



<http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/>

Bulletin of the Brooklyn Entomological Society.

Brooklyn, N.Y. :The Society,

<http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/bibliography/16211>

new ser.:v.30-31 (1935-1936):

<http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/204880>

Article/Chapter Title: On mounting leafhoppers

Author(s): Ball, E. D.

Subject(s): Auchenorrhyncha, Hemiptera

Page(s): Page 84, Page 85

Contributed by: Smithsonian Libraries

Sponsored by: Biodiversity Heritage Library

Generated 10 March 2017 2:24 PM

<http://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/pdf4/062733800204880>

This page intentionally left blank.

METHODS AND TECHNIQUE.

A Plea for Courtesy.

Several brief articles have been noted recently in which the writers have given new names to species bearing pre-occupied names. Apparently not one of these writers communicated with the author of the species, pointing out the error, and giving the describer an opportunity to make the correction himself. Such a procedure would be only common courtesy. This point is, in fact, covered in the Code of Ethics under Article 34 of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature, but far too few workers adhere to the ruling. If the original describer made the correction it would make for less confusion in subsequent check lists and citations. Again, it would be the courteous thing for the original describer, in making his correction, to mention the name of the one who called attention to the error.

In another instance a systematic worker had two species, one of Le Conte's and one new. He mistook the new species for Le Conte's and described Le Conte's species as new with a specific key to the genus. The error was kindly called to his attention by another worker and the first worker immediately published a new description and key, making the necessary correction, but no mention was made of the one who called attention to the error; again, a failure to observe a common courtesy.

Surely common sense should overcome the desire to be author of a nomen mutatum; should overcome the reluctance to admit an error through a false sense of infallibility.—GEO. R. HOPPING, Vernon, B. C.

On Mounting Leafhoppers.

The writer once mounted up and sent to a specialist some bees that a botanical friend had collected in a pollination study. The large bees were pinned but the smaller ones had dried out, until they were brittle and so were mounted on card points. What that specialist wrote about imbeciles, idiots and other amateur entomologists was illuminating, if not comforting. He concluded his letter with this well remembered statement, "The way to mount an insect is to stick a pin through it—the bigger the pin the better."

The writer always intended to get together an assorted set of finishing nails and bridge spikes and send that specialist a properly mounted collection, but there were too many leafhoppers awaiting

study and alas, too many of these leafhoppers had been mounted by bee specialists and presented little but a verdigris impregnated fringe around a "bigger and better" pin or perhaps they had been glued in the middle of a cardboard paving block. If they had escaped both these fates it was only to fall into the hands of a coleopterist who would gleefully bend down the end of a card point and daub one whole side of the little leafhopper with glue, thus committing in one single stroke the two worst atrocities of leafhopper mounting—hiding the wing venation and attaching by a fragile wing, easily broken off.

But how do you mount a leafhopper? Simple—the legs, the sternum and the venter furnish no diagnostic characters—while on the other hand, they do furnish a relatively broad flat point of attachment which when properly glued to a card point insures permanency without obscuring any valuable structure.

The best card points are cut by hand from heavy linen ledger paper. The paper is cut into strips 9 mm. wide. A heavy razor kept moderately sharp will cut through 6 or 8 strips at a time, and can be varied to form extremely fine points for small species and broader ones for the larger specimens. All points should be tapering, broad enough at the base to firmly hold on a No. 2 pin and fine enough at the point not to overlap either the face or the genital structures. The point should be pushed up on the pin so that a specimen can be studied by a low power compound microscope or a hand lens without touching the pin head.

The leafhopper should be placed on its back with its head away from the operator, the tip of the card point touched with glue (or shellac) and pressed firmly into the middle of the under side and then righted. The leafhopper will then be right side up on the end of the point with its head forward and all its diagnostic characters visible. In this day of high cost of pins and labor the writer often uses 10 mm. card points and after mounting one leafhopper on the end as before places three small drops of glue along the point and with a flat forceps adds three other specimens. One of these may be mounted bottom up to show face and genitalia if desired. Usually two males are mounted near the end and two females (or one and a nymph) nearer the pin. The sexes are thus associated and several individuals can be compared at once.—E. D. BALL, Tucson, Arizona.