

NOTES ON TENTHREDINOIDEA, WITH DESCRIPTIONS OF NEW SPECIES.

BY S. A. ROHWER, WASHINGTON, D. C.

PAPER XI.—(GENERA OF PAMPHILIINÆ AND NEW SPECIES).

PAMPHILIINÆ (olim *Lydinæ*).

Linnaeus in 1758 divided the genus *Tenthredo* into six divisions; all except the last, which was composed of species known in immature stages only, are now recognized as families or subfamilies. The fifth of these Linnæan divisions of *Tenthredo* contained species now placed in the subfamily Pamphiliinæ. Latreille (Hist. nat. Crust. et Insect, III, p. 303, 1802) was the first to give this division of *Tenthredo* a name, when he founded his genus *Pamphilus* on *Tenthredo sylvatica* Linnæus—the genus being monobasic.*

Fabricius (Syst. Piez., p. 43, No. 5, 1804), apparently overlooking Latreille's name of 1802, founded his genus *Lyda* on sixteen species, which have been placed in various segregates of Pamphiliinæ. Curtis (British Entomology, 1831) fixed the type of the genus *Lyda* as *Tenthredo sylvatica* Linnæus, a species originally included, making the genus a synonym of the older name *Pamphilus*—the two genera having the same types.

Panzer (Fauna Ins. Germ., Vol. VIII, p. 86, 1805) proposed another name, *Cephaleia*, for the same group, but the name has been restricted to include only those species closely allied to *Tenthredo signata* Fabricius, so the name still holds good.

A. Costa (Pros. Hym. Ital., III, p. 232, 1894) was the next to propose names for the various groups of species, when he divided *Lyda* into *Acantholyda* and *Anoplolyda* on the presence or absence of a super-apical spur on the anterior tibiæ.

Rev. F. Konow in 1897 (Ann. K. K. Nathist., Hofmus, XII, pp. 1-32) considered these insects as a tribe, Lydides, and recognized five genera and four additional subgenera. Since then his arrangement has been followed, and with the exception of *Liolyda* Ashmead (CAN. ENT., p. 209, 1898), no new segregates have been proposed.

*Monobasic is a term used to indicate that a genus was founded on one species. In a certain sense it is synonymous with the current use of monotypic, but monotypic had best be used in a restricted sense for those genera which are strictly monotypic, i.e., containing only one species. Monotypic is an unfortunate name, for all genera are necessarily monotypic, as they can have only one type.