

CULEX CONSOBRINUS AGAIN.

BY D. W. COQUILLET, WASHINGTON, D.C.

In the July number of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, Prof. J. M. Aldrich attempted to rescue Dr. Williston's *Culex inornatus* from the synonymy by referring the true *Culex consobrinus*, Desvoidy, as a synonym of *Culex pipiens*, Linné, and denying that any of the other species which the writer originally placed in the synonymy of *consobrinus* is identical with *inornatus*.

Desvoidy did not give a separate description of his *consobrinus*, but compared it with what he identified as *pipiens*, observing that it differed in having the palpi and tarsi "brunicosis, non flavis." Desvoidy was noted for his erroneous identifications of previously described species, and that he mistook some larger species for the true *pipiens*, seems to admit of no doubt, since the measurement he gives, "long. 3 lineas," is too long for the latter, all the specimens of which in the National Museum fall short of 2.5 lines. His measurements are usually accurate, as may be gleaned from those he gave of such strongly-marked, easily-recognized forms as *Culex mosquito*, *Anopheles maculipennis*, *A. argyritarsis*, *Psorophora ciliata*, etc., all of which are within the range of the specimens of the given species. He gave the same measurement for *consobrinus* as for *pipiens*, and in deciding what species the former refers to it is necessary to find a species which is larger than the true *pipiens*, has the ground colour he gave for *pipiens*, "cinereo-subflavescens. Thorax, dorso-levator fulvescente," and that inhabits Pennsylvania, the locality given for *consobrinus*. Up to the present time we know of *only one species* that fills all of these requirements, and this is the form which I have identified as *consobrinus*.

Even if I erred in this identification, there are still at least two other names that stand in the way of Dr. Williston's *Culex inornatus*, namely, *C. impatiens*, Walker, the type of which Mr. Theobald states agrees in nearly all respects with what I have identified as *consobrinus*, except in the abdominal banding, and this was not of sufficient importance to cause him to regard it as representing a distinct species; and *C. pinguis*, Walker, which Mr. Theobald admits may be synonymous with *consobrinus*.

As I hope to review this subject more at length in a forthcoming monograph, it need not be enlarged upon here; sufficient facts have been given above to fully disprove Mr. Aldrich's contention in relation to the true *Culex consobrinus* of Desvoidy.