

3. *A. rugifrons* m:

 " (Thomson, 1878, pp. 158-160.)

Eight years later, Howard (1886), in a paper entitled "A Generic Synopsis of the Hymenopterous Family Chalcididae," repeated almost entire, with the exception of two or three sentences of minor importance, the *Conspectus subgenerum* of Thomson given in foregoing, and indicated that the then subgenus was as yet unknown in the continent of North America, north of Mexico. Howard, however, raised the tribes of Thomson to the rank of subfamilies, and his subtribes to the rank of tribes. In the following year, Cresson (1887) gave Howard's synopsis of the genus *Pteromalus* verbatim, so up to that epoch *Arthrolytus* was still retained as a subgenus.

In describing the first North American species Ashmead (1893) treated the group as a genus, and thus in 1893 it first attained to that rank, already forshadowed by its treatment as such by Möller (1882) eleven years previously and the attitude taken by Howard in regard to the larger groups of Thomson. De Dalla Torre (1898) listed the species of the genus, and gave *Pteromalus* Thomson (*sic*) as its synonym, whereas in reality *Arthrolytus* being a part of *Pteromalus* Swederus has no synonym strictly, since it was taken out of the latter group and made independent of it. Its synonymy, therefore, should have been given as *Pteromalus* Swederus (*partim*). *Pteromalus* Thomson was a subgenus of *Pteromalus* Swederus; at present, the latter, therefore, should be *Pteromalus* Swederus (Thomson); Thomson practically gave us the modern conception of the genus *Pteromalus*. Then Ashmead (1904) in his monumental work on the Chalcidoidea formally defined the genus *Arthrolytus* in a synopsis of the modern tribe Pteromalini Ashmead, 1904, which is practically the old genus *Pteromalus* Swederus raised to the rank of a tribe. Also, Ashmead there, and previously in 1893, formally designated *Arthrolytus punctatus* Thomson as type of the genus, formerly such by page precedence. Finally, Schmiedeknecht (1907, 1909) treated the genus in a manner essentially similar to Ashmead's treatment, so that it is unnecessary to quote here.

The following description of the genus is based on Thomson's descriptions of the genus and species, that of Ashmead's and Möller's