

Although fresh surprises meet the reader at every turn as he proceeds to read the paper through, he is led to suspect that Dr. Cook, in spite of his fluent style, may at times be unable to say exactly what he means. He evidently wishes to make us believe that the kelep *quâ* dried insect, spitted on a pin, is nothing but a poor ponerine ant, but *quâ* living, nest-building, boll weevil exterminator, is really a creature *sui generis* which the advanced systematist would do well to regard as the sole representative of a distinct family, the Kelepidæ. Here Dr. Cook shows admirable self-restraint, for it might just as well be made the type of a new phylum (Kelepata) or subkingdom (Kelepozoa). At any rate, it is clear that the kelep rises to a dignity analogous to man, whom certain theological taxonomists regard as a poor, though upright primate physically, but as belonging psychically to an entirely different order of being, because he is possessed of the 'free intelligence of the angels.'

Dr. Cook's amazing estimate is attributable to a confusion of ideas concerning certain well-known phenomena among social insects in general and to a lot of inconclusive, not to say slovenly, observations on the kelep in particular. He begins by confounding the nuptial, or marriage, flight and the swarm, or, at any rate, by continually introducing these in his discussion where they do not belong. The nuptial flight is a well-known occurrence in all social insects that have winged males and winged females, in the honey-bees as well as in the ants and termites. Nevertheless, Dr. Cook believes that it is sorely in need of a new name and suggests 'concourse,' a designation as superfluous as it is inept. Swarming, on the other hand, which is peculiar to the honey-bee, is characterized by the old queen leaving the hive with a detachment of workers and establishing a new