

DR. DYAR'S CRITICISM OF "MOSQUITO LIFE."

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

Dr. Dyar's criticism of "Mosquito Life" in the February number of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST (it cannot possibly be called a review—the author informs me that no copy of the book was sent to Dr. Dyar) calls for a reply, that the many false statements may be corrected. To define my own position in the case, it may be stated that when Miss E. G. Mitchell, the author, began work on the drawings for the Carnegie Monograph, she was assigned a desk in Dr. Dyar's office at the National Museum, and he was given general supervision of her work. Instead of giving her a specimen to draw, he handed her two trays containing about 35 slides of larval skins, bidding her compare them critically and ascertain if more than one species was in the lot. How well she did her work may be gleaned from the first paragraph of an article in the Journal of the N. Y. Ent. Soc., Vol. XIII., p. 107, under the title "Brief Notes on Mosquitoes," by Harrison G. Dyar, A. M., Ph. D., and which runs as follows:

"Distribution of *Theobaldia absobrinus*, Felt.—In re-examining my series of *Theobaldia incidens* from British Columbia (Proc. Ent. Soc., Wash., VI., 38, 1904), I find it to contain a mixture of a second species which I am able to identify with *T. absobrinus*, Felt."

Not one word in the entire article to indicate that the work had been done by any other person than himself! The lady continued her work for several weeks, then informed me that she would prefer to resign rather than continue working under the unpleasant existing conditions. She was therefore given desk-room in my office in the National Museum, where she continued her work on the drawings under my general supervision, and so matters stood until the cessation of her work about a year later.

I will now take up the more flagrant of Dr. Dyar's false statements in the order in which he gives them:

1. "In the title the species of the United States are said to be treated of, but in reality, only those of the Atlantic coast region are dealt with." Only a casual glance through the book is necessary to reveal the fact that *Franciscanus*, *incidens*, *varipalpus*, *Curriei*, *pullatus*, *Fletcheri*, *Spenceri*, etc., all western or Pacific Coast forms, are dealt with.

2. "The illustrations show the effects of Mr. F. Knab's expert artistic criticism." Without wishing in the least to detract from Mr. Knab's ability as a critic or artist, I am in a position to know that he never saw any of the drawings of the adults, and an incident which he himself related to

March, 1908

me indicates that the author herself was the real critic. At her first visit to his office, he showed her one of his wash-ink drawings of a larva. Although she did not know the species, she told him that she was sure, from those she did know, that he had omitted two hairs, indicating on the figure where they ought to be. Mr. Knab vehemently denied the omission, protesting that he had been extremely careful not to overlook a single hair. She asked to see the specimen on which the figure was founded, and upon examining it, the hairs were found, and Mr. Knab was manly enough to acknowledge himself in the wrong!

3. "Mr. Coquillett only receives some, though inadequate, recognition. His name might have better assisted in gracing the title page." By this it is evidently intended to imply that I wrote part of "Mosquito Life." As a matter of fact, the MSS. of that book were written by Miss Mitchell at her home in East Orange, N. J., and sent to the publishers before she returned to Washington. I was in Washington all this time, as the records of the Bureau of Entomology show, and neither wrote nor dictated any part of the book.

4. "A certain obtuseness of scientific conscience is, we think, responsible for this condition, and it has further led our author to publish her work independently, although she was employed to assist in the publication of the much-delayed Carnegie Institution Monograph, and had in her hands for study the material collected for that work." She was not employed to assist in the preparation of the *text* of the Monograph, and at no time did she have in her hands the Carnegie material *for study*; during all the time she was at work on the Monograph I had charge of the adults, while Dr. Dyar had control of the early stages. All she was employed to do was to make drawings of some of the early stages and details of the same, besides copying in charcoal some of the line drawings she had previously made for Dr. Dupree, and which he had generously loaned her for that purpose. During the period when she was drawing for the Monograph, she devoted her spare time to completing a series of keys to the North American mosquitoes, begun in Louisiana, intending to use them as a thesis for the degree of M. S. in the George Washington University. No secret was made of this, and, as a student of the above University and as a citizen, she had right of access to the study-collection of the Museum. The chaotic condition of the larva collection at that time caused her unwittingly to incorporate in the keys a few species belonging to the Carnegie collection. These species were not new at the time, and Dr. Dyar's keys containing all of these and many other species were pub-

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