

Cul + Tab.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

January 10, 1910.

Dear Doctor Lutz:

I am very much obliged to you for your letter of the 7th of December, which we find of the greatest interest. We highly appreciate your desire to avoid confusion by withholding your own material for publication. It makes us all the more anxious to hasten the publication of our work, which is now completed and in the hands of the copy reviser. There will still be some delay on account of unfinished drawings. I have referred your more specific comments to Mr. Knab, who submits the following for your consideration:

"It is very natural that Dr. Lutz should be at odds with us on certain matters of classification--we are by no means satisfied with our own scheme. Still, we have done the best we could, according to our lights. We are still convinced that the palpi and the scale-characters should not be used. Some of the characters which look good with a small number of species lose this value with additional species. Certain groups which we felt should be defined we have had to abandon from failure to find tangible adult characters. The truth is that the specific characters are the ones that are often best developed and tend to obscure the generic ones.

"We do not understand what Doctor Lutz means when he says we disrespect priority; we are adhering to it as strictly as we can! I think this will all appear clear to him when he sees our completed work.

"Stegoconops we have had to reject as a composit genus. S. capricorni, the type, is a Haemagogus as can at once be seen by the

structure of the thoracic lobes (prothorax). As to the shape of the abdomen, we have complete gradation, through other species, with the typical Aedes. I have worked very hard with these things as we had the feeling that Aedes, as we now understand it, should be broken up, but I got no satisfactory results. As to the group Janthinosoma, we base our conception not on the larvae alone but on the male genitalia as well and they indicate exactly the same grouping. We include 384 species of mosquitoes in the monograph, and we have studied the larvae and male genitalia of nearly three fourths of these, so we have some basis for our views. Also we have had some material from outside our region for study.

"We regret exceedingly that Doctor Lutz has not published anything concerning the larva of Mansonia; it would be a great help to classification. Besides, this mosquito is very important economically. We have united Mansonia and Taeniorhynchus, virtually on our findings with regard to the male genitalia. Possibly they should be separated, but at all events they are closely related, so the association will do no harm.

"We are quite mystified by Doctor Lutz's statements with reference to "Microculex"argenteoumbrosus. We have specimens sent by Doctor Lutz a number of years ago as Culex imitator which agree perfectly with specimens we have from Trinidad and Panama, bred from Bromeliids. Theobald's description of argenteoumbrosus agrees in every respect with these specimens. Also it was evident that Dr. Peryassú did not know "argenteo-umbrosus," but contented himself to quote Theobald's description, and this strengthened our belief.

As it is we want to see the thing, or at least be told the tangible differences! What is the Culex amazonensis--is it the species by ^{W. Spix} ~~Spix~~ and Martins? I did not consider their description tangible! (I see that species is amazonicus, not amazonensis--we have no reference to any Culex amazonensis!)

"We suspected that Myzomyia "tibiomaculata might be Anopheles eiseni but we could not make the description fit to our satisfaction. A. eiseni was published in 1902, so has priority. We took insolita and oswaldoi to be the same, giving priority to the latter. We had worked out the Culex apicalis problem along the same line as Doctor Lutz; that species, then, will have to be known as confinis Arrib.-- the species called confinis by Theobald will have to stand as indoctum Dyar & Knab. We are looking forward with the greatest interest to Doctor Lutz's further notes and to the material he promises us."

I received the first part of your monograph on the Brazilian tabanids, and have looked through it with the greatest interest. I realize that you are very busy. All good men are. And this makes me appreciate all the more your kindness in writing me this long letter.

Wishing you every success and a prosperous year,

Sincerely yours,

L. O. Howard

Chief of Bureau.

Dr. Adolpho Lutz,
Caixa de Correio No. 926,
Manguinhos, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.