

*Lobogaster*, Phil. It differs from *Rhyphus* in the structure of the head (the eyes separated by a broad front in both sexes, the occiput but very little developed), of the antennæ (the scapus short, the flagellum more filiform, &c.), of the thorax and abdomen, also in the venation (for the details compare above).

Its relationship to *Lobogaster* is apparent in the structure of the abdomen, of the antennæ, and in the venation. The differences, however, are:—1, the eyes are glabrous and not “longe hirsuti” as Philippi has it; 2, the bifurcation of the second and third veins takes place some distance *before* the anterior cross-vein, and is not coincident with that cross-vein; 3, the difference in size, both species of *Lobogaster* measuring 17–18 millim. in length, while the species of *Olbiogaster* are about half as long. Without taking notice of the difference in the colouring, which is merely specific, I will mention some minor discrepancies between my specimens and Dr. Philippi’s description: the face is slightly convex, but not “projecting like a bladder;” the hairs on the face are short and inconspicuous, and it cannot be said to be densely beset with long bristles (“mit langen Börstchen dicht besetzt”). Philippi speaks of “ein Paar Börstchen über den Ocellen,” which I do not perceive in *Olbiogaster*; his figure (incorrectly?) represents a quantity of long hair on the front and vertex. The first abdominal segment is described as “lang behaart” in *Lobogaster*, which is not the case with my specimen. Philippi counts twelve joints in the antennæ of *Lobogaster*; Schiner sixteen. I rather believe the latter, as both *Rhyphus* and *Olbiogaster* have the same number.

The difference between the venation of *Lobogaster* and *Olbiogaster* I have explained above. That the venation of *Lobogaster* is exceedingly like that of *Rhyphus*, is very easy to perceive in comparing the latter with figure 16 *b* of Philippi (not the principal figure 16, where the venation is given incorrectly). When Schiner (Reise d. Novara, p. 23) discovers differences between both which do not exist, it is the result of a most unnatural interpretation of the homology of the veins, in consequence of which the second vein (his *Radialader*) is said to be entirely wanting, and the fork to be formed by the third vein alone (his *Cubitalader*)!

My statements are based on a specimen from Costa Rica, three (male and female) specimens from Porto Rico (in the Berlin Museum), and the type specimen of *Rhyphus tæniatus*, Bellardi, Saggio &c. Append. p. 5, fig. 5, which is a male *Olbiogaster*.

### 1. *Olbiogaster cognatus*, sp. n., ♀.

Reddish-yellow. Head black, except the mouth-parts and the first joint of the antennæ, which are reddish-yellow; the face is dark brown in the middle, yellow on the sides; antennal flagellum black; front above the antennæ silvery, which colour is bounded by a straight line, running a little below the anterior ocellus. Thorax shining reddish-yellow, with a scattered yellowish pubescence; pleuræ likewise shining, except a spot, in the shape of an elongated square, above the sterno-pleural suture, which is semiopaque, and in an oblique light shows a whitish, almost silvery reflection; a brownish spot in front of the root of the wings. Halteres reddish-yellow. Abdomen reddish-yellow, of a slightly paler shade than the thorax; the whole surface clothed with a golden-yellow, appressed pubescence; segments 1–4 with a brown spot in the anterior corner of each segment, the one on the first segment the smallest, on the other segments