THE DIPTEROUS GENUS IMITOMYIA TNS. (HIMANTOSTOMA LW.). BY J. M. ALDRICH, U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY.

Loew described *Himantostoma sugens* as number 87 of his Fourth Century of N. A. Diptera, in Berliner Ent. Zeitschrift for 1863. He appended a note describing the genus as new also; it contained but the one species, based on a single male specimen, the locality being given as Illinois.

Until recent years this genus remained an enigma to dipterists. Coquillett in his Revision of N. A. Tachinidæ, 1897, 40, mentions it among those unknown to him. Adams, in Williston's Manual, 1908, 377, lists it among those which he cannot place in his table. Townsend, however, states in his Taxonomy of the Muscoidean Flies, 1908, 126, that he has seen the type; without further comment he places it in his tribe Clistomorphini, family Phasiidæ. Later (Proc. Ent. Soc. Wash., XIV, 49, 1912) he proposes Imitomyia to replace Himantostoma, which is preoccupied by Agassiz in Coelenterata in 1862; this time he refers the genus without comment to tribe Eutherini, subfamily Pseudodexiinæ, family Exoristidæ.

In 1915 Harrison E. Smith published the new genus and species, Saskatchewania canadensis (Can. Ent., XLVII, 153), based on two males and four females taken at Farwell Creek, Saskatchewan. A few months later when visiting me he stated that Dr. Townsend believed this to be the long-lost Himantostoma sugens.

On June 18, 1918, I collected thirteen females of *sugens* at Minot, N.D., on flowers of ox-eye daisy growing in low ground (slough or hay land among small timber) near the Mouse River just above the city. One of these I later sent to Nathan Banks at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, who compared it with the type of *sugens* and pronounced it the same species. My material exactly fits Mr. Smith's excellent description of *Saskatchewania canadensis*, and was taken about 60 miles from the southeast corner of Saskatchewan.

Since the species has been rediscovered in the northern plains region, it would appear quite likely that the original specimen came from there also. Osten Sacken received much material from Robert Kennicott (see his Record of My Life Work, p. 35), who collected in Illinois as well as in the far north for him; so there was an opportunity for error before the specimens reached Osten Sacken.

In 1897 Thalhammar (Termesz. Füzetek, XX, 145) described a $Himan-tostoma\ hungarica$ from Hungary. Bezzi in the Palæarctic Catalogue made this a synonym of $Ancistrophora\ mikii$ Schiner.

The genus was described by Professor Bezzi in Boll. de Lab. Zool. Portici, XII, 86-93, 1917. Here he recognizes hungarica as a valid species of Himantostoma, and describes a species from North Africa as H. mochii. In receiving this paper from the author in 1918, I sent him a specimen of the type species sugens, and he has since informed me that neither of the old-world species is congeneric; hungarica he puts back as it was in his catalogue, and has proposed a new genus for mochii, which is still I believe unpublished.

A new description of the genus and species is unnecessary, since Mr. Smith has given a complete one which is readily accessible. I will add, however, that in the table in Coquillett's revision Imitomyia will come out at couplet 6, page 30, where it separates by possessing a long, slender proboscis and very striking flat facial carina; and in Adams's table it runs to couplet 10, p. 361, where it March, 1919