



12-30-1954

A note to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of Koch's Die Pflanzenläuse

F. C. Hottes
Grand Junction, Colorado

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/gbn>

Recommended Citation

Hottes, F. C. (1954) "A note to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of Koch's Die Pflanzenläuse," *Great Basin Naturalist*. Vol. 14 : No. 3 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/gbn/vol14/iss3/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Western North American Naturalist Publications at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Basin Naturalist by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

A NOTE TO COMMEMORATE THE ONE-HUNDREDTH
ANNIVERSARY OF KOCH'S DIE PFLANZENLÄUSE

F. C. HOTTES
Grand Junction, Colorado

Since 1954 marked the one-hundredth anniversary of the publication of the first Heft, and since 1957 will mark the one-hundredth anniversary of the printing of the ninth and last Heft, and the publication of the work as a whole, of Koch's *Die Pflanzenläuse*, perhaps it is fitting that we review briefly the manner in which this work was published. Furthermore I believe I have discovered something new concerning the publication of this work, and although trivial, believe it of interest. I offer it herewith, to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the publication of this work which had such a profound influence on Aphid Taxonomy.

I suspect that few of the younger Aphid Taxonomists are aware of the fact that Koch's *Die Pflanzenläuse* was originally published in nine parts or Heften. Few in America, surely have access to the volume thus published. It appears to be terribly scarce even in Europe, where only a few copies appear to have been published. Even the volume printed in 1857, as a whole is rare and high priced. It is this volume which most American Aphid Taxonomists are familiar with. Its contents are the same, as that of the volume issued in parts, bound volumes of which are apt not to show evidence of interrupted publication, only the first part being indicated.

Because a number of new genera and species were described in the parts as issued, it is important to know the date of publication of each Heft, so that the new forms may be associated with the date of issue, and not the date of the completed work, as is so often done.

Inasmuch as Hagen, 1862, Horn and Schenkling, 1928, and Börner, 1952, are either not clear, accurate or complete in their reference to the publication of the various Heften, and because none refer to the publication of the work as a whole in 1857, a review may be of value to younger workers, despite the fact that my Old Mentor Dr. O. W. Oestlund covered much of the same material in a paper published in *Entomological News* in 1910. The paper, also partly obscured by time deserves to be better known. Oestlund gives the dates and pages for the Heften as follows: "Parts 1-4 issued in 1854. Heft 1, pp 1-8 and 1-36, Heft II pp 37-72, Heft III pp 73-

100, Heft IV pp 101-134. Parts 5-7 were issued in 1855. Heft V pp 135-166, Heft VI pp 167-196, Heft VII pp 197-236. Parts VIII and IX were issued in 1857. Heft VIII pp 237-274, Heft IX pp 275-336.

We of this generation, because we are more apt to have access to the volume issued in 1857 as a whole, are likely to learn that the original volume was issued in nine parts on page 328 in a section written by J. H. Kaltenbach. This is also found on page 329 (if numbered) of part nine. Dr. Oestlund states that the plates issued with the Heften are superior to those issued with the volume published in 1857. I have the volume Dr. Oestlund had, before me, and one other consisting of eight parts, and the plates for the same. I agree with the observation made by Dr. Oestlund. The plates issued with the Heften are superior. The superiority lies largely in the manner in which small details of color and pulverulence are shown. The 1857 copies showing pulverulence poorly, if at all. I have seen the plates of four volumes, they, as is true of most hand colored plates, have one thing in common. They differ. This is true even for the plates issued with the Heften. Dr. Oestlund further states, "The number of copies distributed in parts was probably small and on the completion of the work in 1857 the greater part of the edition was united into one with a new title page dated Nürnberg, 1857, in which condition most of the copies now to be had are found."

Evidence I shall now present, and believe to be new, contradicts this statement. The new title page mentioned by Dr. Oestlund differs from the title page of the volume issued as a whole in 1857 not only in style of print, and size of print but carries the name of the publisher, and the name of the printer on the reverse side. The names of the publisher and the printer are absent on the title page of the volume printed in 1857.

When one is fortunate enough to be able to compare a volume issued in Heften with a volume issued complete, and I have been fortunate to be able to compare two of each, other differences become apparent. For example, the style of type used in the printing of the various Heften differs from the style of type used in printing the volume as a whole. Although there is a great resemblance between the two styles of type, the type used in the printing of the Heften is somewhat bolder, it also differs slightly in size. Words printed in *italics*, such as some specific names are also in a different type in the two editions. Names of genera and species although

printed in the same style of type, are printed in different sizes. This is strikingly shown on page 275. There is a striking difference between the two issues, except in part nine, where an asterisk is used. This may be noted by comparing page one of Heft one and page one of the 1857 issue. That used in the Heften is made up of six individual parts, that in the 1857 issue has the parts united by stems. Commas in the Heften are faint, and the tail rather thin and curved, those in the 1857 work are thicker, and have the tail less curved. Although I suspect that the work issued in 1857 was set into type from the printed pages of the Heften, the word content of given lines is not always the same. In fact the word content of a given page may differ by three or four words, or in the case of page 328 of Heft nine where this is found page 327. In no case is the word content of a given page enough to change the page of the description of a new genus or species. Some pages have line content of the two editions the same, this is well illustrated by the first two or three pages of Heft nine. The capital letter Q used in the two editions is not the same, that used on page 227 of Heft VII has the bar under the O, that used on page 227 of the 1857 edition has the bar across the O. I found only one feature which may be viewed as a typographical error. The figure 345 on page 270 of the volume printed in 1857 lacks a period after it, such is present in Heft VIII of the same page.

Because the paragraph on page 328 of Heft nine is printed on the bottom of page 327 of the 1857 edition, the remaining pages of text and index are not the same. Furthermore, the species and genera listed on the second and following pages of the index are not the same in the two editions. Nor has the 1857 edition the announcement of books for sale on page 336 (if numbered).

Therefore I think the volume issued in 1857 as a whole, should be thought of as a reprint edition, and not as an equal to the volume issued in parts. Furthermore I suspect that if we wanted to be technical we might regard the genera and species indicated as new in the 1857 volume as homonyms and synonyms of those described in the Heften.

After a time lapse of a hundred years, speculation as to the reason for a complete new resetting of type for the volume issued in 1857 is rather risky. One suspects that the printer could not afford to keep such a quantity of type idle for a period of two or three years. Hence after the Heften were in print, the plates from which they were printed were reduced to type, so that the type could be reused. It is strange, however, that parts VIII and IX both

issued in 1857 should have to be reset. Perhaps there was a greater demand for the work than first contracted for, in the form of Heften, hence the reprint edition. The fact that different type was used in the printing of the two editions, first suggested to me that different printers were involved.

Dr. Hans Sachtleben, Director of the Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, has kindly supplied me with the following additional information. Their volume of Koch's work which was issued in Heften, has the covers of all except the ninth Heft bound in. The cover of the eighth Heft carries the date 1856.

This Heft should therefore date from 1856 and not 1857. The genera *Cladobius*, *Toxoptera* and *Pachypappa* were described in this Heft, and should therefore date from 1856 and not 1857. Only the genera *Toxoptera* and *Pachypappa* are good, the name *Cladobius* was preoccupied. Börner, 1930 gives the date of these genera as 1856.

Dr. Sachtleben sends the following information which all Aphid Taxonomists will find of interest. He states that the Museum of which he is Director has possession of many of the original drawings of Koch.