he writes as though I had proposed to abolish altogether names for species. He illustrates by an eleven-place numeral in three divisions, whereas the numerical part of such specific designations as I propose would be in one, two or three places. The effort to discredit is too obvious. He says that every man, woman and child has a name. True. Every calf and every pig had a name on my father's small farm in years gone by; but when calves become too numerous, as on a ranch, practical purposes are served better by a numbered tag on bossy's ear. He says that numerals are mixable, and this also is true. The wooden keys a foot long to the front doors of our forefathers were doubtless harder to lose than the little steel ones we now use, and when marked with the name of the man who made them they carried doubtless, for the initiated, a considerable measure of romance. Nevertheless, today we are carrying the little mixable keys stamped out by machinery, and would hardly think of returning to the use of wooden ones. My friend's arguments are entirely admissible. The trouble with them is that they prove too much. The answer to them is that the use of numerals is at the beginning of accuracy in all such fields of activity.

I proposed that all names be carefully preserved each with its author's name and all its romantic history. I proposed that they should have official cognizance and be printed in a book. I did not propose that this book be taken out into the back lot and burned (as one might think from my friend's astonishment), but that it be made accessible to every one, so that the lover of its romance might lave in it to his soul's content. I merely proposed that in addition to such names, we have also a standard list of briefer designations that practical biologists and others might use when doing business.

I will not ask, "What can be the state of a man's mind," who is quite satisfied with existing nomenclatural abominations, for it might seem to imply disrespect for one whom I hold in high esteem, the least of whose services to science have consisted in the naming of new species, and who is the very man I was hoping would have something to say on the main question I have raised,[2] "Whether there is not a better way of disposing of our nomenclatural trouble than by making it as burdensome as possible and then making it permanent?"

James G. Needham

A COMMON SUMACH GALL PRODUCED BY A MITE

In Dr. Needham's excellent "General Biology," on page 37, is a figure of a gall on sumach, which looks just like one very common here at Boulder. As we are using the work as a text-book in the University of Colorado, it became necessary to ascertain whether our gall was really the one figured. Dr. Needham's figure is stated to represent a fungus-gall, but ours is due to a mite. It seems worth while to publish a note on the subject, as confusion is likely to occur if there are really two quite different galls on sumach, looking so much alike. There is a "witches' broom" fungus (*Exoascus purpurascens* Ell. & Ev.) recorded from *Rhus copallina*. The gall masses, as we find them here on *Rhus glabra cismontana* (or *Rhus cismontana* Greene), consist of modified branches with small curled leaflets. The masses are about six inches long and four wide when well developed, and turn red with the normal leaves in the fall. The leaflets are reduced to small warty curled up objects about 12 mm. long. The mite, which may be termed *Eriophyes rhoinus* n. sp., is about 140 μ long and 40 broad, with about 70 cross-striæ, which encircle the body. The posterior dorsal ridges, between the striæ, are distinctly enlarged. The surface, as usual, is minutely punctulate. The usual four pairs of sublateral bristles are present, the first near the tenth ring, the second near or a little beyond the twentieth, the third about 25 μ beyond the second, and the fourth about 32 μ beyond the third. The caudal bristles are moderate, about 60 μ long.

It is very likely the same species which has been recorded by Mr. T. D. Jarvis[1] as affect-

[2] Science for September 2, p. 296.

[1] Rept. Entom. Soc. Ontario for 1908, pl. K, fig. 3.

ing *Rhus* in Canada. His illustration looks exactly like our gall, except that it is larger, but the figure has probably been enlarged. At the bottom of the plate it is stated to be on *Rhus cotinus,* but on page 90 it is assigned to *R. typhina,* which is much more likely.

Eriophyes rhois Stebbins, from Massachusetts, forms a quite different gall on *Toxicodendron toxicodendron* (*Rhus toxicodendron* Linn.).

T. D. A. COCKERELL
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

SEX-LIMITED INHERITANCE

TO THE EDITOR OF SCIENCE: In view of the recent interest in the question of the relation of sex to the barring factor in poultry, an hypothesis for which was presented by Spillman[1] in 1908, and the demonstration of which has been brought forward by Goodale[2] and by Pearl and Surface[3] and others, the following reference to a breeding experiment carried out by Samuel Cushman at the Rhode Island Agricultural Experiment Station in 1892 may be pertinent at this time.

Cushman made a large number of crosses between pure-bred fowls with the purpose of perfecting a good market roaster and capon. Among his crosses were the following:

Indian Game × Light Brahma.
Indian Game × Houdan.
Indian Game × Golden Wyandotte.
Indian Game × Buff Cochin.
White Wyandotte × Light Brahma.
White Wyandotte × Indian Game.
Houdan × Partridge Cochin.
Silver Gray Dorking × Dark Brahma.
Silver Dorking Game × Dorking.
Plymouth Rock × Buff Cochin.
Indian Game × Plymouth Rock.

In Cushman's published results[4] he gives a brief description of the progeny resulting from these crosses and, regarding the Indian Game × Plymouth Rock cross, states that the *cockerels* were between Indian Game and Plymouth Rock in shape; that the combs resembled those of the Indian Games, and that the plumage was like that of the Plymouth Rocks. He states further that the *pullets* were all black and more like the Indian Game in shape. This is the clear statement of the observed facts of a case of sex-limited inheritance.

PHILIP B. HADLEY
R. I. AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION,
KINGSTON, R. I.,
October 18, 1910

[1] *Am. Nat.,* 1908, XLII., 50.
[2] SCIENCE, N. S., 1909, XXIX., 756. *Proc. Soc. Exper. Biol. and Med.,* 1910, 7, 5.
[3] Maine Agric. Expt. Station Bulletin 177, 1910.
[4] *Ohio Poultry Journal,* 1893, II., 7, 185–191.

CORRESPONDENCE IN REGARD TO THE LENGTH OF SERVICE PENSIONS OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION

GARRISON-ON-HUDSON, N. Y.,
November 8, 1910

PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, LL.D.,
Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Sir: In the fourth annual report of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the action of the trustees in connection with the withdrawal of the retiring allowances for length of service is reported by you as follows:

The rules as thus amended provide a retiring allowance for a teacher on two distinct grounds: (1) to a teacher of specified service on reaching the age of sixty-five; (2) to a teacher after twenty-five years of service in case of physical disability.

Although these are the general rules governing retirement, the trustees are nevertheless willing to grant a retiring allowance after the years of service set forth in Rule 1 [Rule 2?] to the rare professor whose proved ability for research promises a fruitful contribution to the advancement of knowledge if he were able to devote his entire time to study or research; and the trustees may also grant a retiring allowance after the years of service set forth in Rule 1 [sic] to the executive head of an institution who has displayed distinguished ability as a teacher and educational administrator.

President Jordan has printed in the *N. Y. Evening Post* the resolutions adopted by the trustees as follows:

It was also on motion, duly made and seconded,