

xytol-balsam (1 slide), 1 ♀ head in xytol-balsam (1 slide). *Co-type* No. 12, 199, United States National Museum, Washington, D. C.; 1 ♂, 1 ♀ tag-mounted.

SPECIES FORMERLY REFERRED TO *Arthrolytus*.

1. *Arthrolytus clisiocampæ* (Fitch).

This species was described as *Cleonimus clisiocampæ* by Fitch (1856). Riley (1871) thought the species to be more properly a *Semeotellus*: about twenty years later, Ashmead (1894) referred it to *Arthrolytus*, and subsequently in Howard, in 1897; Fiske (1903) decided it to be synonymic with *Dibrachys boucheanus* (Ratzburg). Still later, however, he again refers to it as *Arthrolytus clisiocampæ* (Fitch) (Mason, 1906). I have examined specimens of this insect in the Mason collection, determined by Ashmead and labelled variously *Dibrachys clisiocampæ* (Fitch), *Arthrolytus clisiocampæ* (Fitch), and there can be no doubt but that they are identical and belong to *Dibrachys*. The species is *Dibrachys boucheanus* (Ratzburg) of authors.

2. *Arthrolytus pimplæ* (Ashmead).

Ashmead, 1894, p. 339.

De Dalla Torre, 1898, p. 155.

An examination of the description of this species, together with notes furnished me by Mr. J. C. Crawford, of the National Museum, Washington, D. C., taken from the types, shows that it belongs properly to *Dibrachys* Foerster. The antennæ are inserted distinctly below (ventrad of) the middle of the face, from the direct cephalic aspect, the face not being produced ventrad. This character is easily seen upon comparison of the two genera. The species *pimplæ*, however, has the antennal pedicel longer than the proximal funicle joint, not true with *Dibrachys*, but the sum of its characters, so far as I know them, shows its affinities to the latter genus.

3. *Arthrolytus incongruens* Masi., 1907.

This species has 3- and 4-dentate mandibles; it is therefore not *Arthrolytus*, as at present understood.

*Table of the Species.*

The following diagnosis is based mostly on the literature. I have been unable to select structural characters as a basis for separation of the species, and have not much reliance on colorational differences in these metallic *Pteromalinae*. For the present, therefore, the species, as they now stand, are indexed in the following table, which should be used with caution.