THE TERMINOLOGY OF HOMOTYPES OF INSECTS

To museums generally, and to those who have not the advantages of a large state museum, in particular, the value of having representative collections of insects (in fact of all groups) comprising specimens known to agree in every detail with the types of the species they represent (homotypes) is a *desideratum* which can not be too strongly emphasized; and the present note has been written in the hope that it will enlist the cooperation of specialists in making such collections a possibility. My object has not been to provide a contribution to the terminology of "types," but mainly to recapitulate the terms which may be applied to typical specimens of a species. The phrases "agrees with type," or "compared with type" are not very satisfactory, as such specimens differ in value according to their locality, and if they are compared by the original describer of the species or not, in addition to which a uniform system of labelling is essential in a large collection. I, therefore, propose the adoption of the following terms by entomologists, which, with a few additions, are essentially the same as those used by Schuchert and Buckman[1] and recognized by Banks and Caudell.[2]

Topotype: t.t.: A specimen from the same locality as the original type of the species, with which it has been compared by a specialist other than the original describer, and found to agree in every particular.

Metatype: m.t.: A topotype, but compared by the original describer of the species.

Homeotype: h.t.: A specimen compared with the type by a specialist, and found to agree exactly, but not from the type locality.

Idiotype: i.t.: A homeotype, but compared by the original describer of the species.

Neotype: n.t.: A specimen from the same geographical region, preferably from the type-locality, chosen by a specialist or by the original describer, to replace a holotype which is destroyed or lost, or useless for comparison.

The selection of neotypes would to some extent be eradicated if typical specimens were properly labelled, as would be the necessity for regarding some species in the future as "unrecognizable;" and a proper appreciation of the fragility of insect types should in itself be an incentive to the adoption of the above terms. I would also propose that specimens which have been identified only from a description or figure should bear a label indicative of this fact. The letters "i.d." (="identified from description") written on a corner of the determination label would serve the purpose. To facilitate recognition in the cabinet typical specimens should bear a distinctive label as shown in the circlets after the terms, and it is also necessary that the authority for the identification should be made evident in the accompanying specimen label.

Homeotype.
Sphecodes
gibbus Linn.
det. R. Jones, 24

Homeotype.

A word on the necessity for the uniform designation of the primary types may not be out of place here. It is now more or less universally accepted that only one specimen of a species can represent its "type" (*Holotype*), the other specimens before the author at the time of describing being known as *paratypes,* and the type of the opposite sex to the holotype as the *Allotype.* An allotype which is described after the publication of the original description should be known by Mr. J. H. Durrant's term *Neallotype.* Many authors, however, still follow the practice of calling one specimen the type and the other examples at the time of describing cotypes, while others name all original specimens "types." This leads to much confusion, and it is desirable that a uniform system should be established and rigorously followed. The series of specimens called "types" by some authors are really cotypes, and the selection of a *lectotype* from among such series merits more universal attention. It need hardly be mentioned that lectotypes should be selected with great care. After a lectotype has been selected the remaining "types" which agree with it are known as *paralectotypes.*

The mere creation of terms for various kinds of "types," "morphs," etc., will serve no useful purpose unless the authors themselves consistently employ them. The terms of entomological nomenclature are in need of a severe revision and if this note directs attention to this need and the necessity for eliminating all unnecessary terms its aims will have been accomplished.

CEDRIC DOVER
LONDON

[1] *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.*, 7, xvi, p. 102, 1905.

[2] "The Entomological Code," pp. 14 and 15: Washington, 1912.

THE COSTS OF MEDICAL JOURNALS

THE enclosed sheet, showing the comparative costs of various journals to subscribers, was prepared by the publisher, J. Springer of Berlin. It was given to me through the kindness of Professor Kurt Koffka of Giessen, who is now acting professor of education in Cornell University. In these days of increased printing cost, this comparison of German, English and American prices may be of interest to scientific men. The figures give the price in cents per sheet of sixteen pages.

German	Price per sheet (16 pages)	English	Price per sheet (16 pages)	American	Price per sheet (16 pages)
Archiv für Dermatologie und Syphilis	$0.19	*British Journal of Dermatology and Syphilis*	$0.30	*Archives of Dermatology and Syphilology*	$0.06
Archiv für Gynäkologie	.21	*Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology of the British Empire*	.24	*American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*	.15
Brauer's Beiträge zur Klinik der Tuberkulose mit Zentralblatt für Tuberkulose	.21	*British Journal of Tuberculosis*	.18	*American Review of Tuberculosis*	.11
v. Greefe's Archiv für Ophthalmologie	.28	*British Journal of Ophthalmology*	.25	*Archives of Ophthalmology*	.15
				American Journal of Ophthalmology	.14
Pflüger's Archiv für die gesamte Physiologie	.22	*Journal of Physiology*	.27	*Journal of General Physiology*	.09
Zeitschrift für Hals-, Nasen und Ohrenheilkunde	.17	*Journal of Laryngology and Otology*	.16	*Laryngoscope*	.14
Zeitschrift für Hygiene	.19	*Journal of Hygiene*	.31	*Journal of Hygiene*	.15
Zeitschrift für Kinderheilkunde	.23	*British Journal of Children's Diseases*	.34	*Journal of Diseases of Children*	.06
Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie	.30	*Journal of Neurology and Psychopathology*	.32	*Archives of Neurology and Psychiatry*	.07

CORNELL UNIVERSITY SETH WAKEMAN

QUOTATIONS

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES

IT will be remembered that the National Union of Scientific Workers issued in May a vigorous protest against the boycott of ex-enemy nations organized by the "International Research Council." This protest was given a fair amount of publicity in the press, though some journals, in particular *Nature* and *The Times*, declined to print it; and copies were sent to the principal scientific societies in Great Britain, and to a selection of foreign academies and societies.

A good many replies have been received. A number of these (for example, those of the Royal Society and the Royal Astronomical Society) are merely formal acknowledgments, stating that the secretary will bring the matter before the council of the society.

Some few societies, however, have already found time to consider the question. Thus the Optical Society has passed a definite resolution of sympathy with the attitude of the Union. The Meteorological Society is "not opposed" to the admission of ex-enemy nations to international Unions and Congresses. The Geological Society and the London Mathematical Society have never associated themselves with the boycott.

No society has, at present, expressed an opinion on the opposite side; and there can be no reasonable doubt that the Union's claim to represent, in this matter, "an overwhelming majority of British men of science," was perfectly justified.

A considerable number of replies have been received from German academies. These naturally all express agreement with our resolution, and gratitude to the Union for the stand it has taken. . . .

One "international" congress was held during the summer, the Mathematical Congress at Toronto. In connection with this, our protest excited a good deal of attention in America. It is an instructive comment on the manner in which the boycott has been organized, that many American mathematicians who attended the congress discovered for the first time when they arrived at it that Germans were excluded. A good deal of indignation was expressed, and the representatives of the American Mathematical Society moved a resolution for the removal of the ban. This