

catalogued

ON SOME CONTROVERSIAL ITEMS CONCERNING
A FEW HEMIPTERA

by E. Bergroth

In my paper on Colobathristidæ in these « Annales » 1910, p. 295 I wrote : « For Colobathristidæ DISTANT later (1903) mistook a genus of the Mydochid subfamilies Malcinæ and Heterogastrinæ respectively. » Mr. DISTANT (Ann. Soc. Ent. Belg., 1910, p. 418) cannot deny the fact, but finds fault with this statement and « to make the discussion clearer », he points out, *inter alia*, that « the objection was really made by BREDDIN (1907) though now repeated by BERGROTH ». The *fact* is, however, that HORVÁTH three years before BREDDIN pointed out that *Malcus* forms a distinct subfamily and that *Artemidorus* belongs to the Heterogastrinæ. It is thus to Dr. HORVÁTH rather than to me Mr. DISTANT ought to have addressed his anti-criticism, for in giving a brief historical review of what had been written on the Colobathristidæ I had, of course, simply to repeat HORVÁTH's statement, the correctness of which I do not doubt for a moment. Mr. DISTANT says that it would perhaps have been better for me to mention the fact that the subfamily Malcidæ proposed by STÅL (1865) was subsequently discarded by STÅL himself in his En. Hem. IV, p. 170 (1874), where he places *Malcus* under « genera et species Lygæidarum incerti loci systematici ». I could not mention such a « fact » because it would have been a deliberate misstatement. If STÅL in his Enum. Hem. IV had placed *Malcus* in any of his other subfamilies, I had had the right to say that he had discarded his subfamily Malcidæ. But the type of *Malcus* was destroyed or mislaid in 1874 (which is clearly indicated by the absence of the words « Mus. Holm. » after the name) and thus unknown to STÅL himself who consequently could not locate it definitely in his system of 1874, but naturally placed it among the genera *incertæ sedis* where he never put species known to him. I know *Malcus flavidipes* STÅL (*scutellatus* DIST.) and quite agree with HORVÁTH and BREDDIN in regarding the Malcinæ a well founded subfamily.

As to *Artemidorus* Mr. DISTANT says he is « still a heretic ». In 1903 DISTANT placed *Colobathristes* BURM. (sensu lato STÅLI) = *Curupira* DIST. in the family Coreidæ, and *Artemidorus* DIST. in the Colobathristinæ of the family Lygæidæ. The logical consequence of Mr. DISTANT's « heresy » is that he now has to show : 1) that and why *Colobathristes* and *Artemidorus*, far from belonging to different families, are really nearly related genera; 2) that and why HORVÁTH

was wrong in placing *Artemidorus* in the Heterogastrinæ. Until he has done so, his opinion of *Artemidorus* cannot be taken seriously.

As to *Eumenotes obscura* WESTW. I had already stated in my paper on this genus (Deutsche ent. Zeitschr., 1907, pp. 498-501) both that all the three figures published of this insect are faulty and defective, and in what particular points they are so. In spite of the discrepancies in the figures I have no doubt that they all refer to the same species. I have seen numerous specimens of it from Burma and many different islands of the Malayan archipelago, and may now add that the neuration of the membrane is very variable, scarcely any two specimens being alike in this respect, although it is always more or less reticulated. When STÅL wrote his « Enumeratio » vol. I, he did not know the insect, but, as Mr. DISTANT correctly states, I had overlooked that he mentions it in a subsequent paper, placing it in the Dinidorinæ. He had apparently not noticed the position of the spiracles of the first abdominal segment, and I still regard the genus as forming a distinct division of the Tessaratominaæ.

✓ In 1904 DISTANT described a new genus *Dandinus*, placing it in the subfamily Pentatominaæ. I have an undescribed Australian genus allied to *Dandinus* and it is quite possible that *Dandinus* was correctly placed by DISTANT, although it is a rather ambiguous form. DISTANT has recently, following SCHOUTEDEN, transferred the genus to the Graphosomatinaæ and says : « When the wings of many Pentatominaæ are examined we may except more inclusions into the Graphosomatinaæ, which is at present, with many genera, a somewhat difficult problem, if the wing-neuration is to be the dominant factor. » As the wing-neuration is practically identical in the Graphosomatinaæ and the Pentatominaæ, and as it in consequence never hitherto has entered anybody's mind to consider the wing-neuration a factor (still less a dominant one) in distinguishing these subfamilies, I fail to grasp the fanciful suggestion just cited. If Mr. DISTANT has detected some character in the wing-neuration, by which a Graphosomatina can be distinguished from a Pentatomina, such a fact will forsooth be highly appreciated by all hemipterists and it is to be regretted that Mr. DISTANT puts his light under a bushel. By all means, let us know all about it, Mr. DISTANT.