heterandria

Neoheterandria

Poeciliopsis

Phallichthys

Tribe Scolichthyini

Scolichthys

Subfamily Xenodexinae

Xenodexia

FIGURES

Figure 1. Cranium of Gambusia hispaniolae.

A. Dorsal view.

B. Ventral view.




Figure 1

Figure 2. Oblique dorsolateral posterior view of the cranium of G. hispaniolae.




Figure 2

Figure 3. Lateral view of the ethmoid and orbital regions of G. hispaniolae.




Figure 3

Figure 4. Upper jaw of G. hispaniolae.

A. Dorsal view.

B. Lateral view.




Figure 4

Figure 5. Lower jaw of G. hispaniolae.

A. Lateral view.

B. Medial view.




Figure 5

Figure 6. Opercular apparatus of G. hispaniolae, lateral view.




Figure 6

Figure 7. A. Jaw suspensorium of G. hispaniolae, lateral view.

B. Embryonic view of anterior half of jaw suspensorium, G. hispaniolae.




Figure 7

Figure 8. Lateral view of hyoid arch of G. hispaniolae.




Figure 8

- Figure 9. A. Anterior part of the hyoid arch of G.
hispaniolae, ventral view.
- B. Urohyal of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view.
- C. Urohyal of G. hispaniolae, lateral view.





Figure 9

Figure 10. Dorsal gill arches of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view, right side only.




Figure 10

Figure 11. Ventral gill arches of G. hispaniolae, dorsal view.




Figure 11

Figure 12. Lateral view of the anterior vertebrae of G.
hispaniolae. Only the first pleural and
epilpleural ribs are shown.




Figure 12

Figure 13. Caudal skeleton of G. hispaniolae, lateral view. Only the right halves of the fin rays are shown.




Figure 13

Figure 14. Dorsal fin skeleton of G. hispaniolae, lateral view. Only the proximal ends of the right halves of the fin rays are shown.




Figure 14

Figure 15. Pectoral girdle and fin of G. hispaniolae.

A. Lateral view, fin removed.

B. Pectoral fin, lateral view. Modified extensions on rays 3-5 are stippled darkly.






Figure 15

Figure 16. Pelvic girdle of G. hispaniolae.

A. Ventral view. Only the outer two fin rays on the right side are shown.

B. Lateral view.

A



B



Figure 16

Figure 17. Anal fin skeleton of a female G. hispaniolae.

A. Lateral view of hemal spines and proximal anal radials.

B. Closer lateral view of proximal, medial, and distal anal radials. Right side only shown for proximal radials and fin rays.




Figure 17

Figure 18. Gonopodial suspensorium of G. hispaniolae,
lateral view.




Figure 18

Figure 19. Lateral view of the proximal part of the anal fin of G. hispaniolae, rays 1-7.




Figure 19

Figure 20. Gonopodium of G. hispaniolae.




Figure 20

Figure 21. Cladogram depicting interrelationships in the
tribe Gambusiini.




Figure 21

Figure 22. Lateral view of the gonactinostal complex of:

- A. Heterandria jonesi
- B. Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis
- C. Belonesox belizanus
- D. Gambusia holbrooki




Figure 22

Figure 23. Gonopodia of:

A. Brachyrhaphis cascajalensis

B. Belonesox belizanus




Figure 23

Figure 24. Median teeth of third pharyngobranchial
toothplate:

- A. Gambusia vittata
- B. Gambusia yucatana
- C. Gambusia luma




Figure 24

Figure 25. Dorsal views of the cephalic sensory canal systems of:

A. Gambusia senilis

B. Gambusia pseudopunctata




Figure 25

Figure 26. Epibranchial 1:

A. Gambusia regani

B. Gambusia yucatana




Figure 26

Figure 27. Anterior portion of ventral gill arches, dorsal view::

- A. Gambusia panuco
- B. Gambusia yucatana
- C. Gambusia puncticulata




Figure 27

Figure 28. Ventral hypohyal and anterior ceratohyal,
ventral view:

- A. Gambusia panuco
- B. Gambusia wrayi
- C. Gambusia punctata




Figure 28

Figure 29. Dorsal and caudal fin patterns:

A. Gambusia alvarezi

B. Gambusia pseudopunctata





Figure 29

Figure 30. Cladogram depicting relationships among subgenera.




Figure 30

Figure 31. Sub-orbital bar, shown on Gambusia holbrooki.




Figure 31

Figure 32. Cladogram depicting relationships in the subgenus Heterophallina.




Figure 32

Figure 33. Gonopodia of members of the subgenus

Heterophallina:

- A. Gambusia vittata
- B. Gambusia marshi
- C. Gambusia panuco
- D. Gambusia regani
- E. Gambusia rachowi
- F. Gambusia echeagayari




Figure 33, A-D




Figure 33, E, F

Figure 34. Cleithral process:

A. Gambusia luma

B. Gambusia echeagayari




Figure 34

Figure 35. Cladogram depicting relationships among species groups in the subgenus Arthrophallus.




Figure 35

Figure 36. Cladogram depicting relationships in the affinis species group.




Figure 36

Figure 37. Gonopodial suspensorium of Gambusia georgei.

Compare with Fig. 18.




Figure 37

Figure 38. Gonopodia of members of the affinis species group:

- A. Gambusia affinis
- B. Gambusia holbrooki
- C. Gambusia speciosa
- D. Gambusia aurata

Note: G. lemaitrei also belongs to this group.
See Rivas (1963) for a figure of its gonopodium.




Figure 38

Figure 39. Male pectoral fins. Modified parts of pectoral rays are stippled darkly:

A. Gambusia vittata

B. Gambusia holbrooki

C. Gambusia pseudopunctata

Note: See Fig. 15B for G. hispaniolae.




Figure 39

Figure 40. Cladogram depicting relationships within the nobilis species group.




Figure 40

Figure 41. Gonopodia of members of the nobilis species group:

- A. Gambusia nobilis
- B. Gambusia georgei
- C. Gambusia heterochir
- D. Gambusia krumholzi
- E. Gambusia eurystoma
- F. Gambusia sexradiata




Figure 41, A-D




Figure 41, E, F

Figure 42. Cladogram depicting relationships within the senilis species group.




Figure 42

Figure 43. Gonopodia of members of the senilis species group:

- A. Gambusia senilis
- B. Gambusia gaigei
- C. Gambusia alvarezi
- D. Gambusia hurtadoi
- E. Gambusia amistadensis
- F. Gambusia geiseri
- G. Gambusia longispinis
- H. Gambusia atrora




Figure 43, A-D




Figure 43, E-H

Figure 44. Caudal fin skeletons of:

A. Gambusia luma

B. Gambusia hispaniolae

C. Gambusia atrora

D. embryonic caudal skeleton of G.
hispaniolae




Figure 44

Figure 45. Cladogram depicting relationships among species groups in the sungenus Gambusia.




Figure 45

Figure 46. Cladogram depicting relationships within the nicaraguensis species group.




Figure 46

Figure 47. Gonopodia of members of the nicaraguensis species group:

A. Gambusia nicarguensis

B. Gambusia wrayi

Note: Gambusia melapleura also belongs to this group. See Fink (1971a) for a figure of its gonopodium.




Figure 47

Figure 48. Cladogram depicting relationships within the puncticulata species group. Open circles indicate electrophoretic characters of Greenfield and Wildrick (1984).




Figure 48

Figure 49. Gonopodia of members of the puncticulata species group:

- A. Gambusia yucatana
- B. Gambusia hubbsi
- C. Gambusia baracoana
- D. Gambusia bucheri
- E. Gambusia puncticulata
- F. Gambusia oligosticta
- G. Gambusia caymenensis

Note: G. manni, G. monticola, and G. howelli also belong to this group, but are not figured. See Fink (1971b) for some of these figures. The gonopodium of G. hispaniolae is pictured in Fig. 20.




Figure 49, A-D




Figure 49, E-G

Figure 50. Cladogram depicting relationships within the punctata species group.

Figure 50




Figure 51. Gonopodia of members of the punctata species group:

- A. Gambusia luma
- B. Gambusia pseudopunctata
- C. Gambusia punctata
- D. Gambusia rhizophorae
- E. Gambusia xanthosoma

Note: G. beebei also belongs to this group.

See Rivas (1969) for a figure of its gonopodium.




Figure 51, A-C




Figure 51, D,E

Figure 52. Distribution of members of the subgenus
Heterophallina.




Figure 52

Figure 53. Distribution of members of the affinis species group.

Figure 53




Figure 54. Distribution of members of the nobilis species group.




Figure 54

Figure 55. Distribution of members of the senilis species group.




Figure 55

Figure 56. Distribution of members of the nicaraguensis species group.




Figure 56

Figure 57. Distribution of members of the puncticulata
species group.

Figure 57




Figure 58. Distribution of members of the punctata species group.

Figure 58




Figure 59. Area cladograms for groups found in Texas and northern México:

A. nobilis species group

B. senilis species group

Legend: W = widespread

E = endemic





Figure 59

Figure 60. Area cladograms for groups found in the Río Pánuco basin:

- A. subgenus Heterophallina
- B. affinis species group
- C. senilis species group

Legend: P = Pánuco basin

C = Cuatro Ciénegas basin

SM = Southern México

NM = Northern México

SA = South America






Figure 60

Figure 61. Area cladograms for groups found in Central America and the Caribbean:

- A. nicaraguensis species group
- B. puncticulata species group
- C. punctata species group

Legend: NCA = Nuclear Central America

J = Jamaica

H = Hispaniola

B = Bahamas

EC = Eastern Cuba

CI = Cayman Islands

C = Cuba

F = Florida




Figure 61

APPENDIX

Beware! Reading this character list is not a substitute for reading the body of the paper. Characters are merely summarized and abbreviated here; the discussion of the full nature of each character and its level of generality is found in the text. Most characters listed are scored absent = 0; present = 1. Scoring for multistate characters is given in the following list.

1. Gonactinost 5 stands freely.
2. Gonactinosts 2, 3, and 4 fuse into a column.
3. Axillary blotch.
4. Female anal pigment.
5. Hook on ray 5a.
6. Ray 4a with coalesced segments, bent anteriorly.
7. Male pectoral fin modification.
8. Thickened ray 2, proximally.
9. Bump in ray 5 proximally.
10. No uncinete process on gonapophysis 1.
11. Elbow in ray 4a.
12. Hooks on rays 4p and 5a pointing upwards.
13. IPB3 teeth with medial serrate pad.
14. Disconnected infraorbital sensory canals
15. Elbow shape: falcate = 0; triangular = 1; spatulate = 2.

16. No uncinata process EB1.
17. Lateral prong on HB1.
18. Wings on BB3.
19. Shape of VHH: flat = 0; with central process = 1;
triangular with central process =2.
20. Hypurals: unfused = 0; fused, with keyhole = 1; fused
completely = 2.
21. Spotted fin patterns.
22. Sub-orbital bar.
23. Ray 4p hook: round = 0; acuminate = 1; multisegmented
acuminate = 2.
24. Anal spots: none = 0; median = 1; paired crescents = 2.
25. Retrorse spines on ray 3.
26. High number (more than 5) of segments distal to elbow
on ray 4a.
27. High number (up to 9 or more) of segments distal to
serrae on ray 4p.
28. High number (16 or more) of spines on ray 3.
29. Ray 3 spines fan-like, not pointed.
30. Terminal segment of ray 5a with long base.
31. High number (8 or more) of serrae on ray 4p.
32. Serrae on ray 4p: pointing proximally=0;
perpendicular=1; reaching distally and recurved=2.
33. No forward-directed spines on ray 3.
34. Buckling in ray 4a, with displaced elbow.
35. Lateral palp on gonopodium.

36. Body with ventral keel.
37. Elongate cleithral process.
38. Notch proximal to elbow.
39. Long ray 3 spines, with long inner processes.
40. Multisegmented elbow (seven segments).
41. Small bifid ray 3 spines.
42. Lateral projection on elbow.
43. Serrae on ray 4p: proximal to elbow=0; opposite elbow=1; distal to elbow=2.
44. Ray 3 foreshortened.
45. Ray 4a foreshortened.
46. Eight or fewer ray 3 spines.
47. Gonopodial outline: median pointed=0; rounded =1; lobe-like=2 within subgenus Gambusia; pointed at anterolateral edge=2 within subgenus Arthrophallus.
48. Transversely enlarged segment(s) distal to serrae on ray 4p=1; same segments greatly enlarged, filling gaps between rays 4p and 5a=2.
49. Electrophoretic characters, red and yellow caudal and dorsal fins (Greenfield et al., 1982).
50. High meristic characters (Fink, 1971b).
51. Ray 5a hook large, scythe-like.
52. Ray 4p hook large, scythe-like.
53. Body with 4-6 rows of large spots.
54. One pair metacentric and two pairs submetacentric chromosomes in both sexes.

55. Ray 4a S-shaped, curving back over ray 3 spines.
56. Pectoral ray 5 with distal scallop.
57. Pectoral ray 2 with enlarged blade proximally.
58. Pectoral rays with both dorsal and ventral blades.
59. One pair of large metacentric chromosomes in females only.
60. Shape of medial part of HBl: square, no cleft=0; with shallow cleft, not split=1; deep cleft, not split=2; forked, widely split=3. Unordered.
61. Number of gonapophyses: three=0; sometimes or always two=1.
62. Exaggerated distal point of gonopodium.
63. Serrated segments on ray 4a distal to elbow.

The following matrices were used as PAUP input, using the following options: MISSING=9, SW=GL, MULPARS, MAXTREE=100, ROOT=OUTGROUP, OPT=FARRIS.

1. For Fig. 21. Outgroup relations.

CHARACTER NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0
BRACHYRH	1	0	1	1	0	0
BELONESO	1	1	1	0	1	1
GAMBUSIA	1	1	1	1	1	1

One tree was found.

Length = 7.000

Consistency = 0.857

2. For Fig. 30. Subgeneric Relationships.

CHAR. NO.	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
HETEROPH	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ARTHROPH	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2
GAMBUSIA	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

One tree was found.

Length = 20.000

Consistency Index = 0.950

3. For Fig. 32. Relationships within the subgenus

Heterophallina.

CHAR.NO.	12	13	20	21	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VITTATA	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARSHI	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

PANUCO	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
REGANI	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
RACHOWI	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
ECHEAGAY	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1

One tree was found.

Length = 20.000.

Consistency Index = 0.850

4. For Figs. 35, 36, 40, and 42. Relationships within
the subgenus Arthropallus.

CHAR.NO.	14	16	17	18	20	21	22	23	24	30	31	32	38	39	40	41	42
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AFFINIS	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
HOLBROOK	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
SPECIOSA	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	1
AURATA	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
LEMAITRE	1	0	9	0	9	1	9	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
NOBILIS	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
GEORGEI	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
KRUMHOLZ	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
HETEROCH	1	9	0	1	9	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
EURYSTOM	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0
SEXRADIA	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	9	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0

SENILIS	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
GAIGEI	1	1	0	0	9	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
GEISERI	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
ALVAREZI	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
HURTADOI	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
LONGISPI	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
AMISTADE	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
ATORA	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0

CHAR.NO. 43 44 45 46 47 48 57 60 61 62

OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
AFFINIS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1							
HOLBROOK	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1							
SPECIOSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0							
AURATA	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0							
LEMAITRE	2	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	9	0							
NOBILIS	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0							
GEORGEI	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0							
KRUMHOLZ	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0							
HETEROCH	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	9	0							
EURYSTOM	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0							
SEXRADIA	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0							
SENILIS	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0							
GAIGEI	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	3	1	0							
GEISERI	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	1	0							

ALVAREZI	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0
HURTADOI	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0
LONGISPI	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0
AMISTADE	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	0
ATRORA	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0

15 trees were found.

Length = 71.000

Consistency Index = 0.507

Figs. 35, 36, 40, and 42 represent parts of a strict consensus tree of the 15 trees found.

5. For Figs. 45, 46, 48, and 50. Relationships within the subgenus Gambusia.

CHAR. NO.	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	30	32	39	42	47	48
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NICARAGU	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
WRAYI	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
MELAPLEU	1	9	1	1	2	9	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
YUCATANA	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
HISPANIO	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
MANNI	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1
HUBBSI	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
MONTICOL	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1

BUCHERI	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
BARACOAN	1	9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1
PUNCTICU	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
OLIGOSTI	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
CAYMENEN	1	9	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
HOWELLI	1	9	1	1	9	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
LUMA	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0
BEEBEI	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	9
PSEUDOPU	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	1
PUNCTATA	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2
RHIZOPHO	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2
XANTHOSO	2	9	1	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2

CHAR. NO.	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	59	60	61	63
OUTGROUP	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NICARAGU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WRAYI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
MELAPLEU	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1
YUCATANA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
HISPANIO	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
MANNI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0
HUBBSI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
MONTICOL	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0
BUCHERI	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0
BARACOAN	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0
PUNCTICU	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0

OLIGOSTI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0
CAYMANEN	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0
HOWELLI	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	0
LUMA	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
BEEBEI	0	0	1	1	0	9	0	0	9	0	0
PSEUDOPU	0	0	1	1	1	9	0	0	3	0	0
PUNCTATA	0	0	1	1	1	9	0	0	2	0	0
RHIZIPHO	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	2	0	0
XANTHOSO	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	9	0	0

For overall relationships within the subgenus and relationships within the nicaraguensis and punctata species groups, G. oligosticta, G. caymenensis and G. howelli were dropped. This produced 80 trees.

Length = 62.000

Consistency Index = 0.613

Figs. 45, 46, and 50 are parts of a strict consensus tree of the 80 equally parsimonious trees found.

For relationships within the puncticulata species group, the deleted taxa were restored and members of other species groups were deleted. This produced 45 trees.

Length = 32.000

Consistency Index = 0.812

Fig. 48 is a strict consensus tree of the 45 equally parsimonious trees found.

LITERATURE CITED

Alvarez, J.

1952. Dicerophallini, nueva tribu de Poeciliidae de Chiapas. *Ciencia*, 12(3-4):95--97.

Baird, S. F., and C. Girard

1854. Descriptions of new species of fishes collected by Mr. John H. Clark, on the U.S. and Mexican Boundary Survey, under Lt. Col. Jas. D. Graham. *Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia*, 6(1852-1853):387--390.

Breder, C. M., Jr.

1934. A new Gambusia from Andros Island, Bahamas. *Am. Mus. Novitates*, 719:3 pp.

Campos, H. H., and C. Hubbs

1971. Cytomorphology of six species of gambusiine fishes. *Copeia*, 1971(3):566--569.

Carter, H. J.

1981. Aspects of the physiological ecology of species of Gambusia from Belize, Central America. *Copeia*, 1981:694--700.

Chen, T. R., and A. W. Ebeling

1968. Karyological evidence of female heterogamety in the mosquitofish, Gambusia affinis. *Copeia*, 1968(1):70--75.

Croizat, L.

1958. Panbiogeography. Caracas: publ. by the author.

1964. Space, time, form: the biological synthesis.
Caracas: publ. by the author.

Darnell, R. M.

1962. Fishes of the Río Tamesí and related coastal lagoons in East-Central México. Publ. Inst. of Marine Sci., 8:300--365.

de Beer, G. R.

1937. The development of the vertebrate skull.
Oxford: Univ. Press.

Dingerkus, G., and L. D. Uhler

1977. Enzyme clearing of alcian blue stained whole small vertebrates for demonstration of cartilage. Stain Technology, 52(4):229--232.

Evermann, B. W. and W. C. Kendall

1894. The fishes of Texas and the Rio Grande, considered chiefly with reference to their geographical distribution. Bull. U. S. Fish. Comm., 12(for 1892):57--126.

Fink, W. L.

1971a. A revision of the Gambusia puncticulata complex (Pisces: Poeciliidae). Publ. Gulf Coast Res. Lab. Mus., 2:11--46.

- 1971b. A revision of the Gambusia nicaraguensis species group (Pisces: Poeciliidae). Publ. Gulf Coast Res. Lab. Mus., 2:47--77.
- Fowler, H. W.
1950. Colombian zoological survey. Part VI. - Fishes obtained at Totumo, Colombia, with descriptions of two new species. Notulae Nat., 222:8 pp.
- Geiser, S. W.
1923. Notes relative to the species of Gambusia in the United States. Am. Midland Naturalist, 8(8-9):175--188.
- Girard, C.
- 1859a. Ichthyology of the boundary. In: United States and Mexican boundary survey, under the order of Lieut. Col. W. H. Emory, Major First Cavalry, and U. S. Commissioner. Washington, 2(2):85 pp.
- 1859b. Ichthyological notices. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 11:56--68.
- 1859c. Ichthyological notices. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 11:113--122.
- Gosline, W. A.
1963. Considerations regarding the relationships of the percopsiform, cyprinodontiform, and gadiform fishes. Occas. Pap. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan, 629:38 pp.

Gosse, P. H.

1851. A naturalist's sojourn in Jamaica. London:
Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans.

Greenfield, D. W.

1983. Gambusia xanthosoma, a new species of poeciliid fish from Grand Cayman Island, BWI. *Copeia*, 1983(2):457--464.

1985. Review of the Gambusia yucatana complex (Pisces: Poeciliidae) of Mexico and Central America. *Copeia*, 1985(2):368--378.

Greenfield, D. W., T. A. Greenfield, and D. M. Wildrick

1982. The taxonomy and distribution of species of Gambusia (Pisces: Poeciliidae) in Belize, Central America. *Copeia*, 1982(1):128--147.

Greenfield, D. W., C. F. Rakocinski, and T. A. Greenfield

1983. Spatial and trophic interactions in wet and dry seasons between Gambusia luma and Gambusia sexradiata (Pisces: Poeciliidae) in Belize, Central America. *Fieldiana Zool.*, 14:16 pp.

Greenfield, D. W., and D. M. Wildrick

1984. Taxonomic distinction of the Antilles Gambusia puncticulata complex (Pisces: Poeciliidae) from the G. yucatana complex of Mexico and Central America. *Copeia*, 1984(4):921--933.

Gregory, W. K.

1933. Fish skulls: a study of the evolution of natural mechanisms. Philadelphia: Amer. Philos. Soc.

Günther, A.

1866. A catalogue of the fishes in the British Museum. London, 6:368 pp.

Hennig, W.

1966. Phylogenetic Systematics. (translated) Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press.

Hildebrand, S. F.

1938. A new catalogue of the fresh-water fishes of Panama. Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zool. Ser., 22(4):217--359.

Hollister, G.

1940. Caudal skeleton of Bermuda shallow water fishes. IV. Order Cyprinodontes: Cyprinodontidae, Poeciliidae. Zoologica, 25(1):97--112.

Hubbs, C.

1957. Gambusia heterochir, a new poeciliid fish from Texas, with an account of its hybridization with G. affinis. Tulane Stud. Zool., 5(1):3--16.

Hubbs, C. and H. J. Brodrick

1963. Current abundance of Gambusia gaigei, an endangered fish species. Southwestern Naturalist, 8(1):46--48.

Hubbs, C., R. A. Kuehne, and J. C. Ball

1953. The fishes of the upper Guadelupe River, Texas. Texas J. Sci., 5:216--244.

Hubbs, C., and A. E. Peden

1969. Gambusia georgei sp. nov. from San Marcos, Texas. Copeia, 1969(2):357--364.

Hubbs, C., and R. A. Reynolds

1957. Copulatory function of the modified pectoral fin of gambusiin fishes. Amer. Nat., 91(860):333--335.

Hubbs, C., and V. G. Springer

1957. A revision of the Gambusia nobilis species group, with descriptions of three new species, and notes on their variation, ecology, and evolution. Texas J. Sci., 9(3):279--327.

Hubbs, C. L.

1926. Studies of the fishes of the order Cyprinodontes. VI. Misc. Publ. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan, 16:86 pp.
1927. Studies of the fishes of the order Cyprinodontes. VII. G. manni, a new species from the Bahamas. Copeia, 164:61--65.

1929. Studies of the fishes of the order
Cyprinodontes. VIII. Gambusia gaigei, a new
species from the Río Grande. Occas. Pap. Mus.
Zool. Univ. Michigan, 198:11 pp.
1936. Fishes of the Yucatan Peninsula. Publ. Carnegie
Inst. Washington, 457:157--287.
1955. Hybridization between fish species in nature.
Syst. Zool., 4(1):1--20.
- Humphries, C. J., and L. R. Parenti
1986. Cladistic biogeography. Oxford, Claredon Press.
- Jordan, D. S. and H. E. Copeland
1876. Checklist of the fishes of the freshwaters of
North America. Bull. Buffalo Soc. Nat. Sci.,
3:133--164.
- Jordan, D. S. and B. W. Evermann
- 1896-1900. The fishes of North and Middle America: a
descriptive catalogue of the species of
fish-like vertebrates found in the waters of
North America, north of the Isthmus of Panama.
Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1-4:1--3313.
- Jordan, D. S. and C. H. Gilbert
1886. List of the fishes collected in Arkansas, Indian
Territory, and Texas, in September, 1884, with
notes and descriptions. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus.,
9:1--25.

Krumholz, L. A.

1948. Reproduction in the western mosquitofish, Gambusia affinis affinis (Baird and Girard), and its use in mosquito control. Ecol. Mon., 18:43pp.

Miller, R. R.

1975. Five new species of Mexican poeciliid fishes of the genera Poecilia, Gambusia, and Poeciliopsis. Occas. Pap. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan, 672:44 pp.
1986. Composition and derivation of the freshwater fish fauna of Mexico. Anales Esc. de Ciencias biol., México, 30(1-4):121--153.

Miller, R. R., and W. L. Minckley

1970. Gambusia aurata, a new species of poeciliid fish from northeastern Mexico. Southwestern Naturalist, 15(2):249--259.

Minckley, W. L.

1962. Two new species of fishes of the genus Gambusia (Poeciliidae) from northeastern Mexico. Copeia, 1962(2):391--396.
1963. A new poeciliid fish (genus Gambusia) from the Rio Grande drainage of Coahuila, Mexico. Southwestern Naturalist, 8(3):154--161.

Myers, G. S.

1935. An annotated list of the cyprinodont fishes of Hispaniola, with descriptions of two new species. *Zoologica*, 10(3):301--316.
1937. Fresh-water fishes and West Indian zoogeography. *Ann. Rep. Smithsonian Inst.*, 1937:339--364.

Nelson, G.

1969. Gill arches and the phylogeny of fishes, with notes on the classification of vertebrates. *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, 141(4):475--552.
1973. Relationships of clupeomorphs, with remarks on the structure of the lower jaw in fishes. In P. H. Greenwood et al. (eds.), *Interrelationships of Fishes*, pp. 333--349. London: Academic Press.

Nelson, G., and N. Platnick

1981. *Systematics and biogeography*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

Parenti, L. R.

1981. A phylogenetic and biogeographic analysis of cyprinodontiform fishes (Teleostei, Atherinomorpha). *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist.*, 168(4):335--557.

1984. A taxonomic revision of the Andean killifish genus Orestias (Cyprinodontiformes, Cyprinodontidae). Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 178(2):107--214.

Patterson, C.

1982. Morphological characters and homology. In: K. A. Joysey and A. E. Friday (eds.), Problems of phylogenetic reconstruction, Systematic Assoc. Special Vol. 21, pp. 21--74. London: Academic Press.

Peden, A. E.

- 1972a. Differences in the external genitalia of female gambusiin fishes. Southwestern Naturalist, 17(3):265--272.
- 1972b. The function of gonopodial parts and behavioral pattern during copulation by Gambusia. Can. J. Zool., 50(7):955--968.
- 1973a. Variation in anal spot expression of gambusiin females and its effect on male courtship. Copeia, 1973(2):250--263.
- 1973b. Virtual extinction of Gambusia amistadensis n. sp., a poeciliid fish from Texas. Copeia, 1973(2):210--221.

Poey, F.

1854. Los guajacones, pecesillos de agua dulce. In F. Poey, Memorias sobre la historia natural de la Isla de Cuba. Havana, 1:374--392.

Ramaswami, L. S.

1945. The chondrocranium of Gambusia (Cyprinodontes) with an account of the osteocranium of the adult. Half-yearly J. Mysore Univ., Sect. B, 6(1):273--299.

Regan, C. T.

1913. A revision of the cyprinodont fishes of the subfamily Poeciliinae. Proc. Zool. Soc. London, 11:977--1018.
1914. Descriptions of two new cyprinodont fishes from Mexico, presented to the British Museum by Herr A. Rachow. Annu. Mag. Nat. Hist., 8(14):65--67.

Rivas, L. R.

1944. Contributions to the study of the poeciliid fishes of Cuba. I. Descriptions of six new species of the subfamily Gambusiinae. Proc. New England Zool. Club, 23:41--53.
1969. A revision of the poeciliid fishes of the Gambusia punctata species group, with descriptions of two new species. Copeia, 1969(4):778--795.

1971. A new subspecies of poeciliid fishes of the genus Gambusia from eastern Cuba. Publ. Gulf Coast Res. Lab. Mus., 2:5--9.
- Rosen, D. E.
1964. The relationships and taxonomic position of the halfbeaks, killifishes, silversides, and their relatives. Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 127(5):217--268.
1967. New poeciliid fishes from Guatemala, with comments on the origins of some South and Central American forms. Am. Mus. Novitates, 2303:15 pp.
1975. A vicariance model of Caribbean biogeography. Syst. Zool., 24(4):431--464.
1979. Fishes from the uplands and intermontane basins of Guatemala: revisionary studies and comparative geography. Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 162(5):267--376.
1985. Geological hierarchies and biogeographic congruence in the Caribbean. Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard., 72:636--659.
- Rosen, D. E., and R. M. Bailey
1959. Middle-American poeciliid fishes of the genera Carlhubbsia and Phallichthys, with descriptions of two new species. Zoologica, 44(1):1--44.

1963. The poeciliid fishes (Cyprinodontiformes), their structure, zoogeography, and systematics. Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 126(1):1--76
- Rosen, D. E., and M. Gordon
1951. A new fish of the genus Gambusia from southern Veracruz, Mexico, with a discussion of the tribe Gambusiini Hubbs. Zoologica, 36(4):267--272.
1953. Functional anatomy and evolution of male genitalia in poeciliid fishes. Zoologica, 38(1):1--47.
- Rosen, D. E., and K. D. Kallman
1959. Development and evolution of skeletal deletions in a family of viviparous fishes (Cyprinodontiformes, Poeciliidae). Quart. J. Florida Acad. Sci., 22(4):169--190.
- Rosen, D. E., and J. R. Mendelson
1960. The sensory canals of the head in poeciliid fishes (Cyprinodontiformes), with reference to dentitional types. Copeia, 1960(3):203--210.
- Rosen, D. E., and L. R. Parenti
1981. Relationships of Oryzias, and the groups of atherinomorph fishes. Am. Mus. Novitates, 2719:25 pp.

Rosen, D. E., and A. Tucker

1961. Evolution of secondary sexual characters and sexual behavior patterns in a family of viviparous fishes (Cyprinodontiformes, Poeciliidae). *Copeia*, 1961(2):201--212.

Smith, M. L., and R. R. Miller

1986. The evolution of the Rio Grande Basin as inferred from its fish fauna. In: C. H. Hocutt and E. O. Wiley (eds.), *The zoogeography of North American freshwater fishes*, pp. 487--517. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Turner, C. L.

1940. Superfetation in viviparous cyprinodont fishes. *Copeia*, 1940(2):88-91.
1941. Morphogenesis of the gonopodium in Gambusia affinis affinis. *J. Morph.*, 69(1):161--186.
- 1942a. A quantitative study of the effects of different concentrations of ethynyl testosterone and methyl testosterone in the production of gonopodia in females of Gambusia affinis. *Physiol. Zool.*, 15(3):263--279.
- 1942b. Morphogenesis of the gonopodial suspensorium in Gambusia affinis and the induction of the male suspensorial characters in the female by androgenic hormones. *J. Exp. Zool.*, 91(2):167--193.

1942c. Sexual dimorphism in the pectoral fin of Gambusia and the induction of the male character in the female by androgenic hormones. Biol. Bull., 83(3):389--400.

Weisel, G. F.

1967. Early ossification in the skeleton of the sucker (Catostomus macrocheilus) and the guppy (Poecilia reticulata). J. Morph., 121(1):1--18.

Weitzman, S. H.

1962. The osteology of Brycon meeki, a generalized characid fish, with an osteological definition of the family. Stanford Ichthyol. Bull., 8(1):77 pp.

Wildrick, D. M., I-S Kim, and D. w. Greenfield

1985. A unique gambusiine karyotype and its relevance to the systematics of the Gambusia punctata species group. Copeia, 1985(4):1053--1056.