# NOTES ON THE NOMENCLATURE OF SOME BRITISH PARA-SITIC HYMENOPTERA

By W. D. HINCKS, M.P.S., F.R.E.S.

The following notes were made during an examination of the generic names used in several families of parasitic Hymenoptera, in connection with the preparation of a list of Hymenoptera for a Check List of British Insects on which Mr. G. S. Kloet and I have been working for some time. Their publication is necessary in order to explain certain synonymy adopted in this List. I have restricted the present notes to those questions which require annotation. Other synonymical matters which perhaps may be new to British workers though not new an themselves are included in the actual List. Besides these, there remain other questions not considered either here or in the List because vital data were not available. In any case it has not been the function of the present writer to attempt to revise the whole generic nomenclature of this great section of one of our largest Orders. However, in the pursuit of a fixed plan of procedure in the preparation of the Hymenoptera section of the Check List some inconsistencies have been discovered and these I have endeavoured to resolve.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature have placed a small number of names in the parasitic Hymenoptera on the Official List of Generic Names by their action at Lisbon, approved and adopted by the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology in 1935, and published in the Compte Rendu of the Congress (1936: 181–196). Full details of this important step are to be found in the new official organ of the Commission (1943. Bull. zool. Nomencl. 1: 27–30).

There are several other instances in which action by the International Commission seems desirable, and a few such instances are referred to below. It is not my intention to make any applications to the Commission for suspensions of the rules at the present juncture, but rather I wish to draw the attention of Hymenopterists to these questions so that they may be thoroughly discussed before any action is taken.

There remain a certain number of other names which are preoccupied or incorrect in other ways, and have no claim to be preserved by the International Commission under their plenary powers. These names are dealt with here.

I am personally indebted to the Secretary of the International Commission. Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., for much help in my work. I have to thank him for reading the manuscript of the present paper and for making valuable suggestions which I have followed. I must also express my indebtedness to the excellent publications of Henry L. Viereck (see Bibliography).

In view of the controversial nature of nomenclatorial work when unaccompanied by taxonomic evidence, I wish to state that I amentirely responsible for the conclusions which follow hereafter.

# BRACONIDAE.

I have already published five short papers on the nomenclature of the Braconidae and Aphididae (Hincks, 1943a, b, c, 1944a, b), so that the following notes represent merely a supplement to this previous work.

PROC. R. ENT. SOC. LOND. (B) 13. PTS. 3-4. (APRIL 1944.)

1. Coeloides Wesmael, 1838, N. Mém. Acad. roy. Bruxelles 11: 59. Coeloidina Viereck, 1921, Proc. U.S. national Museum 59, no. 2364: 133.

I have already (1943, Entomologist 76: 97) given a short note on this genus based on the data recorded by Viereck (1914, 1921) and I there adopted the

synonymy Coeloidina Viereck (= Coeloides Wesmael, partim).

Dr. Roy D. Shenefelt (1943) has just published a most interesting and valuable revision of the North American representatives of the genus Atanycolus Foerster, 1862. In this paper he examines fully the nomenclature of Atanycolus Foerster, 1862, Coeloides Wesmael, 1838, and Coeloidina Viereck, 1921. It is evident from the data which he records that the name Coeloidina Viereck is a redundant synonym of Coeloides Wesmael. Wesmael misidentified Ichneumon initiator Fabricius, 1793, a species actually belonging to Atanycolus, where it is so placed by Fahringer (1925) as A. initiator Nees. The Wesmaelian insect was renamed by Wesmael himself as Coeloides scolyticida Wesmael, 1838, and Shenefelt correctly regards this as the genotype of Coeloides. The type of Coeloidina Viereck is the congeneric Coeloides melanotus Wesmael, 1838, and thus Viereck's name is superfluous.

2. Dolopsidea nom. nov. pro Dolops Marshall, 1889, Trans. ent. Soc. Lond. 1889: 206, nec Audouin, 1837, nec Agassiz, 1846.

Recently (1943, Entomologist 76:101), in discussing the genus Dolops Marshall, 1889, I decided that it would not be necessary to alter this preoccupied name since Dolops Audouin, 1837, appears to be a nomen nudum and Dolops Agassiz, 1846, is only an emendation of Doliops Waterhouse, 1841.

The appearance (26 Oct. 1943) of Opinion 148 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has clarified the position regarding the interpretation of Articles 25 and 34 of the International Code as far as they concern generic names. Since it is ruled that "(2) A generic name is to be rejected as a homonym if it has previously been published as an emendation of another generic name of earlier date" it becomes necessary to propose a new name for Marshall's genus. I therefore propose Dolopsidea as a new name for Dolops Marshall, 1889, Trans. ent. Soc. Lond. 1889: 206, nec Audouin, 1837, nec Agassiz, 1846.

The genotype is Dolops hastifer Marshall, 1889, by designation of Viereck (1914, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 83: 48).

3. Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 19: 267.

Adelura Foerster, 1862, loc. cit.: 267, nec Bonaparte, 1854. Adelurola Strand, E., 1928, Arch. Naturgesch. 1926, 92, A8: 51.

Adelura Foerster, 1862, is preoccupied by Bonaparte's Avian genus published in 1854. In 1928 Dr. Embrik Strand proposed the new name Adelurola for that of Foerster, evidently overlooking the fact that certain Foersterian synonyms of Adelura were available. Of these Dapsilarthra Foerster, 1862, has page priority and should replace the preoccupied Adelura. The monobasic genotype is Alysia apii Curtis, 1826.

# ICHNEUMONIDAE.

4. Chaerelymma Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 187.

Cratocryptus Thomson, C. G., 1873, Opusc. ent. 5: 520.

The above synonymy is quite generally known and has been adopted to a very limited extent by modern authors. The genotype of Chaeretymma is designated by Viereck (1914) as Cryptus furcator Gravenhorst, 1829, and the same author has pointed out that Cratocryptus Thomson with the same genotype is a synonym.

Difficulty, however, arises in the separation of this genus from that most frequently known as *Microcryptus* Thomson (1873); in fact *M. erythrinus* (Grav.) and *M. lacteator* (Grav.) are placed in the present genus under Thomson's generic name in such a recent work as that of N. F. Meyer (1933). If this action is supported, and it may well be correct judging from the descriptions only, a further complication arises in that *M. erythrinus* (Grav.) is the monobasic genotype of *Microcryptus*, which name therefore would become another synonym of *Chaeretymma*.

I am not proposing this new synonymy here as I have not yet had an opportunity of examining specimens of *M. erythrinus*, and for the present I am leaving both the species mentioned together with the closely allied *sperator* (Grav. 1829) in the old genus *Microcryptus*. In any case recent authors use *Pezoporus* Foerster, 1868, for *Microcryptus*, but as will be seen below this name is preoccupied.

Aptesis Foerster, 1850, Arch. Naturgesch. 16 (1): 71.

Pezoporus Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 181, nec Illiger, 1811, nec Klug, 1842. Microcryptus Thomson, C. G., 1873, Opusc. ent. 5: 520.

Microcryptus Thomson, 1873, has Cryptus erythrinus Grav., 1829, for genotype and as shown above may possibly become a synonym of Chaeretymma Foerster, 1868. Viereck (1914) has indicated that Pezoporus Foerster, 1868, with the monobasic genotype Ichneumon nigrocinctus Grav., 1815, should in any case be used for Thomson's genus. In fact this name has received a limited recognition amongst recent authors. It is overlooked, however, that it is preoccupied by Illiger in 1811 in the Aves and by Klug in 1842 in the Coleoptera.

Aptesis Foerster, 1850, of which the genotype was selected by Viereck (1914) as Ichneumon sudeticus Grav., 1815, has been used as a separate genus in the days when brachyptery was regarded as a generic character and subsequently, oddly enough, it was used as a subgenus of the more recent Microcryptus. I propose to use the Foersterian name in place of Microcryptus and instead of the preoccupied Pezoporus, over both of which it has priority. I believe the genotype I. sudeticus is conspecific with I. nigrocinctus, the genotype of Pezoporus.

It should be remembered that Aptesis has been used by many older authors in a very loose sense to include several widely different brachypterous Cryptines, and that as now applied it will be restricted to the brachypterous nigrocinctus group and to the congeneric macropterous species hitherto ranged under Microcryptus. It may be noted in passing that brachyptery in these insects is restricted to the female sex.

6. Agrothereutes Foerster, 1850, Arch. Naturgesch. 16 (1): 71.

Gambrus Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 188. Spilocryptus Thomson, C. G., 1873, Opusc. ent. 5: 501.

It is doubtful if there is any difference of generic value between Gambrus and Spilocryptus: indeed they are often regarded as subgenera only. Viereck (1914) has designated Pezoporus abbreviator (Grav. 1829), which seems to be the same insect as Ichneumon abbreviator Fabricius, 1793, as the genotype of Agrothereutes. This is congeneric with Spilocryptus hospes (Tscheck, 1870)

(= Spilocryptus zygaenarum Thomson, 1873), the type of Spilocryptus Thomson, 1873, and Agrothereutes therefore has priority over Thomson's name.

- Exolytus Foerster, 1858, in Holmgren, Svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl. 15: 328.
   Mesoleptus (Gravenhorst) Viereck, 1914, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 83: 93.
- Mesoleptus Gravenhorst, 1829, Ich. Eur. 2:3.
   Mesoleptidea Viereck, 1912, Proc. ent. Soc. Washington 14:176.

Viereck (1914) has pointed out that the genotype of Mesoleptus Gravenhorst, 1829, is Ichneumon laevigatus Gravenhorst, 1820, by designation of Curtis (1837). This species is also the monobasic genotype of Exolytus Foerster and accordingly the two names would be synonymous, the Stilpnine genus being known as Mesoleptus Grav. and the Tryphonine genus taking the name Mesoleptidea Viereck, 1912.

As Mesoleptus is the typical genus of the Mesoleptini and because these changes of name will cause much confusion. I consider that it would be advisable to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to suspend the rules in this case by invalidating Curtis's selection of the genotype. Westwood (1840) selected Mesoleptus narrator Grav., 1829, as genotype which hardly helps matters, as this species appears to belong to another genus. The genotype of Mesoleptuae Viereck, 1912, which would be a synonym of Mesoleptus if my suggestion is followed, is Mesoleptus cingulatus Grav., 1829, by original designation, and this might serve as the genotype of Gravenhorst's old genus.

I might add that Curtis appears to have had no very clear idea of *Mesoleptus* and his folio (no. 644) is very confused; at least part of his generic characters are taken from his new species *Mesoleptus waltoni*, which is a synonym of *Catoglyptus fuscicornis* (Gmelin, 1790) according to Morley (1911).

- Lampronola Curtis, 1832, Brit. Entom. 9: 407.
   Meniscus Schioedte, 1839, Mag. de Zool. 9: 10.
- 10. Cylloceria Schioedte, 1838, Rev. zool. (Soc. Cuv.): 140. Lampronota auctt. nec Curtis, 1832.

There is some confusion between the names Lampronota Curtis, 1832, Meniscus Schioedte, 1839, Cylloceria Schioedte, 1838, and Xenacis Foerster, 1868. The genotype of Lampronota Curtis (Viereck erroneously states monobasic) is Ichneumon setosus Geoffroy in Fourcroy, 1785, by original designation. This species is always regarded as belonging to Meniscus, and congeneric with the genotype of the latter, Ichneumon catenator Panzer, 1804. Meniscus Schioedte, 1839, will therefore become a synonym of the prior Lampronota Curtis, 1832. Viereck (1914), who points out the above details, goes on to comment that Lampronota auctt. nec Curtis, 1832, will be replaced by Cylloceria Schioedte, 1838. The type of Cylloceria is designated by Viereck as "(Phytodietus) Cylloceria caligata (Gravenhorst) Schioedte" and his comments are therefore correct in that Cylloceria should replace Lampronota auctt. nec Curtis, but I think his inclusion of Xenacis Foerster, 1868, as a synonym of Cylloceria must be due to a mistake caused by the fact that Gravenhorst described three species of PIMPLINAE under the specific name of caligatus. One is the above-quoted Phytodietus caligatus Gravenhorst, 1829 (Ich. Eur. 2: 936) and another is Lissonota caligata Grav., 1829 (Ich. Eur. 3: 38). The latter is

the monobasic genotype of *Xenacis* Foerster, 1868. Le have no evidence that these two references represent the same species and I therefore infer that *Xenacis* should be maintained as distinct from *Cylloceria*.

- 11. Cteniscus Haliday, 1836, in Curtis, Guide Brit. Ins. ed. 2:98, and
- 12. Exenterus Hartig, 1837, Arch. Naturgesch. 3 (1): 156.

Westwood (1840) designated Tryphon (Cteniscus) curtisii Haliday, 1838, as the genotype of Cteniscus Haliday, 1836. The monobasic genotype of Exenterus Hartig, 1837, is Tryphon marginatorius Gravenhorst, 1829 (= Ichneumon marginatorius Fabricius, 1793). If authors are correct in placing these two species in Exenterus, then it follows that that genus must take the name Cteniscus Haliday, and Cteniscus of authors will require a new name in the event of the two genera being maintained as distinct.

According to Morley (1911: 204) however (who places the two genera together under *Exenterus*), there is a prior citation by Curtis, overlooked by Viereck (1914), of *Cteniscus aurifluus* Haliday, 1838, as the genotype of *Cteniscus*.<sup>1</sup>

Curtis's citation retains the status quo undisturbed, but whether his designation can be accepted I do not know, since it was made in 1832 prior to the appearance of Cteniscus in the second edition of Curtis's Guide and before the genus was described by Haliday in 1838.

Personally I am inclined to regard the genus *Cteniscus* as dating from 1832 (Haliday in Curtis), and *C. aurifluus* Haliday is therefore the genotype by original designation.

13. Diadegma Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 153.

No species was included in this genus by Foerster, but in 1908 Morley placed in this genus the single new species Diadegma anomala Morley, 1908, which has therefore been accepted as the type of Foerster's genus. It appears, however, that a year previously (1907) Schmiedeknecht adopted Campoplex crassicornis Gravenhorst, 1829, as the type of this genus. Morley (1914:169) refers to this matter again and places Campoplex crassicornis Grav. in the genus Meloboris Holmgren, 1858. It would appear that Morley's use of the name Diadegma is invalid but the affinities of his insect are so doubtful that its correct placing must await further study.

 Eustiphrosomus nom. nov. pro Stiphrosomus Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 198, nec Fieber, 1858.

The name Stiphrosomus Foerster, 1868, is preoccupied by that of Fieber, 1858, proposed for a genus of Hemiptera. I therefore propose Eustiphrosomus n. n. to replace the invalid name of Foerster. The genotype is Ichneumon fuscicornis Gmelin, 1790, by designation of Viereck (1914).

 Phobetellus nom. nov. pro Phobetus Thomson, C. G., 1889, Opusc. Ent. fasc. 13: 1430, nec Leconte, 1856.

The name *Phobetus* of Thomson is preoccupied by that of Leconte proposed for a genus of Coleoptera. The name *Phobetes* Foerster, 1868, is not available

 $^{\text{t.}}$  Curtis 1832 : 399, '' Mr. Haliday has discovered two new species [of Tryphon], one T. aurifluus (the type of his proposed subgenus Cteniscus) occurs on Willows from July to Sept.; ''

as it appears to apply to a distinct genus defined by Davis (1897) on a single North American species (Viereck 1914). I therefore propose the name *Phobetellus* to replace that of Thomson. The genotype is *Tryphon fuscicornis* Holmgren, 1854, by designation of Viereck (1914).

 Ipoctoninus nom. nov. pro Ipoctonus Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Ver. Rheinl. 25: 199, nec Heine, 1860.

The name *Ipoctonus* of Foerster is preoccupied by that of Heine used for a genus of Birds. Heine's name is an emendation for *Dendropicos* Malherbe, 1849, but *Opinion* 148 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature rules that names are to be rejected as homonyms if predated by emendations of earlier names. I therefore propose the name *I poctoninus* n. n. to replace that of Foerster. The genotype is *Ichneumon chrysostomus* Gravenhorst, 1820, designated by Viereck (1914).

 Otlophorinus nom. nov. pro Otlophorus Schmiedeknecht, 1914, Opusc. Ich.: 2867, nec Foerster. 1868.

Viereck (1914) has designated Tryphon vepretorum Gravenhorst, 1829, as the genotype of Otlophorus Foerster, and in this he appears to be correct since Thomson (1894), the first to revise Foerster's genus, included vepretorum under his section 6 of Mesoleius (Otlophorus). Schmiedeknecht seems to be the next author revising the group and he states that vepretorum should be referred to Protarchus Foerster, 1868. Protarchus has page priority and Otlophorus Foerster therefore becomes a synonym. Schmiedeknecht's genus is without a name, and in order to supply this deficiency I propose Otlophorinus n. n. and hereby select Mesoleius pulverulentus Holmgren, 1855, as genotype.

 Prospudaea nom. nov. pro Spudaea Foerster, 1868, Verh. naturh. Rheinl. 25: 211, nec Snellen, 1867.

Spudaea Foerster is invalidated by the prior use of the name by Snellen in the Lepidoptera. The emendation Spudaeus Thomson, 1883, of Foerster's name is antedated by Spudaeus Gistl, 1848, and Spudaeus Dallas, 1851. I therefore propose Prospudaea n. n. to take the place of Foerster's name. The monobasic genotype is cited as Trematopygus (Spudaea) clypearis Brischke, 1888, by Viereck (1914).

19. Therion Curtis, 1829-30, Guide Brit. Ins. (4): 101.

Therion Curtis, 1839, Brit. Entom. 16: 736. Exochilum Wesmael, 1849, Bull. Acad. Roy. Bruxelles 16(2): 119.

I do not know why Viereck (1914) and other authors have given preference to Wesmael's name when *Therion* Curtis, clearly has priority. The two genera are isogenotypic, having *Ichneumon circumflexus* Linnaeus, 1758, for type, by designation of Curtis (1839) in the case of *Therion*. The genus *Exochilum* is monobasic. In my opinion *Therion* Curtis, should be reinstated.

20. Anomalon Jurine, 1807, N. Méth. class. Hyménopt.: 114.

Paranomalon Viereck, 1912, Proc. ent. Soc. Wash. 14: 175.

Anomalon is the typical genus of the Anomalonini. According to Viereck (1914) the genotype is *Ichneumon laetatorius* Fabricius, 1781, and the genus is therefore identified with *Bassus* auctt. nec Fabricius [1804-5]. If this were

accepted, the genus would be isogenotypic with, and take precedence over, Diplazon Nees, 1818. The group or subfamily name based on Diplazon would also be replaced. Gravenhorst (1829) used the name Anomalon in an entirely different sense and has been followed by almost all authors. In my view considerable inconvenience and confusion would be avoided by retaining Anomalon in Gravenhorst's sense. The designation of Ichneumon laetatorius as genotype was made by Curtis (1828), the first to divide Jurine's composite genus, and Anomalon can only be retained as understood by Gravenhorst (1829) if the International Commission agree to use their plenary powers to that effect.

Paranomalon Viereck, 1912, was proposed to replace Anomalon auctt. nec Jurine.

# 21. Campoplex Gravenhorst, 1829, Ich. Eur. 3: 453.

Campoplegidea Viereck, 1912, Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 42: 633.

Westwood (1840) designated "C. difformis Gr." as the genotype of Campoplex. Gravenhorst's difformis appears to have been a composite species, but at least part of his description applies to Ichneumon difformis Gmelin, 1790, which led Viereck (1914) to cite the genotype as (Ichneumon) Campoplex difformis (Gmelin) Gravenhorst. Angitia rufipes Gravenhorst, 1829, appears also to be partly included with difformis by Gravenhorst.

Ichneumon difformis is usually placed in the genus Omorga Thomson, 1887 (= Omorgus Foerster, 1868, nec Erichson, 1847) and Viereck therefore states that Campoplex Grav. [= Omorgus (Foerster) Thomson]. Meyer (1935) has recently treated difformis as belonging to Eulimneria Schmiedeknecht, 1907 (= Limneria Thomson, 1887, nec Adams, 1851, nec Holmgren, 1858). Should this position be correct, it would be necessary to replace Eulimneria by Campoplex.

Since Viereck (1912) has designated Limneria mutabilis Holmgren, 1858, as the genotype of Omorgus Foerster, 1868, and if the position of this species as a Eulimneria as indicated by Meyer is correct, then on the basis of its genotype also Omorga (Omorgus Fst.) becomes a synonym of Campoplex Grav.

Campoplegidea was proposed by Viereck (1912) to take the place of Campoplex auctt. nec Grav., but it seems very necessary that before this can be adopted these genera of the Campoplegini should be re-examined in respect to the various genotypes proposed.

In my opinion Westwood's designation of Gravenhorst's difformis should be rejected on account of its composite nature, and as Viereck's citation of Campoplex oxyacanthae Boie., 1855, as the genotype of Campoplegidea represents a species not originally included in Campoplex, it should also be rejected in favour of a new designation which would preserve this well-known genus Campoplex as usually understood.

 Sagaritopsis nom. nov. pro Sagaritis Holmgren, 1858, K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl. 2 (8): 43, nec Huebner, [1821].

The generic name Sagaritis Holmgren, is preoccupied by that of Huebner used for a Lepidopterous genus. I therefore propose the name Sagaritopsis n. n. to replace that of Holmgren. The genotype is Campoplex declinator Gravenhorst, 1829 = Ichneumon dilatator Thunberg, 1822, by original designation.

23. Absyrtus Holmgren, 1858, K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl. 2:32.-

This name has been previously used by Rafinesque in 1815, but since the latter appears to be a nomen nudum it will not be necessary to replace Holmgren's name. The emendation Absyrtes proposed by Brischke in 1880 is invalid and the name has in any case been previously used by Guenée in 1857.

24. Porizon Fallén, 1813, Spec. nov. Hymenopt. (2): 18. Thersilochus Holmgren, 1858, K. svenska Vetensk. Akad. Handl. 2 (8): 135.

The monobasic genotype of *Porizon* is *Ichneumon moderator* Linnaeus, 1758, according to Viereck (1914), and this species being a species of *Thersilochus*, it becomes necessary to replace that genus by *Porizon*. *Porizon* auctt. nec Fallén was renamed *Porizonidea* by Viereck (1914).

I am personally inclined to accept the position required by the application of the rules and not to ask the Commission to use their plenary powers in this case, since both genera belong to the same group, the Porizonini, and the changes involve little inconvenience.

#### EURYTOMIDAE.

Eudecatoma Ashmead, 1888, Ent. Amer. 4: 42.

Decatoma auctt. nec Spinola, 1811, Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. (Paris) 17: 151.

In 1904 Ashmead designated Chrysis adonidum Rossi, 1790, as the genotype of Decatoma Spinola. Dalla Torre (1898) places this species as a synonym of Eurytoma aterrima (Schrank, 1781). If the specific synonymy is correct, Decatoma Spinola becomes a synonym of Eurytoma Illiger, 1807, to which genus aterrima now belongs. Decatoma as understood by modern authors will thus require another name. Balduf (1932, Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 79, art. 28:4) revised the North American species of the genus but failed to notice this matter. The only synonym of Decatoma he mentions is Eudecatoma Ashmead, and this is available to replace Decatoma of authors.

The genotype of Ashmead's genus is the American Decatoma batatoides Ashmead—monobasic, through subsequent reference, according to Gahan and Fagan (1923).

### ENCYRTIDAE.

26. Mayrencyrtus nom. nov. pro Liothorax Mayr, 1875, Verh. zool. bot. Wien 25: 728, nec Motschulsky, 1860.

Liothorax Mayr is preoccupied by Liothorax Motschulsky proposed in 1860 for a genus of Coleoptera. I therefore propose Mayrencyrtus n. n. to replace the invalid name of Mayr. The monobasic genotype is Encyrtus glaphyra Walker, 1837.

#### PTEROMALIDAE.

 Euamblymerus nom. nov. pro Amblymerus Walker, 1834, Ent. Mag. 2:303 (partim).

The genotype of Amblymerus Walker, 1834, is A. amoenus Walker, 1834, by designation of Westwood (1840). Unfortunately Eutelus dilectus Walker, 1834, is the genotype of Eutelus Walker, 1834, by designation of the same author and this species is a synonym of Amblymerus amoenus. The transfer of amoenus

to Euselus (to which genus it appears to belong) as the valid name for E. dilectus will necessitate the use of Amblymerus in place of Euselus and the substitution of Eusenblymerus n. n. for Amblymerus Walker, partim.

Ashmead (1904) overlooked Westwood's citation of the genotype of Amblymerus and designated Amblymerus dubius Walker, 1834, which may be accepted

as the genotype of the present genus.

Neopolycelis nom. nov. pro Polycelis Thomson, C. G., 1878, Hym. Scandin.
 143, nec Ehrenberg, 1831.

Polycelis is already in use by Ehrenberg, 1831, for a genus of Vermes. The emendation of Ashmead proposed in 1894 to Polyscelis and adopted by Dalla Torre (1898) is also preoccupied by the emendation of Ehrenberg's name proposed by Girard in 1850. I therefore suggest the name Neopolycelis n. n. to replace that of Thomson.

The genotype is Pteromalus conspersus Walker, 1835.

#### MYMARIDAE.

29. Mymar Curtis, 1832, Brit. Entom. 9: 411.

The name Mymar first appeared in Curtis's Guide (4) (1829–30:112) as Mymar Hal[iday]. Haliday described it in 1833, but Curtis had previously (1832) described and figured the genus and listed 20 species. The list was stated to be based on Walker's notes, but the description of the genus is undoubtedly Curtis's own work and it should be credited to him rather than to Haliday (who probably first recognised it), Walker, or Walker in Curtis, as is done by various authors.

Curtis designated Ichneumon punctum Shaw, 1798, as the genotype, and subsequently Westwood (1840) cited Mymar pulchellus Curtis. 1832, as the type. If Curtis's prior selection were accepted, Mymar would have to be used instead of Anaphes Haliday, 1833, which is isogenotypic with it, having I. punctum as its genotype. This synonymy is adopted by Gahan and Fagan (1923). Thus the genus Mymar of authors would require another name, perhaps either Flabrinus Rondani, 1877, or Mymarilla Westwood, 1879, being substituted for it. However, Curtis, in describing the genus Mymar, also figured and described M. pulchellus Curtis, and he states underneath his generic description "Obs. The dissections and descriptions are taken from the species figured", I therefore consider, since Ichneumon punctum does not belong to the same genus as M. pulchellus on which Curtis based his generic diagnosis, being described as an Anaphes by Haliday in 1833, that Curtis was incorrect in selecting Shaw's species as the genotype of his genus. Westwood's designation of M. pulchellus is therefore valid and should be followed as hitherto.

#### PLATYGASTERIDAE.

# 30. Ectadius gynomamertes nom. nov.

Platygaster mamertes Walker, 1835, Ent. Mag. 3: 227, female only.

In 1835 Walker described *Platygaster mamertes* from male specimens taken by himself and Haliday. He also added the description of a female taken by Haliday which he doubtfully associated with this species.

The male was transferred to Synopeas Foerster, 1856. by Marshall (1873, Cat. Brit. Hymenopt. Oxyura: 19) and the female was also doubtfully referred

to the same position. Kieffer (1926) retained the male in Synopeas but placed the female in Ectadius Foerster, 1856, using the specific name mamertes Walker for both species.

In following Kieffer's arrangement it will be necessary to rename the female placed in Ectadius and I therefore propose the name gynomamertes n. n. for Platygaster mamertes Walker, 1835, 2, nec 3.

### References.

ASHMEAD, W. H., 1904, Classification of the Chalcid Flies or the superfamily Chalcidoidea. Mem. Carnegie Mus. 1:337. Curtis, J., 1824-40, British Entomology, 16 vols., 770 col. plts.

Dalla Torre, C. G. de, 1898, Catalogus Hymenopterorum 5: 1-598.

DAVIS, G. C., 1897, A Review of the Ichneumonid Subfamily TRYPHONINAE. Trans. Amer. ent. Soc. 24: 193-348.

Fahringer, J., 1925, Opuscula Braconologica 1.

GAHAN, A. B., and FAGAN, M. M., 1923, The Type species of the Genera of Chalcid-oidea or Chalcid-flies. Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 124: 1-173.

HINCKS, W. D., 1943a, Nomenclature of two species of APHIDIIDAE (Hym.). Ent. mon. Mag. 79: 44.

-, 1943b, Nomenclature notes on Braconidae and Aphididae (Hym.). Entomologist 76: 97-104.

1943c, Further nomenclature notes on Braconidae and Aphididae (Hym.). Entomologist 76: 221-224.

, 1944a, On the status of the names Aphidius Nees, 1818, and Incubus Schrank, 1802 (Insecta, Hymenoptera Apocrita, APHIDIIDAE). Bull. zool. Nomencl. (in

, 1944b, A note on the Nomenclature of some Microgasterine Braconidae (Hym.) with reference to the works of Haliday and Nees von Esenbeck published in 1834. Ent. Record 56: 19-20.
Kieffer, J. J., 1926, Scelionidae in Das Tierreich 48: 885, Berlin and Leipzig.

MEYER (MEYER), N. F., 1933-36, Tableaux analytiques de la faune de l'U.R.S.S., publiés par l'Institut zoologique de l'Academie des Sciences. Tables systématiques des Hyménoptères parasites (fam. ICHNEUMONIDAE) de l'U.R.S.S. et des pays limitrophes. Tabl. anal. Fn. U.R.S.S., Pts. I-VI, 1933-6. [In Russian.] MORLEY, C., 1908-14, British Ichneumous 3-5.

Schmiedeknecht, O., 1906-27, Opuscula Ichneumonologica. Blankenberg-i-Thüringen. 3-5.

Shenefelt, R. D., 1943, The genus Atanycolus Foerster in America north of Mexico. Research Studies State Coll. Washington 11:51-163.

THOMSON, C. G., 1894, Opuscula Entomologica. Lund. VIERECK, H. L., 1914, Type Species of the Genera of Ichneumon-flies. Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 83: 1-186.

, 1921, First Supplement to "Type species of the genera of Ichneumon-flies." Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 59: 129-150.

Westwood, J. O., 1840, An Introduction to the Modern Classification of Insects: 2, Synopsis of the Genera of British Insects: 1-158.