**Cenocoelius huggerti**, the First Record of the Subfamily Cenocoeliinae (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) from Africa
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**Abstract.**—A new species of cenocoelid braconid, *Cenocoelius huggerti* Pitz and Sharkey sp. n. is described from a single specimen collected in the Gambia, Africa. This represents the first species of Cenocoeliinae described from the Afrotropical region.

The subfamily Cenocoeliinae is relatively small with approximately 65 described species (Achterberg 1997, Braet and Achterberg 2001). The few cenocoelines with known biology are koinobiont endoparasitoids of xylophagous Coleoptera larvae, mainly in the Cerambycidae and Curculionidae (Scolytinae) but to a lesser extent in the Buprestidae and other Curculionidae (Saffer 1982, Shaw and Huddleston 1991). Species of cenocoelines had been recorded from all continents of the world with the exception of Africa (Achterberg 1994) until the discovery of *Cenocoelius huggerti* Pitz and Sharkey sp. n. Although cenocoelines are now known to be cosmopolitan, they are predominantly found in the neotropics.

Placement of this African species was hindered by the poorly defined genera of Cenocoeliinae. Most species of Cenocoeliinae are placed in the genus *Cenocoelius*. In the most recent revision of the genera, Achterberg (1994) re-instated the genus *Capitonius*; he formally transferred two species to this genus, though he asserted that a majority of New World cenocoelines belong to *Capitonius* (Achterberg 1997). With no phylogenetic analysis presented, Achterberg (1994) proposed suites of characters to differentiate the genera, but he did not posit autapomorphies for the genera. Without this framework, his key, diagnoses, and descriptions must be used to understand his generic concepts. Preliminary phylogenetic analyses (Pitz, in prep.) suggest other genera within the subfamily, though morphologically distinct, render *Cenocoelius* and *Capitonius* paraphyletic. We place the African species in *Cenocoelius* based on the lack of characters that would place it in *Capitonius* (vertex depressed medially and ratio of veins M+Cu:1-M of hind wing 1.2–2.1) or any of the other small, morphologically distinct genera of Cenocoeliinae.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Generic identification was accomplished using Achterberg’s (1994) key to the genera of Cenocoeliinae. The specimen was compared to original descriptions and determined specimens of *Cenocoelius* to establish that it represents a new species.

Morphological terminology used follows that of Sharkey and Wharton (1997). All photographs were taken using a JVC KY-F75 3CCD digital camera attached to a Leica MZ-16 stereoscope and were prepared using an Auto-Montage® imaging system.

*Cenocoelius huggerti* Pitz and Sharkey sp. n.

*Etymology.*—Named after Lars Huggert, the recently deceased Swedish entomolo-
gist and collector of the only known specimen of this species.

Description.—Holotype Female (Fig. 1). Length: 4.9mm. Color: body mostly melanic except testaceous as follows: fore tibia, fore tarsus, mid and hind tibiae apically, mid tarsus except basal tarsomere; wings hyaline. Head (Figs 2–4): antennae broken, 15 flagellomeres remaining on left and 11 on right, each flagellomere with two to three rows of longitudinal placodes; median ocellus in antennal scrobe, lower than lateral ocelli; vertex smooth, with moderately dense weak punctures and setae laterally; antennal scrobe deeply impressed, extending to lateral ocelli, ver-
tex flat to convex; lateral carina bordering antennal scrobe reduced, ending immediately anterior to lateral ocellus; median lamella of antennal scrobe sharp anteriorly and posteriorly, flattened over mesal third, protruding slightly above scrobe; face and clypeus smooth with moderately dense punctures and setae; ventral margin of clypeus with one medial tooth. **Mesosoma** (Figs 5-6): pronotum with small oval pronope, subpronope absent, rugosopunctate anteriorly, with rugose transverse depression across entire width with numerous longitudinal carinae, smooth with moderate punctation posteriorly; mesoscutum punctate to foveate on anterior

---

**Fig. 4.** *Cenocoelius huggerti* holotype female, anterior view of head.

**Figs 5-7.** *Cenocoelius huggerti* holotype female. 5, lateral view of mesosoma. 6, dorsal view of mesosoma. 7, wings.
surface, medial lobe with large irregular fovea and moderately dense setae, lateral lobes mostly smooth with sparse setae; notauli meeting slightly anterior to truncal articulation, with perpendicular carinae that create mostly large oval cells in notauli; scutellar sulcus with four fovea; scutellum smooth with moderately dense setae; propodeum rugosoareolate with moderately dense setae; mesopleuron with fovea on posterior border and dorsomedially, otherwise smooth with moderately dense setae; sternaulus complete, composed of single row of large fovea; metapleuron and propodeum irregularly rugosoareolate, with moderately dense to dense setae; medial face of hind coxa with well defined depression angled anteromedially, ending ventrally just anterior to middle of coxa, without carina anteriorly; tarsal claws each with quadrate basal lobe.

Wing (Fig. 7): crossvein r-m of forewing present, second submarginal cell present; ratio of veins M+Cu:1-M of hind wing 3.3.

Metasoma: first median tergite with two strong carinae basally, otherwise smooth; second and third median tergites smooth; length of first median tergite 1.5 times its apical width; length of ovipositor:length of forewing ratio approximately 0.80–0.90.

Notes.—Right hind wing glued to point

Biology.—Unknown

Male.—Unknown
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