

Cul. J
BOA VISTA, Rio Tapajós, Estado do Pará
Dec 15/32

Dear Doctor Lutz:

Your letter of Nov 8 is at hand. I do not agree with Dyar on nomenclature and I do agree with you on generic limits. But *Kerteszia lutzii* Theobald can not replace *K. cruzii* D & K unless we can show that Theobald's description antedates Cruz's description of *Nyssorhynchus lutzii* Cruz. Both were originally described and published under the generic name *Anopheles* in 1901, which was before either *Myzomyia* (1902) or *Kerteszia* (1905) were published. You can tell which appeared first. I have no data on that point here.

Dyar says "the type of a genus is a name, not a species, according to the rules." If that is true, I have completely misunderstood the rules. I have always maintained and still maintain that the type of a given genus is the species upon which that genus was founded, as per the holotype specimen of the genotype species. Any other concept is absurd. A genotype is bound to be a species. A name can not be considered as a concept distinct from that of a species, for a name means a species always and nothing more nor less than a species.

Nomenclature would be in a state of inextricable confusion under Dyer's decision, for an author's descriptions would mean nothing whatever and only the names he cites would count, turning everything topsyturvy. Types would be worthless if misidentified.

Mansonia should evidently be dropped and *Taeniorhynchus* used in its place, for it appears that *titillans* Walker is the genotype of both. *Aedes* must be restricted to the group represented by its genotype. The combination *Stegomyia aegypti* is permanent.

An author, if he wish to make an ass of himself, can sink all the genera in the world but his action does not in the slightest degree affect the validity of those genera. The latter stand always on their individual merits, as exemplified in the characters of the species on which they were originally based.

I am compelled to reserve decision in most cases of culicid nomenclature until I can refer to complete literature. But I can show that *Cellia tarsimaculata* Goeldi is not *Nyssorhynchus tarsimaculatus* HDK and subsequent authors. I have sent notes on this to Entomological News and Revista de Entomologia. And I seriously doubt that *Culex fatigans* Wiedemann is same as *quinquefasciatus* Say.

I have so far identified 8 species of *Nyssorhynchus* here, which do not agree in characters with the descriptions of what are supposed to be the same species in other regions and districts. Recently I have separated this material on leg and wing coloration into 17 groups, which may or may not be good races. These I am preparing to verify on egg, larval, pupal and hypopygial characters by breeding through from egg to adult with eggs secured from captured females duly numbered and preserved for later identification. In this manner we hope to be able to define the limits of variation of our forms.

I sent 35 species of Culicidae, including 5 *Nyssorhynchus*, to Doctor Pinto not long ago for description of new forms and opinions on my determinations of others.

With best regards to yourself and confreres, I am always

Yours sincerely,

Dr A. Lutz
Instituto Oswaldo Cruz
RIO DE JANEIRO

C. H. B. Wiedemann