

to this insect so far as they go.—McL.), because no specimen from Africa is known to him; and “that the collection of Linnæus has been maltreated by additions, destruction and displacement of labels.” The discovery of a true African specimen would make McLachlan’s objection untenable. Nobody would be surprised that an insect, with such a large distribution, and found in Castilia and Naples, should be found in Africa. For the statement of the displacement of labels in the Linnean collection McLachlan quotes the preface of Staudinger’s *Catalog der Lepidopteren*, 1871, p. xvi.—xvii. This quotation is indeed very unfortunate, as the German original is essentially different (p. xvi.) from the French translation (p. xvii.) which is alone used by McL.:—“C’est malheureusement un fait certain que l’acquéreur de la collection de Linné a eu la déplorable idée de remplacer quelquefois des exemplaires endommagés par des exemplaires frais—*vielleicht* vorhandene schlechte Exemplare durch bessere ersetzte.” So long as McLachlan gives not any other evidence for his opinion, it is apparently not admissible.

Concerning the Neuroptera in the Linn. collection, I have published (*Stett. Ent. Z.*, vol. vi., 1845, p. 155) the list *still before me*, made in 1844 by Mr. R. Kippist, then Secretary of the Linn. Soc.

Of the 83 species described in *Syst. Nat. Ed.*, xii., were present 50 species, but 17 of them were later additions, with labels written *not by Linnæus*, but probably by Mr. Smith, with the occasional addition “exdescript Linn.” These 17 species are marked *only with pencil* in Linnæus’s own copy of *Syst. Nat. Ed.*, xii. The other 33 species have labels in Linnæus’s own handwriting, and are marked in the copy of *Syst. Nat. Ed.*, xii., with ink. From these alone it is certain that they were in the collection of Linnæus, and *among these is M. formicalynx*. I have compared myself the collection in 1857 and 1861. I found nothing changed and no indication of displacements.

Illiger’s paper, 1801, in his *Magazin*, vol. i., p. 7.

Westwood’s paper of the Linnean *Staphylinus* (*Tr. Ent. Soc.*, Ser. I., vol. iv., p. 45); Schaum “*neber zweifelhafte Kaefer Linné’s nach seiner Sammlung*,” *Stett. Ent. Z.*, 1847, p. 276; Haliday *ibid.*, 1851, p. 131; Motschulsky, 1855, *Etudes. Ent.*, iv., p. 25, will show that the sweeping charges in McL. paper can not be considered as warranted.

The description of *M. formicalynx* in *Ed. x.* is the same as in *Ed. xii.*, excepting the clerical error “*antennæ setacæ*” for *clavatæ*, as given in