

lished before the book was even written. However, even on this score, no objection can possibly be applied to her book, since her keys were entirely reconstructed from non-Carnegie material.

5. "Her action in copyrighting drawings which she had been paid to prepare for the Carnegie Institution Monograph is certainly indefensible." Not one of these drawings was published in "Mosquito Life," and as Dr. Dupree had already given the Carnegie people permission to publish such of them as were copied from his own, and the author was merely acting in his place, the publication of the originals in "Mosquito Life" in no way affected this permission.

The above is, I believe, sufficient to show the utter falsity of Dr. Dyar's charges. The writer regrets that, as a matter of justice as well as of record, the occasion necessitates the preparation and publication of the present reply. The author's well-known scientific probity should have precluded the possibility of any personal attack.

A FURTHER NOTE ON SYNELYS ENUCLEATA.

BY L. W. SWETT, MALDEN, MASS.

In the December CAN. ENT., Vol. XXXIX, p. 412, Mr. Prout has added some very interesting material to what I had found out. He seemed puzzled about two things: first, why I thought the original description or typical form was drawn up from one specimen. In the last line of Gueneé's description he says "(♀ semblable)"; this Mr. Prout must have overlooked, as he says it was drawn up from "6 examples," and the typical form was the one without blotches, but, as can be seen, it was from one specimen that he drew the description, and Mr. Prout is mistaken. Gueneé certainly knew all the forms, and the "6 examples" refers to the other two forms under variety A with blotches on both wings and on the fore wings only. Secondly, Mr. Prout wonders why I believed the form with blotches on both wings to be *enucleata*. Well, simply because I found them so labelled in Packard's collection and figured in the Monograph, and because I knew that Gueneé's types were known to Packard, and that they corresponded, I formed this conclusion. I found on reading the description that the two did not agree, but accepted Packard's judgment in preference to my own in this case. I have no doubt that Mr. Prout is correct, and shall accept his judgment regarding my correction, as being in Europe with the Walker types and

March, 1908