# The Linnean types of Ichneumon flies. 

By<br>A. ROMAN.

The private collections of Carl von Linné were after his death purchased by sir J. E. Smith, came soon to the Linnean Society in London and are its chief treasure. Much as this transaction must be deplored from Swedish side, for the collections themselves is has pretty certainly been an advantage. In Sweden they would probably have been for a long time more or less neglected and ill-used, in England they have always been an object for veneration, and parts of them also for study.

The insects crossed the North Sea in a none too good state of preservation after their sojourn in the damp little museum building at Hammarby, Linné's summer residence. Smith incorporated them with his own collection but had the good sense to retain the original labels, who alone make it possible to recognize the Linnean specimens. Generally the existing specimens are genuine, but in a few cases changes of labels or specimens have been made which complicate the identification of types. A number of species are lost, but most of these were probably missing already at the sending out of the collection.

Curiously enough the Ichneumonid types have, to my knowledge, never been studied except one species (compunctor). Mr. Morley in his extensive work "Ichneumons of Great Britain" (5 vols.) never mentions their existence, much less used them. Many Linnean names are now used in a traditional way, mostly as Gravenhorst placed them, without having seen the types, in his big Ichneumonologia Europæa" of 1829 . Almost no later author seems to have had any curiosity about the correctness of his identifications, which were, as will be shown, in many cases wrong. My own interest in these types may be taken for a result of numerous excursions in the Upsala region during my student years at the university where Linné lectured. By them I got a fairly good acquaintance with Linnés collecting ground and its Ichneumonid fauna. It is only natural that I wanted to study his types, the great majority of which were taken in the surroundings of Upsala, prob-
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ably all those for which no other locality is indicated. In the spring of 1928 came at last the desired opportunity by a grant from the Swedish Academy of Sciences, supplemented by a courteous positive answer from the Linnean Society to my application for permission to study the Linnean specimens.

To both these celebrated institutions I tend my humble and sincere thanks and wish to specially acknowledge the kind help given by the officials of the Society, among whom I had most to do with Mr. Spencer Savage.

When studying the types it was sometimes felt as an inconvenience that there was no material for comparison at hand; one species (prarogator) could not be definitely named for that reason. The collection would no doubt be of more use if deposited in the British Museum, as has already been proposed, but one can easily understand that the Society does not like to be deprived of its most valued possession. - During my visit in 1928 the Linné specimens were still mixed with the Smith collection, but in a brief visit 1930 I saw that they had been rearranged as a special collection, probably according to Dr. Jackson's Catalogue of 1913. This catalogue being compiled exclusively from signs in Linné's own copies of Syst. naturæ ed. X and XII, cannot pretend to correctly enumerate the species present at the death of Linné, and the collection shows this conclusively. There are I3 types of Ichneumonoidea not in the catalogue but existing in the collection, 4 names in the catalogue are not represented by types, and one name in the catalogue is represented by another in the collection (agricolator). Two of the species not represented by types I consider as nevertheless correctly identified (raptorius and strobilella). - In the Stockholm Museum there is a unique Linnean type belonging to the De Geer collection: Ichn. ariolator from Surinam, a Cryptine $\sigma^{\circ}$ whose $\circ$ I had the good fortune to capture in 1915 at Rio Branco in Brazilian Amazonas.

Of Linné's works the following were indispensable for elucidating the types:

Fauna suecica ed. I, 1746, and ed. II, I76I.
Systema natura ed. X, 1758, and ed. XII, 1767.
Mentioned above is the catalogue of the Linnean Society:
Jackson, B. D. Catalogue of the Linnean specimens of Amphibia, Insecta and Testacea noted by Carl von Linné. Transcribed and codified by - - - Suppl. to Proc. Linn. Soc. for the 125th Sess., I912-13. London 1913. 48 sides.

I have to thank the Society for a copy of this catalogue.

## Discussion of types.

Acarorum (Mutilla) 1758 , p. $593=$ Gelis ac. L. \& auct. a Foerst.
The unique type is glued on a quadrangular piece of paper and fits the short diagnose. But the description in Fauna Suecica ed. II is added later and belongs to another species (sthorax niger $s$ ) no longer represented. - Linné's other Gelis, Mut. formicaria, no longer exists, and the species now called so may be that of Gravenhorst and Foerster, but has its safe fundament in Thomson's description of 1884.
agricolator (Ichneumon ${ }^{\text {r }}$ ) 1767 no. $54=$ Cenocoelius secalis L. 1758, p. 567 .

Syn. Cenoc. rubriceps Ratz., Thoms.
The type is a + without abdomen and hind legs. Already Linné discovered the identity of secalis and agricolator, for the Linnean label on the type carries both names, thus $\begin{gathered}\text { agricolator } \\ \text { secalis }\end{gathered}$ Perhaps this means that the same specimen represents both species, for there is no separate specimen of secalis, though only this name figures in the list of Jackson (p. 35).
aphidum 1746 no. 953,1758 , p. $568=$ ?Aphidius sp.
The specimen carrying a Linnean label with this name is no type, because it does not fit the description. In fact, it belongs to the next species in the collection (as it was arranged in the spring of 1928), Spathius exarator L. The real aphidum L. almost certainly was an Aphidius Nees, and it would be the genotype if we only knew what species it was, but this unfortunately never can be known.
assectator 1758, p. $566=$ Gasteruption ass. L. \& auct. pro p.
Syn. Gast. affectator auct. pro p.
A pair of which the $q$ suits the description and is the type, the $\sigma^{r}$ being of another species, jaculator L. Since Schletterer's monograph of 1889 it has been usual to spell the species name affectator, but this has no support in Linné's works. Everywhere it is written with the long $\int$ or f , not with the similar $f$ or f , so assectator is the correct name, whatever Linné may have meant with it.
bicolorus 1767 no. $58=$ Ctenochares bic. L.
Syn. Ct. instructor Fabr.
The type is a $\circ$ lacking the antennæ. Near it in the box was another $\circ$ of the same species. This is the only exclusively southern species among the existing types of Ichneumonoidea.

[^0]cinctus 1746 n:o 984, 1758, p. $566=$ Hemiteles c. L.
Syn. H. bicolorinus Gr.
There is a single $\circ$ without antennæ and legs. Not occurring in Jackson's list.
circumflexus 1746 no. 974,1758 , p. $566=$ Exochilum circ. L. \& auct.
One $q$ without antennæ, certainly the type.
comitator 1758 , p. $563=$ Coelichneumon com. L. non auct.
Syn. C. lineator F. \& auct.
One $P$ in the collection, probably the type. The diagnose is so short that any black Ichneumonine with white antennal ring will suit it. Linné evidently did not see through his weak lens the white points on the vertex and before the scutellum, so when Fabricius discovered the latter ones he took it for granted there was a new species before him. The comitator auct. non L . will need another name, but I am afraid auspex O. F. Müller 1776 and fasciatus Gmelin 1790 who are next in turn according to Dalla Torre's Catalogue, are of rather dubious identity.
compunctor 1746 n:o 957, 1758, p. $564=$ Apechthis comp. L.
Syn. A. brassicaria Poda.
There are two $\%$ in the collection, as already reported by Mr . R. E. Turner, who by request of Messrs. Cushman and Rohwer (Proc. ent. Soc. Wash. 20, 1918, p. 187) inspected this species. He thought both specimens to be Pimpla instigator F. and found it most uncertain that either should be the type. - My opinion about these specimens is another. They belong to different species and according to modern taxonomy also to different genera. The first specimen, with label 957 ?n, is almost certainly Linnean, for it exactly suits the description of compunctor; it is Apechthis brassicarice Poda. The second specimen, with label Angl. J. E. S.», belongs to Smith's collection and has of course no type value; it is Pimpla instigator F. In the Linnean description of 1746 there is one character fitting brassicaria but not instigator: ${ }^{\text {An- }}$ tennæ - - subtus secundum totam longitudinem dilute testaсеæ - - —. It is unfortunately not included in the diagnose of 1758 , which may belong to either species, but its discriminating value remains undiminished. - In Jackson's list this species is absent.
constrictorius 1758 , p. $56 \mathrm{I}=$ ?
The single specimen, a Ctenichneumon $\stackrel{\circ}{q}$, has an apparently Linnean label, but with a ? under the name. It cannot well be
the type, for the thorax is not at all bidentate, as the diagnose requires.
crispatorius 1758, p. $561=$ Amblyteles cr. L. \& auct.
One $q$ in good condition. There has never been any doubt about this species, which I have myself found a few times hibernating in spruce stumps near Upsala.
culpatorius 1758, p. 561 $=$ Probolus culp. L. non auct.
Syn. P. alticola Gr.
There is a specimen of each sex, the + carrying a Linnean label and being the type. The $\sigma^{\gamma}$ lacks head and hind legs and is quite different, Hoplismenus bispinatorius Thunb. - Absent from Jackson's list.
deliratorius 1758, p. 562, 1761 no. $1597=$ Ichneumon del. L. \& auct.
One $\sigma^{\pi}$ with no antennæ, type. The diagnose of 1758 gives no certainty, but the description of 1761 is convincing.
denigrator 1758 , p. $563=$ Atanycolus den. L. non auct.
Syn. A. heteropus Thoms.
Two $f$ are in the collection, the first one carries a Linnean label and is the type. It is in good condition and measures 10 -II mm in length. The usually so-called denigrator has the ist tergite black, which is not supported either by diagnose or by description (176I). The same species has joint 5 of the hind tarsi distinctly shorter than 3 and only a little longer than 4 , in heteropus joints 3 and 5 are about equal, 4 considerably shorter. I have taken heteropus myself in the prov. of Upland on a felled spruce trunk. - The other $f$ is no doubt the one mentioned 1761: Alium vidi simillimum etc.; it is Cyanopterus flavator F., which species Fahringer 1926 evidently doubted as a Swedish denizen. It goes farther northwards than Upsala, the Stockholm Museum possessing specimens from the province of Hälsingland and myself one from Jämtland.
desertor 1758 , p. $563=$ Cremnops des. L. \& auct.
One 0 , certainly the type. I have found it myself in the prov. of Upland, where it is, however, rare enough.
designatorius 1746 n:o 965,1758 , p. $562=$ Melanichneumon des. L. Syn. M. fortipes Wesm.
The single $\sigma^{\prime \prime}$ in the collection, no doubt the type, has the scutellum totally white. Generally only the sides and apex of the $\sigma^{\pi}$ scutellum are pale, but already Kriechbaumer, who 1898 first described this male, mentions both forms of ornamentation. Thom-
son 1896 introduced fortipes as Swedish from just the province of Upland, and I have later got a f from Dalecarlia (leg. E. Klefbeck) which so far marks the northern limit of the species.
cdictorius 1746 no. 960 , 1758 , p. $562=$ Ctenichneumon ed. L. non auct.
Syn. Ct. fossorius pallipes Grav.
Two $\sigma^{\sigma}$ in the collection, both of the same species and agreeing with the description. In autumn, this is the commonest form of the genus in the conifer woods about Upsala; that Linné 1746 writes: >Habitat in pratis», must not be taken too litterally. Before this, edictorius was considered a $\sigma^{7}$ variety of Ct. divisorius Gr ., which species is a southern one in Sweden and scarcely found at Upsala.
exarator 1758 , p. $564=$ Spathius ex. L. \& auct.
Two of without head in the collection, a Linnean label designating the type. Not in Jackson's list. An easily recognized house-insect and consequently always correctly understood.
extensor 1746 no. 986. 1758, p. $564=$ Eubadizon ext. L. \& Marshall. Syn. E. pectoralis Nees \& auct.
One $\&$ with Linnean label, certainly the type though Linné expressly states in his 1758 diagnose: "corpore nigro immaculato". - This species has always been a mystery, several authors have tried to solve it in different ways, and I suppose Marshall had seen this type before giving the correct name. The red mesosternum was probably never seen by Linné, for specimens were at that time - and much later, too - meant to remain in their boxes and were consequently usually studied from above with weak lenses. What specially strenghtens my conviction of the present specimen as the type, is the mentioning 1746 of duæ setæ sive tentacula ad os». Looking at the specimen, no doubt the maxillary palps are meant. In most specimens these are invisible from above, but here the head is sharply reclined and the long white palps show off excellently. In his own copy of Syst. Nat. ed. IO, Linné has changed in ink stentaculis to palpis».
fossorius 1761 no. $1599=$ Amblyteles foss. L. non auct.
Syn. A. subsericans Gr.
There is one $\sigma^{\sigma}$, certainly the type. G. Heinrich wants this species to be included in the genus Limerodes Wesm. The wellknown fossorius Grav. will have to take another Linnean name (see edictorius), but is of another genus. - Among the Fabricius types in Brit. Mus. there is a subsericans, correctly labelled as fossorius L., and Grav. quotes foss. L. as a synonym of subser.
fusorius 1761 n:o $1598=$ Proticlneumon fus. L. non Thoms.
Syn. Ichn. fuscus L. 1767; P. pisorius Thoms. non L.
There are three $\sigma^{*}$, all Protichneumon of different species. First comes the type, then $P$. fuscipennis $W$. with totally black face, and lastly $P$. fusorius Thoms. with black and yellow hind femora. Evidently fusorius comprised all Protichneumons with red abdomen and black antennæ, that is the males, while their females with white-ringed antennæ formed pisorius L . The real species were to Linné and his followers inclusive Gravenhorst simple varieties. The type is specially recognized by $»$ frons linea lutea ante singulum oculum», viz. pale anterior orbits. Not in Jackson's list.
glaucopterus 1746 no. 973, 1758, p. $566=$ Opheltes gl. L. \& auct.
Only one specimen with four abdominal segments left. There seems never to have been any doubt about this species.
incubitor 1746 no. 970, 1758 , p. $563=$ Gambrus inc. L non auct. Syn. G. ornatus Grav.
There are three $q$, the first of which carries a Linnean label and is probably the type. It lacks hind legs and looks freshly emerged, the tip of the abdomen carrying a large mass of whitish materia. Since the sixth tergite has no white spot and the nervellus is broken below the middle, the specimen may belong to G. inferus Thoms., but femora I are not black at base and femora III are described as simply red. I do not think inferus differs specifically from ornatus, Thomson described many species from too scanty material. The second specimen is Spilocryptus mandator L. (cimbicis Tschek) with the four anterior coxæ black. The third specimen, with a label ${ }^{2} 970$ ? , is a typical $G$. ornatus Gr . Not in Jackson's list.
inculcator 1746 no. 972 , 1758 , p. $565=$ Cryptus inc. L.
Syn. C. sponsor F.
One $\circ$ with Linnean label, probably the type, because the strongly incurved abdomen seems to agree with the words »abdomine falcato» in F. suec. ed. II. The antennæ are simply called nigræ», but in the present specimen two of the middle joints have a small white spot above, evidently not observed by Linné. This species is a distinctly southern one in Sweden, but may still be found at Upsala, where I have taken it.
infractorius 1761 no. $1584=$ Platylabus inf. L. non auct.
Syn. $P$. phaleratus Hal.; P. leucogrammus Wesm.
One $P$ in very good condition, certainly the type. Thanks to the characteristic white pattern I guessed this synonymy aiready in 1914 (Ark. f. zool. 9: 2).
jaculator 1746 n:o 985, 1758, p. $565=$ Gasteruption jac. L., Thoms. Syn. G. Thomsoni Schlett.
Two $\%$ of the same species in the collection, certainly types. In all southern Sweden and still at Upsala this is by far the commonest long-tailed species. It soon begins to be superseded by $G$. subtile Thoms., which species is in the prov. of Hälsingland (lat. $61-62^{\circ} \mathrm{N}$.) the only long-tailed one to my experience.
lituratorius 1761 no. $1594=$ Hypsantyx lit. L. non auct.
Syn. H. impressus Grav.
The single $\sigma^{\circ}$ is in good condition and certainly the type. From Thunberg. and Gravenhorst till now this name has been used for another tryphonine of the genus Diaborus Först., Thoms., where the pale pattern on each tergite consists in a semicircular white spot behind. In Hypsantyx only the apical margin of the four first tergites is yellow in the middle, just as Linné describes it (in the $P$ only the three first apical margins are yellow-marked, the 3 d one often obsoletely). The name to be assumed by the Diaborus seems to be scalaris Gr. 1829, for lituratorius Thunb. I822, 1824 has two other species as types (see Roman 1912).
luctatorius 1746 no. 983, 1758, p. $562=$ Amblyteles luct. L. non auct.
Syn. A. erratorius Thunb.; culpatorius Grav.; litigiosus Wesm. The collection contains three $\sigma^{2}$ of different species. The first one is certainly the type, because the fourth tergite with its 3 dark red spots agrees exactly with the description. Only one previous author has made a correct guess at luctatorius L., but that author was Thomson (Ann. soc. ent. France i886, p. 24). - The other two specimens are Ichneumon suspiciosus Wesm. and Amblyteles (Spilichn.) occisorius F., of which suspiciosus is common in the woods around Upsala, but occisorius is a distinctly southern species I have never myself found at Upsala. A. erratorius is rather scarce around Upsala and I cannot remember having found the $\sigma^{7}$ there, but the $\circ$ used to occur in spring, running on the ground in sunny, grassy places.
luteus 1746 no. 967 , 1758, p. $566=$ Ophion lut. L., Thoms.
As arranged in the spring of 1928 , there were 4 specimens in two rows. The first one, a $\sigma^{\prime}$, seems to be the type, carrying a Linnean label and being rather uniformly yellow. The next specimen is a $q$ of the white-designed $O$. obscurus F ., the third one, labelled Angl. Jones is Paniscus ocellaris Thoms. ${ }^{\circ}$, and lastly comes with no label a $f$ of Enicospilus merdarius Grav.
mandator 1758 , p. $565=$ Spilocryptus mand. L.
Syn. S. cimbicis Tschek.

The two $\sigma^{3}$ in the collection are probably types, for they agree with the few characters mentioned. Evidently they were only looked at from above, where the white ornaments on face, coxæ, trochanters I, II and tarsi III are invisible. The species occurs more or less in southern and central Sweden. Not in Jackson's list.
manifestator 1746 no. 959, 1758, p. $563=$ Ephialtes man. L. non auct.
Syn. E. carbonarius auct.
There are four $q$ of three species in the collection. Specimens I and 3 belong to the type species, I being recognizable as type by the very long terebra with diverging halves of the sheath. The second specimen is a huge E. gnathaulax Thoms., 20 mm long; the last one is labelled "Angl. Jones» and came from Smith's collection, it is mesocentrus Gr. Thus the traditional manifestator is altogether absent and must take either the name imperator Kriechb. (1854) or, if correctly included among the synonyms by Dalla Torre, adulterator Vill. (i789). On the other hand, Gravenhorst as early as 1807 correctly used the name manifestator L .
moderator 1758 , p. $564=$ Nemeritis (Phadroctonus) mod. L. non auct.
Syn. C. flaviventris Ratz., Rn.; N. cremastoides Holm. \& auct.
The single $P$ in the collection is gummed on a large piece of paper beside a white, cylindrical cocoon, the paper carrying the inscription strobilell». This is almost certainly the type, the only objection being the length of the terebra. In the present species it is not quite the length of the abdomen, Linné's description says aculeo corpore subbreviore"; evidently he judged it rather hastily. - According to Linné, moderator is a parasite of his Ichn. strobilellow, but later investigation in Sweden (see I. Trägårdh 1917) has shown $N$. flaviventris directly to parasitize the spruce cone moth Laspeyresia strobilella L.
molitorius 1761 n:o $1587=$ Ichneumon mol. L. \& auct.
Syn. I. crassifemur Thoms.
Two $P$ in the collection, certainly types. Both agree more or less in the sculpture of their hind femora with crassifemur. In i910 I saw Thomson's types of that name and did not think them deserve specific rank. In the latest years G. Heinrich has expressed the same opinion and thinks moreover that melanotis Holmg. is another synonym. He may be right about melanotis, but I am not yet quite convinced. - Not in Jackson's list.
peregrinator 1758 , p. $563=$ Barichneumon per. L. non Gr. nec Rn.
Syn. I. scriptorius Thunb.; vacillatorius Grav.

Represented by three different $\mathcal{P}$, of which the first one with Linnean label is probably the type. Of this species Linné gave a very meagre diagnose, not supplemented by any later description. In Thunberg's collection peregrinator is represented by Ichn. latrator Grav., which species I 1912 found very acceptable. The present species is, however, still a little closer to the diagnose, for ${ }^{2}$ segmentis duobus ultimis nigris» certainly suits scriptorius better than latrator, where the black abdominal tip is broader. On the other side, ano albido is more like latrator than scriptorius who has only pale membranaceous margins at tip. At Upsala I have found scriptorius ㅇ in numbers running on window-panes and think this to be no rare occurrence; Linné may have found it the same way. - The second specimen has the terebra exserted and is a Microcryptus with thick antennæ and pale tip of the scutellum. The last $\ell$ is a small Ichneumon of the latrator group with black femora, possibly spurius Wesm. - Not in Jackson's list.
persvasorius 1746 n:o 964, I758, p. $562=$ Rhyssa pers. L. \& auct.
One pair without heads, certainty types. Occurs in the pine woods of all the holarctic zone.
pisorius 1746 no. 966 \& 968, 1758, p. 561 $=$ Protichneumon pis. L. non Thoms.
Syn. $P$. fusorius Thoms. non L.
Only one $\&$ in the collection, certainly type of F. Suec. 966, though the tibiæ III are yellow with black ends, but probably Linné did not observe this difference from the other species with red abdomen, the tibiæ not being readily seen from above. This species is the regular parasite of Sphinx pinastri and has nothing to do with "Phalana pisi. Linné's statement applies to F . suec. 968, now lost, as is evident by his own copy of this work, where it is added to that number in ink. - Thomson's ingenious interpretation of pisorius and fusorius has unfortunately foundered on priority. Linné no doubt originally meant no. 968 with his pisorius, but included no. 966 when he named it. This species has to carry the name not only because it stands first, but also because it is the one we certainly know. In Syst. nat. ed. XII there is added to pisorius a variety» with ferrugineous antennæ and femora, which seems to be Trogus lutorius F.
prarogator 1758 , p. $565=$ Angitia pra. L. non auct.
Syn. A. ?armillata Grav.
The single $\sigma^{\circ}$ is certainly the type. It is gummed on a large piece of paper beside a thick white cocoon; on the paper is the note in ink: salicis». The species could not be reliably determined from lack of material for comparison, Angitia being a large
and difficult genus and more so in the $\sigma^{7}$ sex. -- Since Gravenhorst we are accustomed to use this name for the Tryphonine Dyspetes, a southern species I have never found at Upsala, and moreover an enemy of sawflies, not of moths.
pugillator ${ }^{1} 746$ no. 975, 1758, p. $565=$ Anomalon pug. L. non auct. (?).
Syn. A. latro Grav. var.
One pair in the collection, the $\sigma^{3}$ carrying a Linnean label but certainly not the type, because it has the whole face yellow. The $q$ ought to be type, but I am not quite sure, for Linné has a couple of bewildering statements. In the diagnose he says: *pedibusque lutels. ", but in the description: ${ }^{\text {p pedes maxima parte }}$ nigri sunt". In the pair at hand the legs I and II are red, III black with largely red tibiæ, all coxæ black. Furthermore the species is said to be common: »Habitat vulgaris Upsaliæ, frequens in viis , which is certainly not true about anything like this species in the Upsala region. I have once or twice found specimens of the allied group Erigorgus, but never A. latro. Perhaps Linné had the luck to find this species once swarming in numbers, but I think it more probable he confounded a lot of more or less similar Ophionines and happened to pick out this pair as a sample of them all. The latro group like Erigorgus are vernal or early summer forms, but at the same time a few species of Campoplex use to be flying, some years numerous enough to be called common. All these Ophionines are very quick to sting when grasped with the fingers. - As a result of this discussion I think we may accept the present species as pugillator, the pair at hand suiting the description enough to be possibly the original one. Since Foerster an early species of Campoplex has had this name, and I think it can keep it, though with Foerster as author.
quasitorius 1761 no. $1582=$ Ichneumon quas. $\mathrm{L} . \&$ auct.
One f, certainly the type. A rare species I have never found myself. There is also a ${ }^{2}$ of Hoplismenus terrificus Wesm., not agreeing with the description.
raptorius 1758 , p. 561 $=($ Amblyteles [Spilichn.] rapt. L. sec. Thoms., non auct.)
(Syn. A. quadriguttorius Thunb.; Gravenhorsti Wesm.).
Represented by a + of Ichneumon primatorius Forst. with Linnean label, but certainly not the type. The reasons against are: I. the fourth abdominal tergite has no white spot above, 2. femora I are largely black, 3. the conspicuous whitish spot above on the hind coxæ and 4 . the large size are not mentioned by Linné,
which is rather unlikely. Beside this $q$ there is another, English one of the same species.

Already in 1812 I expressed my endorsment of Thomson's 1887 opinion about the identity of this species. No other species from Upsala has regularly a white spot on the fourth abdominal tergite, so I am still convinced Thomson is right. The description of I76I means another species (see Roman 1912).
reluctator 1758 , p. $563=$ Echthrus rel. L. \& auct.
The type is a rather small $\circ$ of this wellknown forest species. In England the black-legged form of it was introduced 1907 by Cl. Morley as the Cryptine Nyxeophilus corsicus Marsh., but in 1908 he wrote about the Pimpline E. reluctator without mentioning the former name. The genus really belongs to the Cryptina.
resinelle 1758 , p. $565=$ Macrocentrus res. L.
Syn. M. thoracicus Nees, Thoms.
A single $\sigma^{\sigma}$ gummed on a piece of paper with Resinella written in Linnés hand. This type has the thorax quite black with fulvous legs, the hind tibiæ, however, brown with yellow base. No Macrocentrus is enumerated by either Marshall or Dalla Torre as a parasite of Evetria resinella, but de Gaulle's French Catalogue of 1908 reports M. interstitialis Ratz. from this host. Ratzeburg has described the species as a Brachistes and Marshall lists it as a doubtful species of Calyptus; why de G. has transferred it to Macrocentrus is unknown to me.
ruspator 1758, p. $565=$ Helcon rusp. L. \& auct.
One $\%$ without antennæ. certainly type. Not in Jackson's list. rutilator 1761 no. $1607=$ Tryphon rut. L. \& auct.

One $\quad$, certainly type. As in continental Europe, this species is common in the greater part of Sweden on meadows, but does not extend to the subalpine meadows in the northwestern part of the country.
sarcitorius 1746 n:o 976, 1758, p. 561 = Ichneumon sarc. L. \& auct.
Three $q$ in the collection, one with Linnean label, certainly the type. The $\sigma^{\circ}$ is rather different and was described as vaginatorius L .
saturatorius 1758, p. 56I = Melanichneumon sat. L. \& auct.
One pair of the same species, the $\%$ with Linnean label and probably the type. Like the three preceding species, this one has always been correctly recognized.
strobilella 1758 , p. $564=($ Ephialtes strob. L. $)$.
(Syn. E. glabratus Ratz.)
The pair whose $f$ carries a Linnean label with this name, does not fit the description at all, but it agrees excellently with
turionella, and I have consequently considered them as being that species.

But what is then strobilella? The type ought to be a $q$ with terebra twice longer than the body and black hind legs. We have not many species with such a long terebra, and the dark hind legs further restricts the possibilities. Linné suspected identity with F . suec. 97 I , but that species is no doubt Cryptus recreator F . (latitarsis Thoms.) with much shorter terebra. The real strobilella was found to live in "Phalana» strobilella like moderator, and it seems probable both came out from the same batch of spruce cones, since Linné thought moderator to be the parasite of strobilella. In this case Ephialtes glabratus is tolerably certain to be the true strobilella, for in later years Trägårdh has found just Nemeritis flaviventris and Ephialtes glabratus to be the two commonest Ichneumonid parasites of Laspeyresia strobilella L. in Sweden. In glabratus the terebra is not twice the length of, but longer than the body, and the hind legs are not exactly black, but brown; this is evidently not to be taken quite litterally.
sugillatorius 1758 , p. 561 $=$ Coelichneumon sug. L. \& auct.
One + , certainly type of this widespread and wellknown species.
titillator 1746 no. 971 , 1758 , p. $565=$ Cryptus tit. L. non auct.(?). Syn. C. recreator $\mathrm{F} . ;$ latitarsis Thoms.
It is not possible to fix this species with absolute certainty, because there is for once too much material in the collection, five $\sigma^{7}$, of which none can be rejected as certainly not Linnean. The important colour features are the red abdomen with only segment I black, and the totally black hind legs with white tarsi. Only the third and fifth specimens fulfil both requirements. No. 3 seems surprisingly enough to be Cryptus obscuripes Zett., a decidedly northern species below middle size, to my knowledge only twice found as far south as the province of Upland. The specimen has no central white spot in the face and a brown anterior half of tergite 2, but is otherwise typical. No. 5 is Cryptus recreator F., a large species I have found several times at Upsala and whose $q$ was, as said under strobilella, known to Linné as no. 97 I of F . suec. ed. I. Of these two species I do not hesitate to think recreator more likely to be the true titillator.

The other three specimens, having more or less red hind legs, cannot be considered. No. I is Meniscus piceator Thunb. carrying the Linnean name label, no. 2 like all the following is a Cryptus, possibly sponsor F ., but without central pale point in the face and with quite black hind coxæ. If there is any central pale point in the mesonotum, the needle conceals it. No. 4 is C. titubator Thunb. (infumatus Thoms.), very common in all Sweden and quite like
obscuripes, but with paler hind legs. On no. 2 there is a small label "982", meaning that number in F . suec. I, which species it cannot be. - Linné altered his position in regard to this species, for in 176I he took up $F$. suec. I 982 as titillator and consequently described the abdomen $»$ ferrugineo basi apiceque nigro .
turionelle 1758 , p. $564=$ Pimpla tur. L. non auct.
Syn. Pimpla examinator F.
As already mentioned under strobilella, I am convinced the specimens placed there rightly belong here and are the true types of turionella. They are a $q$ of $P$. examinator and a $\sigma$ of Glypta resinana Htg ; the $\%$ carries on the needle a pupa with the posterior end missing, the $\sigma^{\circ}$ a hollow spruce bud. The description applies to the $\circ$, but the $\sigma^{\gamma}$ seems to be the original one, for it suits the few negative words about that sex. It is the colour pattern of the tibiæ II that proclaims examinator as the real turionella L., these tibiæ being more or less brownish with a small white ring or spot. In turionella auct. non L. (a meadowspecies, while examinator is a forest one) they are simply red. The difference in coxal colour was not known to Linné, but he described the colour of the four posterior tibiæ in his turionella. The correct name for the false turionelle seems to be contemplator Müll. I776, if Dalla Torre is right in his list of synonyms.

The specimen labelled as turionella is a $\&$ Polysphincta carbonator Grav. and differs from the description in the following points: I. the antennæ are shorter than, not as long as the body; 2. the abdomen is evidently depress, not cylindrical; 3. the tibiæ II are pale variegated, not fuscous with a white ring; 4. the terebra is so very short that Linné probably would not have used the tame phrase aculeus abdomine brevior»; and 5. the whole genus Polysphincta is ectoparasitic on grown spiders and has nothing to do with moths.
vaginatorius 1758, p. $562=$ Ichneumon sarcitorius L. \& auct.
One small $\sigma^{3}$ of the northern form with whitish decoration, certainly the type. The synonymy has been known for a long time.
volutatorius 1758 , p. $562=$ Banchus vol. L. \& auct.
Four $\sigma^{2}$ in the collection, the first one with Linnean label and certainly the type. The two next specimens are the same species, the last one $B$. falcatorius F .

## List

of identified Linnean types of the superfamily

## Ichneumonoidea

Obs．！For synonyms，status of types and circumstances leading to their identification，see discussion above．

Fam．Ichneumonidæ．

Amblyteles crispatorius $L$ ． fossorius L ． luctatorius L． raptorius L ．
Angitia prarogator L． Anomalon pugillator L． Apechthis compunctor L． Banchus volutatorius L．
Barichneumon peregrinator L．
Coelichneumon comitator L． sugillatorius L．
Cryptus inculcator L． titillator L．
Ctenichneumon edictorius L．
Ctenochares bicolorus L．
Echthrus reluctator L．
Ephialtes manifestator L． strobilella L．
Exochilum circumflexum L ．
Gambrus incubitor L．
Gelis acarorum L．
Hemiteles cinctus L．
Hypsantyx lituratorius L ．
Ichneumon deliratorius L．
» molitorius L．
2 quesitorius L．
》 sarcitorius L．
Limerodes fossorius L．
Melanichneumon designatorius
,
saturatorius L.
Nemeritis moderator L．
Opheltes glaucopterus L．
Ophion luteus L．
Phadroctonus moderator L． Pimpla turionella L．

Correct．
for subsericans Grav．
》 erratorius Thunb．
》 quadriguttorius Thunb．
？？armillata Grav．
，latro Grav．var．
2 brassicaria Poda．
Correct．
for scriptorius Thunb．
．lineator F ．
Correct．
for sponsor F ．
－recreator F ．
fossorius pallipes Grav．
，instructor F ．
Correct．
for carbonarius Grav．
，glabratus Ratz．
Correct．
for ornatus Grav．
Correct．
for bicolorinus Grav．
＊impressus Grav．
Correct．
》
）
see Amblyteles．
for fortipes Wesm． Correct．
for flaviventris Ratz．
Correct． ＂
see Nemeritis．
for examinator F ．

## Platylabus infractorius L. Probolus culpatorius L. Protichneumon fusorius L. pisorius L.

Rhyssa persvasoria L.
Spilichneumon raptorius L.
Spilocryptus mandator L. Tryphon rutilator L.
for phaleratus Hal. alticola Grav. pisorius Thoms. \& auct. fusorius Thoms. \& auct. Correct. see Amblyteles. for cimbis Tschek.

Correct.

Fam. Evaniidæ.

Gasteruption assectator L.
jaculator L.
for affectator Schlett. \& auct.
, Thomsoni Schlett. \& auct.

Fam. Braconidæ.

Atanycolus denigrator L. Cenocoelius secalis L. Cremnops desertor L . Eubadizon extensor L. Helcon ruspator L. Macrocentrus resinella L . Spathius exarator L.
for heteropus Thoms.
, rubriceps Ratz. nec Ashm. Correct.
for pectoralis Nees.
Correct.
for thoracicus Nees.
Correct.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Like all the following species.

