

**SYNONYMIC AND TAXONOMIC NOTES ON SOME CHALCIDOIDEA
(HYMENOPTERA), WITH CORRECTIONS OF MY OWN MISTAKES**

by

ZDENĚK BOUČEK

(Department of Entomology, National Museum, Praha)

This contribution contains notes on synonymy and new classification of certain Chalcid flies, mostly from the Palaearctic Region, but also from Ceylon (some Motschulsky's species) and from elsewhere. The notes have accumulated through last few years and, as it would probably take several more years yet before the groups in question are revised, they are published in this short fragmentary form. Some of these notes are mere explanations of the nomenclatorial or taxonomic changes that have been already published elsewhere.

Family CHALCIDIDAE

Hockeria fumipennis* (Walker)Halticella fumipennis* Walker, 1871, Notes on Chalcididae, p. 42; ♂.*Hockeria masii* Bouček, 1952, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 27, Suppl. 1: 72; ♀.*Hockeria fumipennis*: Nikolskaja, 1960, Fauna SSSR, N. S., 76: 130.

Before I published my paper of 1952 I sent specimens of the species considered by me as new to science to the British Museum for comparison with the types of the Walker species unrecognizable from descriptions. The shipment included also *Hockeria masii* I described then from the Island of Corfu. But several years afterwards this species was recognized by Dr. G. J. Kerrich as being the same as *H. fumipennis* Walk., described from Corsica. Dr. Kerrich kindly let me know about the synonymy in his letter of 5th May 1954, but neither of us had the opportunity of publishing the correction. Only when Mrs. Nikolskaja was preparing her monograph for the Fauna of the USSR, I let her know about the synonymy which was then published, but without explanation.

Family TORYMIDAE

Monodontomerus rugulosus* ThomsonMonodontomerus rugulosus* Thomson, 1876, Hym. Scand., 4: 68.*Monodontomerus gladius* Steffan, 1962, Entomophaga, 7: 181–183; ♀♂. **N. syn.**

Thanks to the kindness of my friend Dr. Steffan of Paris I received one paratype of his recently described *M. gladius*. I found it identical with *M. rugulosus* Thomson. The original material of the latter consists of two females, one in better condition than the other, with only the ovipositor broken off and designated as lectotype by the late Dr. A. Jansson of Örebro (the designation not validated by publication), and another female, in a poor condition (without abdomen and the right hind leg). However, only the latter female bears data fitting Thomson's original

statement "funnen i Dalarne af framlidne Prof. Boheman", namely "Dlc" (= Dalecarlia = Dalarne) and "Bhn" (= Boheman). I designate it as lectotype of *rugulosus*, although both specimens belong to the same species.

In spite of their poor condition, especially the lack of the characteristic short ovipositor, the two specimens undoubtedly belong to the same species as *gladius*, mainly by reason of the characters of the antennae, scutellum, propodeum, hind legs and forewings. The species has a distinctly reticulate-alutaceous scutellar frenum like *M. aereus* Walker and *obscurus* Westwood. The latter one is a slender species with slender antennae, quite different from *rugulosus*, which differs from *aereus* mainly by the still broader and shorter antennae, with funicle segments distinctly more transverse, by a longer scutellum, dull and obliquely reticulate-striate sublateral areas of the propodeum, more distinctly infumate wings under the stigmal vein, etc., as partly stressed already by Steffan, 1962, with his *gladius*.

M. rugulosus was described from Sweden, *gladius* from France and the species is known to me also from Austria: Wien-Mauer, 16. VIII. 1953 (Fulmek lgt.).

I wish to thank to Dr. Steffan for permission to publish the new synonymy.

Monodontomerus obscurus Westwood

Monodontomerus obscurus Westwood, 1833, Philos. Mag. (3), 2: 443.

Monodontomerus obscurus var. *steffani* Bouček, 1954, Acta Soc. ent. Česosl., 51: 64—66; ♀. **N. syn.**

The variety *steffani* was based on differences from the redescription of *M. obscurus*, but I now see that they are all within the range of variation of one species and a special name for it does not seem justified.

Paraholaspis amygdali (Bouček), comb. n.

Plastotorymus amygdali Bouček, 1958, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 32: 583—586; ♀♂.

The change of *Paraholaspis* Masi, 1921 (Ann. Mus. civ. St. nat. Genova, 49: 168—169) to *Plastotorymus* Masi, 1921 (ibidem, p. 235) was unnecessary, as the first name was not preoccupied by *Parholaspis* Berlese, 1918. I used again *Paraholaspis* for *cothurnata* Masi in 1961 (p. 8) and recently also Steffan (1962, Fragm. ent., 4: 30), for the same species.

Pseuderimerus flavus (Nikolskaja), comb. n.

Ditropinotus flavus Nikolskaja, 1952, Opred. po Faune SSSR, 44: 140; ♀.

Thanks to the kindness of Mrs. Nikolskaja I was enabled to examine one paratype of her *D. flavus*, from Tadzhikistan, Obi Garm, ex wheat stems, 30. VIII. 1948 (Antova lgt.). In my opinion this species belongs to the genus *Pseuderimerus* Gahan, 1919, having antennae shaped differently from *Ditropinotus*, with basal funicle segments very small, annelli-like, hind femora not serrate beneath, hind tibia with one distinct spur only, etc.

Pseuderimerus flavus (Nik.) is very near to the European *P. luteus* Bouček, 1954, but the whole body in *flavus* is more slender, especially the abdomen which is in the female distinctly longer than head plus thorax, about 3.3 times as long as broad (only at most 2.3 times as long as broad in *luteus*), the protruding ovipositor sheaths are longer, nearly as long as the scutellum, the propodeum is more convex, with carinae indistinct, the coloration of the body paler, etc.

Idarnotorymus pulcher Masi

Idarnotorymus pulcher Masi, 1916, Ann. Mus. civ. St. nat. Genova, 47: 60—63; ♀, — : Erdős, 1963, Beitr. z. Ent., 13: 283—285.
Stanezia elongata Bouček, 1955, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 30: 307—310; ♀♂.

S. elongata described by me was recently synonymized by Dr. Erdős with *I. pulcher*. Although I have not yet seen the type of *pulcher* (neither has Dr. Erdős), the description suggests that the synonymy may be correct. In my opinion however, the species belongs to the Monodontomerinae and not to the Idarninae where it was classified by Masi and by Erdős. It has nothing to do with Idarninae, either in morphology, or in biology (and that was why *I. pulcher* escaped my attention).

I. pulcher is now known from Italy, Czechoslovakia and Central Asia, Uzbekistan: Kara Tepe near Samarkand, VI. 1959 (Diabola lgt.).

Family EURYTOMIDAE

Tetramesa testacea (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Eucharis? testacea Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 44.

The type of this species described from Ceylon is a male of the family Eurytomidae, in my opinion of the genus *Tetramesa* Walker (= *Harmolita* Motschulsky).

Tetramesa ventricosa (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Eulophus ventricosus Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 63; "♂".

This species also was described from Ceylon. According to its type specimen, which is a female with antennae broken off, it belongs to the genus *Tetramesa* Walker. The type is preserved, together with the other Motschulsky types of Chalcidoidea, in the Zoological Museum of the Moscow University, where I was able to examine it thanks to Prof. A. N. Zhelokhovtsev (Želochovcev).

Family EUPELMIDAE

Eupelmus zangherii Masi

Eupelmus Zangherii Masi, 1946, Boll. Soc. ent. Ital., 76: 27—28; ♀.
Eupelmus alboannelatus Belanovskij in Belanovskij et Djadečko, 1951, Dopovidi Akad. Nauk Ukraïn. RSR, 4: 293; ♀♂. **N. syn.**

The type material of *alboannelatus* (a species described in the Ukrainian language and not recorded by the Zoological Record) is preserved in the Zoological Institute of the Academy of Sciences in Leningrad, where

I was enabled to examine it in 1961. It proves that *alboannelatus* is synonymous with *E. zangherii* described from Italy. The species is probably distributed throughout southern and eastern Europe. It is known to me from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, the Moldavian SSR and the Ukrainian SSR. In the Ukraine this *Eupelmus* was reared from the Cecidomyid *Stenodiplosis panici* Rod. It probably attacks more than one species of these midges. I have swept it often in numbers from *Panicum* and *Polygonum*, once in southern Slovakia very abundantly in a rice field. Also Dr. Erdős observed it on *Polygonum* in Hungary.

Eupelmus stramineipes Nikolskaja

Eupelmus stramineipes Nikolskaja, 1952, Opred. po Faune SSSR, 44: 498; ♀♂.

Eupelmus velenceensis Erdős, 1955, Allat. Közlemenyek, 45: 35, 36, 45; ♀♂. N. syn.

During my recent stay in Leningrad I was enabled to see the types of *E. stramineipes* and was allowed, thanks to the kindness of Dr. Nikolskaja, to compare one paratype of that species with my Central European material of *velenceensis*. They proved to belong to the same species.

E. stramineipes was briefly described from Central Asia (the syntype at my disposal comes from Tashkent district, 15. VII. 1932, lgt. Veltyashtshev) and probably therefore its description had not been noticed by Dr. Erdős, who described his *velenceensis* from Hungary.

The marginal vein of the forewing is not twice as long as the postmarginal one as stated in the description of *stramineipes*, but a little longer: in the mentioned syntype the relation between the two veins is 29: 12.

This species is known to me also from Czechoslovakia and the Ukrainian SSR (Bugaz in the mouth of the Dniestr). *E. stramineipes* is associated with *Phragmites*, as stressed already by Erdős, 1955.

Eupelmus testaceiventris (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Roctrocerus testaceiventris Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 49.

The type of this species is a female of the genus *Eupelmus* Dalman. *E. testaceiventris* belongs close to *E. linearis* Förster, *E. zangherii* Masi, *E. popa* Girault, etc. Described from Ceylon.

Family PTEROMALIDAE

Mnoonema timida Motschulsky

Mnoonema timida Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 60, pl. II, fig. 15.

The genus *Mnoonema* Motschulsky, 1863 (*ibidem*, pp. 59—60) certainly belongs to the subfamily Cleonyminae, tribe Cleonymini, to the close vicinity of *Cleonymus* Latreille, 1809, *Ptinobius* Ashmead, 1896, and *Paracleonymus* Masi, 1926. The type specimen of *M. timida* is a male and therefore it is difficult to place it correctly generically. The wings are completely pubescent as in the named genera, the stigmal vein is straight, only half as long as the postmarginal one which is only slightly shorter

than the long marginal vein (relations as 7:14:18). I have seen a female close to *timida* from Formosa (unfortunately with antennae broken off), which might be considered a true *Cleonymus* or a genus very near to it. In spite of this I deem that it is better to take *Mnoonema*, for the time being, as a validly different genus.

Anysis Howard

Cephaleta Motschulsky, 1859, Etudes ent., 8: 173. **N. syn.**

Type (des. by Ashmead, 1904): *Cephaleta purpureiventris* Motschulsky.

Cardiogaster Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 72. **N. syn.**

Type (by monotypy): *Cardiogaster fusciventris* Motschulsky.

Anysis Howard, 1896, Canad. Ent., 29: 167.

Type (by monotypy): *Anysis australiensis* Howard.

Eurycephalus Ashmead, 1903, Ind. Mus. Notes, 5: 61.

Type (by monotypy): *Eurycephalus alcocki* Ashmead.

Eurycranium Ashmead, 1904, Mem. Carnegie Mus., 1: 326, 375. (N. name for *Eurycephalus* Ashm., preocc. in Coleoptera in 1832).

As I am explaining below under *Anysis saissetiae* both *Cephaleta* and *Cardiogaster* (according to the lectotypes) are synonymous with *Anysis*.

Cephaleta Motschulsky, 1859, *Cardiogaster* Motschulsky, 1863, *Scutellista* Motschulsky, 1859, *Muscidea* Motschulsky, 1863, and *Solenoderus* Motschulsky, 1863, were classified by their author in 1863 (pp. 69—73) as "Muscidides", in contradistinction to "Ptéromalides". Dalla Torre, 1898, in his Catalogus Hymenopterorum (vol. 5, p. 87) mentions them under "Subfam. dubia Muscideinae", while Ashmead, 1904 (pp. 325—326), classifies them all as Eunotinae, where they have remained up to now. But *Muscidea*, considered a probable synonym of *Anysis* by Masi, 1931 (pp. 439—440), belongs to Telenominae, Scelionidae, according to the type of its type-species *M. pubescens* Motschulsky, 1863 (as recognized correctly already before me by Dr. V. A. Trjapicyn of Leningrad, who is preparing a paper on all Motschulsky's Chalcid types). Consequently Muscideinae must be regarded as synonymous with Telenominae (new synonymy!). *Scutellista* and *Anysis* (= *Cephaleta*, = *Cardiogaster*) belong all right to Eunotinae, but *Solenoderus* Motsch. is a synonym to *Tetrastichus* Haliday, 1843 (new synonymy!). The type-species *Solenoderus cyaniventris* Motschulsky, 1863, according to its type specimen belongs to the *miser*-group (classified under *Aprostocetus* Westw. in Graham, 1961).

Anysis saissetiae (Ashmead)

Cephaleta purpureiventris Motschulsky, 1859, Etudes ent., 8: 173; (♂). **N. syn.**

Cephaleta brunniventris Motschulsky, 1859, Etudes ent., 8: 174; (♀). **N. syn.**

Cardiogaster fusciventris Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 72—73;

♀♂. **N. syn.**

Eurycranium saissetiae Ashmead, 1905, Proc. U.S. Natl. Mus., 29: 405.

Thanks to Prof. Zhelokhovtsev of the Moscow University Zool. Museum I was enabled recently to examine the types of *Cephaleta purpureiventris*, *C. brunniventris* and of *Cardiogaster fusciventris*. The type material of all the three species comes from ("*Lecanium*") *Saissetia coffeae* (Walk.), from the island of Ceylon.

The original material of *C. purpureiventris* is represented only by one male, the lectotype, of 1 mm. length. In 1863 Motschulsky mentioned under *Cephaleta* (p. 73): "Le mâle (?) présente les cinq derniers articles des antennes très-longuement flabellés" and figured that specimen in Fig. 14 on a accompanying plate. I have not seen that specimen which in any case would not fit the original description of 1859 (fitting the lectotype) and which may have been an Encyrtid male with branched antennae. Whatever this specimen might be, it is of neither nomenclatorial nor taxonomic importance.

As suspected already by Motschulsky himself (1859, p. 174), *Cephaleta brunniventris* is only the female sex of *purpureiventris*. The original material consists of two females glued to one small carton card. One specimen is without head, so I designate the female with head (but with antennae broken off except for the left scape) as the lectotype and mark it with a red circle. It is 1.3 mm. in length, while most specimens of *Anysis saissetiae* I have seen are much larger. I was unable, however, to find any morphological or other differences and so I take both *C. purpureiventris* and *brunniventris* as belonging to the same species as *Anysis saissetiae*.

The type material of *Cardiogaster fusciventris* is represented by six specimens glued to three carton cards. It is undoubtedly identical with the Malayan specimens of *Anysis saissetiae* (Ashm.) available to me. Because I could not examine the whole material at the same time I have not designated the lectotype.

The tarsi of all the mentioned specimens are pentamerous, not tetramerous as stated by Motschulsky.

I consider it reasonable to retain the name *Anysis saissetiae* for this economically important species, because this is a well-known and widely accepted name, especially in economic entomology. The Motschulsky names, on the other hand, have not been used correctly since the description and may be considered forgotten names, especially *Cephaleta*. *Cardiogaster* was used in some references, e. g. by Burks, 1958, in the Supplement to the Synoptic Catalogue of the Hymenoptera of America North of Mexico, for the Eulophid genus *Euderomphale* Girault, on the authority of the late A. B. Gahan, as explained by Compere and Annecke, 1961 (p. 65). Gahan did not see, however, the types of *Cardiogaster*, but based his opinion on *Euderomphale* specimens from India identified as *Cardiogaster* (incorrectly).

***Vrestovia fidenas* (Walker), comb. n.**

Gastrancistrus Fidenas Walker, 1848, List Spec. Hym. Ins. Coll. Brit. Mus. 2, Chalc., pp. 157—158; ♂.

Vrestovia clypealis Bouček, 1961, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 34: 80—82; ♀♂. **N. syn.**

In 1962 I examined the type of *Gastrancistrus fidenas* in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) and found it to be the same species as *Vrestovia clypealis* I described shortly before from Czechoslovakia. The Walker type (one male) comes from England.

Isoplata geniculata (Zetterstedt), comb. n.

Entedon geniculatus Zetterstedt, 1838, Ins. Lapponica, 1: 430 (recte 428); ♂.

Pteromalus celer Förster, 1841, Beitr. Monogr. Pteromal., p. 14; ♀. **N. syn.**

Isoplata geniculata Förster, 1856, Hym. Stud., 2: 62.

Isoplata celer: Delucchi, 1956, Mém. Soc. R. ent. Belg., 27: 172.

In 1962 I examined (thanks to the kindness of Dr. H. Andersson) the type of *Entedon geniculatus* Zett. in the Zetterstedt collection in the Zoological Institute in Lund, Sweden. The type is a well preserved male of *Isoplata*, a species baptized by Förster by chance also *geniculata*. Dr. M. W. R. de V. Graham of Oxford independently also discovered this synonymy.

Platneptis laeta (Walker), comb. n.

Pteromalus Laeta Walker, 1848, List Spec. Hym. Ins. Coll. Brit. Mus., 2, Chalc., pp. 125, 199—200; ♀.

Platneptis maceki Bouček, 1961, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 34: 84—86; ♀. **N. syn.**

I have seen the type of *P. laeta* (also spelled: *loeta*) in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) in London in 1962 and it is the same species as *Platneptis maceki* described by me from Czechoslovakia. As well as *Gastrancistrus fidenas* mentioned above the Walker species has neither been studied, nor redescribed, nor mentioned (except for catalogue works) since its description.

Hyperimerus Girault

Hyperimerus Girault, 1917, Descr. Hym. Variorum cum Observationibus, III, p. 5.

Type (orig. design.): *Hyperimerus corvus* Girault.

Mespilon Graham, 1957, Ent. mon. Mag., 92: 406. **N. syn.**

Type (orig. design.): *Mespilon exiguum* Graham.

Thanks to Dr. Burks of Washington I received through exchange two specimens of the North American *Hyperimerus corvus*. It differs from the European *Mespilon exiguum* only in having a distinctly protruding ovipositor, not regarding some small differences, all on specific level, as e. g. the still denser and whitish pubescence on certain parts of the body and the more finely sculptured propodeum. The differences in length of the ovipositor sheaths cannot be taken as a generic character (analogy in *Anogmus* Thoms.). The European species must be called then *Hyperimerus exiguus* (Graham), comb. n.

The host of the European species *exiguus* remains unknown. It would be interesting to know it. *H. corvus* is a hyperparasite of a *Pseudococcus* (*citri* Risso) and this record fairly fits the host-relationship of the other Asaphini which are known as hyperparasites of aphids and coccids.

Conomorium patulum (Walker, 1835)

In a paper on the hymenopterous parasites of *Hyphantria cunea* Drury in Czechoslovakia (Bouček et Šedivý, 1954, Zool. ent. Listy, 3: 169—189) I published on p. 179 a figure of a Pteromalid male identified then as *Pteromalus planiscuta* Thoms. It was a mistake, because the male belongs to *Conomorium patulum* (Walk.), the female of which is figured on p. 178 of the same cited paper of 1954.

Capellia Delucchi

Capellia Delucchi, 1958, Boll. Zool. agr. Bachicolt., s. 2, 1: 59.

Type (orig. design.): *Eurydinota rufiventris* Girault.

Hylocomus Graham, 1959, Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent., 13 (6): 107—109. **N. syn.**

Type (orig. design.): *Metopon (Dirhicnus) magnicornis* Thomson.

Quite recently I was enabled to examine the type-species of *Capellia*, *C. rufiventris* (Grlt.). It clearly belongs to the same genus as the two European species classified as *Hylocomus* by Graham, 1959 (the paper where *Hylocomus* is described). In my opinion the two genera are synonymous. Also what we know about the biology of the three species confirms this view — all three are associated with *Pinus*: two of them are parasites in resin galls caused by Cecidomyids, the third, *Capellia orneus* (Walker), comb. n., is bound to galls of Lepidoptera on pine shoots (see Bouček, 1959, p. 83).

The other North American species previously known as *Eurydinota lividicarpus* Girault does not belong to *Capellia* (according a female I received through the kindness of Dr. O. Peck of Ottawa), but may be probably best classified with the genus *Spaniopus* Walker, although it slightly differs in the shape of the propodeum [*S. lividicarpus* (Grlt.), comb. n.].

Capellia cecidomyiae (Ratz.), comb. n.

Pteromalus Cecidomyiae Ratzeburg, 1844, Ichneum. d. Forstins., 1: 192—193; ♀♂.

Metopon (Dirhicnus) magnicornis Thomson, 1878, Hym. Scand., 5: 173; ♀♂. — **N. syn.**

Pseudocatolaccus Strandi Masi, 1911, Boll. Lab. Zool. Portici, 5: 206—207; "♂".

Hylocomus magnicornis: Graham, 1959, Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent., 13: 109—111. — —: Bouček, 1961, Acta ent. Mus. Nat. Pragae, 34: 82—83.

In 1961 I synonymized *P. strandi* with *H. magnicornis* but was unaware, until recently, of the host-relationship of the species. In Autumn 1962 Mgr. Ing. W. Kadłubowski of Poznań, Poland, submitted to me for identification one female of this species reared from the small resin galls of *Itonida pini* (DeG.) (often referred to as *Cecidomyia pini*) on pine needles. When the parasite turned to be *H. magnicornis*, I reexamined the type of *Pteromalus cecidomyiae* described by Ratzeburg from the same gall in Germany. They were conspecific!

The Ratzeburg specimen is a male gummed to a small triangular card. Just below the parasite the pin bears a pine needle with the gall of the host, then a small square label "typ", then "Dresden Coll. Reinhard", "28879", a red "Type" label and, in Ratzeburg's handwriting, "*cecidomyiae* Rtz". Most of the labels are of a later origin and suggest that the specimen was donated to Reinhard. Ratzeburg described both sexes of *cecidomyiae* and had many specimens at disposal. His collection being, however, destroyed in Eberswalde, I think it justified the selection of the only remaining syntype (fitting the description) as lectotype. It is a male with abdomen broken off beyond the petiole. It fits well not only Ratzeburg's description, but also Thomson's statement "Mas . . . scapo aeneo . . .", the scapes being dark brown, with a dull metallic tint dorsally. When compared with the males of *Capellia orneus* (Walker), the other European species of the genus, the male of *cecidomyiae* clearly shares specific differences with the female, viz. the richer pubescence of the wings, espe-

cially that of the costal cell and of the basal cell, and the relatively shorter scapus. This is in *cecidomyiae* clearly shorter than the basal part of the rest of antenna from base of pedicellus to apex of the second funicle segment, making in the females at my disposal 0.64, 0.68, 0.70, 0.73, 0.74, 0.76, 0.76 and 0.79 (respectively) of it, while in *orneus* it varies from 0.91 to 1.00. In the latter species the scape in female is often only as long as pedicellus plus anelli plus the first funicle segment.

Apart from the syntype of *cecidomyiae* (designated by me as lectotype) from Germany and the mentioned female from Poland I have seen recently another female reared from *Itonida pini*, again from Poland: Górný Śląsk, 10. V. 1957 [Prof. Kapuscinski]. Further material (only swept specimens) comes from Czechoslovakia (three localities in Bohemia, May-June and September-October), Yugoslavia (Podgora in the Durmitor Mts., VI. 1958, Bouček lgt.) and the U.S.S.R. (Oranienbaum near Leningrad, 15. IX. 1963, Bouček lgt.). *Capellia cecidomyiae* (Ratz.) is thus known from England (Graham, 1959), Norway (Masi, 1911), Sweden (Thomson, 1878), North of the USSR, Germany (Ratzeburg, 1844), Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

Family EULOPHIDAE

Ophelimus Haliday

Ophelimus Haliday, 1843, Trans. ent. Soc. Lond., 3: 300.

Type (des. by Ashmead, 1904): *Eulophus ursidius* Walker.

This genus has been so far very poorly known, although it was made by Ashmead, 1904, the type of the tribe Ophelimini (this name misspelled by Ashmead as Ophelinini, *Ophelinus*, which has been followed by some subsequent authors). For a long time it had been a puzzle to me what this tribe may be like, until 1962, when I was enabled to see the type of *Ophelimus ursidius* (Walker) in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) in London, a species coming from Tasmania. The genus *Ophelimus* proved to be very near and very similar to *Aulogymnus* Förster (= *Olynx* Förster). It differs from the latter practically only in having two funicle segments in the antenna, instead of three. *Ophelimus* Hal. belongs to the subfamily Eulophinae, tribe Elachertini and, if the latter name is found justified as a taxonomic category, the name Ophelimini would be synonymous with it. The degree of development of the second spur of hind tibia has not proved to be a good character for a suprageneric category, neither have the notauli within this subfamily.

In the British Museum specimens of one *Ophelimus* species are classified as two species of a genus called *Ancylaulax* Cameron. I have not been able to find out whether such a genus has been described or not and consider *Ancylaulax* a nomen nudum (otherwise it is a synonym to *Ophelimus* Hal.).

Aulogymnus Förster

Aulogymnus Förster, 1851, Verh. naturh. Ver. preuss. Rheinl., 7: 24.

Type (by monotypy): *Aulogymnus aceris* Förster.

Olynx Förster, 1856, Hym. Stud., 2: 72, 73—74. **N. syn.**

Type (orig. design.): *Ichneumon gallarum* Linné.

Cyniphoctonus Reinhard, 1858, Berlin. ent. Ztschr., 2: 22.

Type (orig. design.): *Ichneumon gallarum* Linné.

Olinx Reinhard, 1858, Berlin. ent. Ztschr., 2: 323. Emendation.

In a recent paper published in the USSR (Bouček, 1961) I used the generic name *Aulogymnus* instead of *Olynx*. Several years before that Ing. Novitzky wrote me that the two names were probably synonymous, as already pointed out by Mayr, 1877 (Verh. zool. bot. Ges. Wien, 27: 161). My own study has confirmed this opinion. I cannot find any justification for taking them as different genera, except perhaps that *Aulogymnus* with the only European species *aceris* Först. is associated with Cynipid galls on *Acer*, while all species attributed to *Olynx* are associated with Cynipid galls on *Quercus* (which might be reflected in a subgeneric subdivision eventually). In *Aulogymnus* the ring segments are a little more distinct, longer than in most *Olynx* (in both genera two in number), the pronotum is larger, longer, the stigmal vein at apex less extended beyond the short uncus, the body partly yellow, etc. But none of these characters provides a clear difference that might be considered as generic. The name *Olynx* is better known than *Aulogymnus*, but also the latter cannot be regarded as forgotten, for it was used in several recent publications (e. g. in Novitzky, 1954, Boll. Lab. Zool. gen. agr. Portici, 33: 152—161, where Novitzky claims that *Aulogymnus aceris* is phytophagous, galligenous!).

***Xanthellum transsylvanicum* Erdős**

Xanthella Szabó-Patayi [?Györfi], 1950, in Móczár et alii, Allathatározó, 1: 389; 2: pl. 108, fig. 9.

Xanthellum neleus: Erdős et Novicky, 1951, Acta biol. Acad. Sci. Hung., 2: 178—180.

Xanthellum neleus var. *transsylvanicum* Erdős, 1951, ibidem, 2: 180.

Xanthellum neleus: Jansson, 1958, Ent. Tidskr., 79: 123—124.

Xanthella transsylvanica: Askew, 1962, Entomologist, 95: 187—188.

The problems connected with the name of this species were mentioned partly by Askew, 1962. But I think that the generic name must be *Xanthellum* Erdős et Novicky, 1951, and not *Xanthella*, as used in Dr. Askew's paper. The name "*Xanthella Szabó-Patayi*" was used for the first time in a Hungarian key, accompanied by a figure, but it is not clear from the book who is the author. Furthermore the name certainly was not published as a new name for the purpose of a scientific record [cf. Art. 8 (2) of the Code]. And, if the name *Xanthella* were valid, then also the specific name *szabopatayi* had to be valid.

***Cirrospilus diallus* Walker, 1838**

In my recent paper (Bouček, 1959), on the European *Cirrospilus* I mentioned under *C. diallus* (p. 176) as a probable synonym also *Eulophus quadrimaculatus* Förster, 1841, synonymized with *elegantissimus* auct. [= *diallus*] already by Reinhard, 1858 (Berlin. ent. Ztschr., 2: 23). Afterwards I examined one female of *diallus* from the Förster collection in Vienna labelled in Förster's handwriting: "*Cirrospilus Tetrastichus elegantissimus* Walk., *Eulophus 4-maculatus* m.!!!", which may be taken as a confirmation of the correctness of the synonymy.

Cirrospilus subviolaceus Thomson

Cirrospilus subviolaceus Thomson, 1878, etc., see Bouček, 1959, p. 180.

Cirrospilus simulator Masi, 1933, Mem. Soc. ent. Ital., 12: 27—28; ♀. **N. syn.**

Cirrospilus luteus Bukowski, 1938, Rev. Ent. URSS., 27: 170; ♂♂. **N. syn.**

In addition to the synonyms of *subviolaceus* mentioned in my paper of 1959 there are two more: *simulator* Masi and *luteus* Bukowski. Thanks to the kindness of Dr. Delfa Guiglia of the Genoa Museo Civico I was enabled in 1961 to examine the type of *simulator*, which is a female of *subviolaceus*. The type material of *luteus* is deposited in Leningrad, in the Zoological Institute of the Academy, where I was enabled to study it in 1961. It represents the pale form of *subviolaceus* Thoms. The statement concerning the relative length of the postmarginal vein in the original description is inaccurate.

Cirrospilus pulcherrimus (Mercet)

In 1959 I mentioned under this species *C. donatellae* Mariani, 1942, as a probable synonym. Later on, Prof. Mariani of Palermo, Sicily, was so kind as to send me for examination one paratype of his *donatellae*. It proved to be the same as *pulcherrimus* and the synonymy to be correct.

Pnigalio subconicus (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Ceranisus? *subconicus* Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 66.

The type of *subconicus*, described from Ceylon, is a female of the genus *Pnigalio* Schrank.

Pediobius viridifrons (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Cirrospilus viridifrons Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 68.

This Singalese species belongs according to its type deposited in the Moscow University Zoological Museum to the genus *Pediobius* Walker.

Pediobius mantiechthrus (Motschulsky), comb. n.

Eulophus mantiechthrus Motschulsky, 1859, Etudes ent., 8: 117.

According to the type material this species belongs to the *epeus*-group of the genus *Pediobius* Walker.

Chrysocharis (Kratochviliana) moravica (Maláč), comb. n.

Kratochviliana moravica Maláč, 1943, Ent. Listy, Brno, 6: 88—91; ♂♂.

Eulophinae sp., Maláč in Kratochvíl, 1943, Acta Soc. Sci. nat. Morav., 15, fasc. 3: 38, 41 (fig. 3).

Because of the inadequate original description it has been impossible for the subsequent authors to recognize the genus *Kratochviliana* and its type-species *moravica* as well. The original material seems to be lost, at least it could not be found in Brno, where Maláč lived. But with the help of the additional data in Kratochvíl, 1943, where also the life history, larval stages and pupa of *moravica* are described, and mainly from a rich material reared by our colleague Ing. M. Čapek from the same host, *Argyresthia laevigatella* H.-Sch. it was possible to determine the species as an

Epilampsis very near to *laricinellae* (Ratzeburg). I synonymized *Epilampsis* Delucchi, 1954, with *Kratochviliana* Maláč, 1943, in Bouček, 1961 (p. 28). By mistake I mentioned there also *K. moravica* Maláč as a synonym of *K. laricinellae* (Ratz.). This is not correct, as *moravica* is a good species. Its differences from *laricinellae* are mentioned in a contemporaneous paper by M.W.R. de V. Graham, in Trans. Soc. Brit. Ent.

Epilampsis Del. is now a synonym to *Kratochviliana* Maláč, but I agree with Dr. Graham, after a discussion with him, that this taxon is not a good genus. We consider it a subgenus of *Chrysocharis* Förster, 1856, mainly because of the existence of species forming intergrades between the typical *Kratochviliana* with strongly carinaceous collar of the pronotum and *Chrysocharis*, where the collar is not set off at all.

***Tetrastichus cyaniventris* (Motschulsky), comb. n.**

Solenoderus cyaniventris Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou, 36: 71—72, pl. II, fig. 16.

According to the type specimen, a female, this species is a *Tetrastichus* of the *miser*-group and *Solenoderus* Motsch. is synonymous with that genus. See also above under *Anysis*.

REFERENCES

- (Belanovskij et Djadečko) Белановский И. Д. и Дядечко М. П., 1951: Новый паразит просяного комарика. — *Dopovidi Akad. Nauk Ukr. RSR*, 4: 291—296.
- Ashmead W. H., 1904: Classification of the Chalcid flies or the superfamily Chalcidoidea, ... — *Mem. Carnegie Mus.*, 1: I—XI, 225—551, pls. XXXI—XXXIX.
- Bouček Z., 1954: Chalcidologické poznámky II, Torymidae. — *Acta Soc. ent. Česosl.*, 51: 55—61.
- Bouček Z., 1959: A study of Central European Eulophidae, II: Diaulinopsis and Cirrospilus (Hymenoptera). — *Acta ent. Mus. Natl. Pragae*, 33: 171—194.
- (Bouček Z.) Боучек З., 1961: Материалы по фауне хальцид (Chalcidoidea) Молдавской ССР. — Труды Молд. н.-иссл. Инст. Садов. Виногр. Винод., 7: 5—30.
- Bouček Z. et Šedivý J., 1954: Blanokřídli cizopasníci přástevníčka amerického (Hyphantria cunea Drury) v Československu. Die Hymenopteren-Parasiten von Hyphantria cunea Drury in der Tschechoslowakei. — *Zool. ent. Listy*, Brno, 3: 169—189.
- Compere H. et Annecke D. P., 1961: Description of parasitic Hymenoptera and comments (Hymenopt.: Aphelinidae, Encyrtidae, Eulophidae). — *Journ. Ent. Soc. S. Afr.*, 24 (1): 17—71.
- Erdős J., 1951: Eulophidae novae. — *Acta biol. Acad. Sci. Hung.*, 2: 169—237.
- Graham M. W. R. de V., 1961: The genus *Aprostocetus* Westwood, sensu lato (Hym., Eulophidae); notes on the synonymy of European species. — *Ent. mon. Mag.*, 97: 34—64.
- Kratochvíl J., 1943: *Argyresthia laevigatella* H. S. — *Práce Morav. přír. společ.* (*Acta Soc. Sci. nat. Morav.*), 15 (fasc. 3): 1—55.
- Maláč A., 1943: Nová chalcida z Moravy. Eine neue Chalcide aus Mähren. — *Ent. Listy (Folia ent.)*, Brno, 6: 87—91.
- Masi L., 1931: Contributo alla sistematica degli Eunotini (Hym. Chalc.). — *EOS*, 7: 411—459.
- Motschulsky V. de, 1859: Entomologie appliquée. Insectes utiles et nuisibles. — *Etudes ent.*, 8: 169—174.
- Motschoulsky V. de, 1863: Essai d'un catalogue des insectes de l'île de Ceylan (II). — *Bull. Soc. Imp. Natur. Moscou*, 36: 35—73.
- Steffan J. R., 1962: Nouvelles espèces de Torymides paléarctiques (Hym. Torymidae). — *Entomophaga*, 7: 181—188.