

unless by actual observation, that it does or does not belong to this genus, and what its sex may be—and when may we hope for this?

In the absence of such direct testimony, and of any insect that may be more consistently united with this little female as its legitimate partner, I shall not hesitate continuing to consider my conjecture of their identity as correct, particularly as it seems confirmed by the structure of the palpi in all.

I shall here therefore terminate these general observations, and proceed with the Monograph, premising that I have found it necessary throughout to give ample specific descriptions to prevent the possibility of mistake. I consider the position of the family in the system will stand thus :

HETEROGYNA, LATR.

SOCIALES, Latr.

Formicidæ, &c.

PARASITICÆ? Shuck.

Dorylidæ, Halid.

SOLITARIÆ, Latr.

Mutillidæ, &c. &c.

Family DORYLIDÆ, Haliday.

DORYLIDÆ, Leach.\*

CHAR. *Head* transverse, small.

*Eyes* and *ocelli* large and prominent.

*Antennæ* setaceous, not geniculated.

*Mandibles* edentate, forcipate.

*Body* elongate, cylindrical; superior wings with two or three submarginal cells and one or two recurrent nervures: one calcar to all the tibiæ.

*Abdomen* with the basal segment usually smaller than the following, from which it is separated by a deep incision.

*Table of the Genera.*

One recurrent nervure :

Three submarginal cells ..... 1. LABIDUS, Jurine.

Two submarginal cells

Femora cylindrical ..... 2. ÆNICTUS, Shuck.

Femora compressed ..... 3. DORYLUS, Fab.

Two recurrent nervures ..... 4. RHOGMUS, Shuck.

I have arranged the family according to what I consider their most

\* In Brewster's Encyclop. Art. Entomology.