Smith have been promoted to professorships of mathematics at the University of Cincinnati.

NEW appointments have been made to the medical staff of Dalhousie University as follows: Dr. R. P. Smith, of Edinburgh and Durham, has been appointed professor of pathology and bacteriology and fills the vacancy created by the resignation of Dr. A. G. Nichols; Dr. G. S. Eadie, of Toronto, who has spent the past two years at the biochemical institute of Cambridge University, has been appointed assistant professor of physiology; Dr. Elizabeth Smith Bean, formerly of the University of Wisconsin, has been appointed instructor in histology and embryology. Dr. Howard A. Jamison, of Glasgow, comes to the university as assistant in pathology and bacteriology, and G. A. Grant fills a similar position in the department of biochemistry.

HAROLD B. PIERCE has resigned as Fleischmann research fellow at the University of Rochester and has again assumed his duties as associate professor of dairy and food chemistry in the department of agricultural and biological chemistry at the Pennsylvania State College.

DR. PERRY YATES JACKSON, instructor in physiological chemistry at the University of Chicago, has been elected to a professorship in the department of chemistry at Park College, Mo.

DR. WILLEM JACOB LUYTEN, astronomer at the Harvard College Observatory, has been promoted to assistant professor of astronomy.

NEW appointments in the college of engineering and architecture at the University of Minnesota include C. A. Hughes and J. A. Wise, assistant professors of structural engineering. Mr. Hughes comes from the University of Toronto and Mr. Wise from the Corps of Civil Engineers of the U. S. Navy.

AT Lafayette College, Ernest M. Fernald, of Cornell University, has been appointed assistant professor of mechanical engineering and Anson W. Voorhees, assistant professor of geology.

AT the University of Buffalo, Dr. George Claude Hicks has been appointed assistant professor of biology; George E. Read, instructor in physics, and Dr. Reginald Pegrum, instructor in geology.

DR. M. A. GRAHAM, associate professor of chemistry at Mills College, has been appointed professor of chemistry at the Dominican College of San Rafael.

DR. PAUL A. MURPHY, formerly head of the plant diseases division, Department of Agriculture, Irish Free State, has been appointed to the newly created professorship of plant pathology in University College, Dublin.

DISCUSSION AND CORRESPONDENCE

EXIT THE TENTAMEN, BUT . . .

DR. HOLLAND in his recent letter to SCIENCE (July 1) has noted the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that that two-page work was not published, but was intended as a circular letter. He does not mention, however, that the *names* involved are not thereby eliminated, but are merely thrown back on later publications, and is entirely silent on the extraordinary confusion that will result from the fact that these later concededly valid uses are in general incidental, rarely naming a type or indicating the intended contents of the genera, or in any way defining them save by citing some one or more species as belonging to them.

For instance, take Limnas, which Dr. Holland mentions. In 1806 it appears in the Tentamen with the well-known species *chrysippus* (Linnaeus). Then in the period 1806–1816, but at dates that are not more exactly known, Hübner figures 16 species of Limnas in the "Sammlung Exotischer Schmetterlinge," thereby firmly fixing the name in a work that every one agrees is published. Incidentally a prospectus in our library shows that 15 Limnas were published in March, 1814. After that he abandons the name, and bases his binary nomenclature (which now becomes strictly binomial) on a series of "coitus" names, from the "Verzeichniss," which began to be published at that time. Later Boisduval on a plate of the Buffon Series, figures a *Limnas pixe,* belonging to a group which is not related to *chrysippus* L., but which *is* related to forms which Hübner excludes from Limnas. The corresponding text was never published. Then the question rises: Is the type of Limnas the first species published in the "Sammlung," which is now unknown, but may be fixed any time by the discovery of a new dated advertisement of the "Sammlung"? or does the ghost of the "Tentamen" fix it to *chrysippus* as soon as valid publication occurs? or does it become *pixe,* a species which Hübner did not know? or do we reject all this, and hunt for the first attempt at a *formal* founding of the name, all these uses being in a sense incidental and assuming that the Tentamen had established the name? or finally do we adopt the name from Hübner's "Systematisch-Alphabetisch Verzeichniss" of 1822, which every one admits was published, but which so far as I can find no one in America has seen? And in the last case does the name actually appear there? Some one in Europe who has a copy will have to answer that. Meanwhile what shall we do with the Danaids of the *chrysippus* group and the Erycinids of the *pixe* group?

Again, take Coleophora, which was in universal use for the best part of a century, and which is still in

99 per cent. of our literature. If we ignore the "Tentamen," it is preoccupied by Haploptilia, published somewhere about 1826. And it again was not formally founded so far as I can find out, but Zeller began to use it (doubtless from the Tentamen) about 1838 when he felt the need of a genus name for the group.

Nine tenths of the Tentamen names are now left in similar states of uncertainty. What would Dr. Holland do about it?

Incidentally I note an error or two in Dr. Holland's statement. As to the Tentamen being unused until Scudder recovered and reprinted it, it (or the names in it) was used by Hübner himself in the "Sammlung Exotischer Schmetterlinge" (for ten years), and it is said in the "Systematisch-Alphabetisch Verzeichniss," his last formal lay-out of the system; also by Ochsenheimer and Treitschke, Stephens, Herrich-Schaeffer, Zeller, Boisduval, Curtis and T. W. Harris. None of these authors adopted *all* the names, as the law of priority was not strictly construed in those days; also most people then did not feel the need of so many genera. Ochsenheimer specifically mentions the Tentamen, and Harris refers to Apatela as in common use. Others cite "Hübner" as author. Hübner himself says it was "partly accepted and partly rejected"—a true statement.

In bringing in the "Verzeichniss," Dr. Holland does not mention that ten years had intervened, and that in the meantime Hübner had used all the Tentamen names of butterflies as generic (as the first names of binomials), also many of the moths. This fact completely invalidates his argument.

WM. T. M. FORBES

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

PARASITIC COPEPODS

IN the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy of Science there recently appeared (vol. 133, p. 613) a paper by Helene Kurtz upon two new parasitic copepods. The first of these new species belonged to the genus Achtheinus, and in dealing with it a question as to the validity of the genus was raised. This question was decided in the negative and it was stated that Achtheinus must be regarded as a synonym of Dana's much older genus Lepidopus. Such a conclusion might seem legitimate at first, but if we follow the steps by which it was reached we realize that the mode of reasoning employed is very defective.

In Dana's genus the first legs were uniramose and 3-segmented, the second, third, and fourth legs were biramose, the rami of the second pair 2-segmented, of the other pairs 1-segmented and rudimentary; the terminal segment of the maxillipeds was flattened into a broad lamina covered with scales, but without a claw. In Achtheinus on the contrary all four pairs of legs are biramose, the rami of the first 3 pairs 2-segmented, of the fourth pair 1-segmented; the maxillipeds have an ordinary terminal segment, with a stout terminal claw, but without scales.

Dana's type specimen has long since disappeared and no others have been obtained that could be identified with it, and hence it is impossible to verify or disprove his genus by any reexamination of specimens. In such a case the validity of the genus must rest upon the original description and the figures illustrating it. Fortunately both of these in the present instance are clear and decisive. Dana recorded the first legs as uniramose, and his figure showed a distinctively uniramose and 3-segmented leg, bearing no resemblance whatever to the first legs of Achtheinus, nor to either ramus of those legs. In the second legs also the basipod is long and narrow and extends out laterally, with the two rami fastened to the outer end, a very different type of leg from that found in the second pair of the genus Achtheinus.

If Dana's genus is to be accepted at all, it must be given these exact details which he described and figured, and nothing can be added to them or subtracted from them. Especially is there no opportunity for conjectures or hypothetical inferences.

Stebbing in discussing South African Crustacea in 1918 (Annals South African Museum, vol. 17, part 1, p. 41) fully recognized these facts. Although he did suggest that the first legs of Dana's specimen "might easily have lost one of the branches in the process of dissection," he nevertheless adopted the genus name Achtheinus and added "the merely conjectural identity of Lepidopus may stand aside."

Miss Kurtz must have failed to understand Stebbing's attitude in the matter for she adopted his suggestion but ignored his real conclusion. Furthermore she carried the suggestion farther than he did by declaring that he had said that the endopod of the first legs in Dana's specimen was probably (wahrscheinlich) broken off. With this for a premise she argued that if the basal segment in the first legs of Dana's genus be regarded as the basipod, the other two segments would correspond to the exopod of the first legs in Achtheinus. And if we could find that "probably" broken-off endopod, and if it should prove to be 2-segmented when we did find it, then the first legs of the two genera would be similar. She considered this sufficient proof of the identity of the two genera and made Achtheinus a synonym of Lepidopus.

She disposed of the scaly covering of the terminal segment of the maxillipeds, which Dana used as the basis of his genus name, by saying that no such