

THE BEE GENUS EMPHOR IN SOUTH AMERICA.

BY C. SCHROTTKY,
Pto. Bertoni, Paraguay.

Mr. J. Vachal (Rev. Ent. Caen., Vol. XXVIII, p. 23, 24) cites 3 species of *Emphor* from Argentina: 1, *E. fructifer* (Holmbg.); 2, *E. tricolor* (Friese), and 3, *E. bifax* Vach. The first is at the same time the type of the genus *Teleutemnesta* Holmbg., and the second was described as an *Ancyloscelis*. Vachal himself regards *Emphor* as a subgenus of *Ancyloscelis*; but this standpoint is not to be discussed here. Changing his term "subgenus" into "genus," the question is left open whether he was correct in synonymizing *Teleutemnesta* with *Emphor*, or not. As I had the occasion to see some specimens of a representative of this group in the collection of Mr. A. de Winkelried, Bertoni, I think it useful to give a detailed description of them as well as some remarks on the group as a whole. For, if Mr. Vachal's views are correct, the genus would have a singular distribution; a few species in Argentina and one in the Eastern United States. The specimens mentioned above came from Santa Fé, Argentina, and cannot be referred to any of the three species cited by Vachal. There is a description of *Ptilothrix tricolor* (Friese) given by Brèthes* (Anal. Mus. Buenos Aires, Vol. XX, pl. 10, p. 295), based apparently on the same insect as the Santa Fé bees, but, as it seems, not on that described by Friese as *Ancyloscelis tricolor*. There are too many differences between the description of the latter and the Santa Fé bees, so these are treated here as a new species: *Emphor opuntiae*. Surely they are at least congeneric and with the same habits as *tricolor*. Mr. A. C. Jensen Haarup states that *tricolor* "is rarer than the preceding"—*Ancyloscelis nigerrima*—"and similarly a cactus-insect" (Flora og Fauna, 1908, p. 103). According to Mr. Joergensen who observed both *tricolor* and *nigerrima* at Mendoza, Argentina, they are one and the same species; the few red hairs on the segments of *tricolor* are soon lost or decoloured and thus the insect becomes *nigerrima*. There are no plastic differences between them (Zool. Jahrb., Vol. XXIX, 1912, Abt. f. Syst. p. 157).

Joergensen says that the bee provides its nest with a tube above the soil, a behaviour not observed of any other bee from Mendoza. Among the flowers visited he likewise cites an *Opuntia* (l. c.). The North-American species, *E. bombiformis* (Cress.), on the contrary, was found on flowers of *Ipomæa* and *Hibiscus*, as far as I know.

The species described by E. L. Holmberg as *Teleutemnesta fructifera* is surely also congeneric, although there seem to exist slight differences in the venation of the wings. Holmberg says that the second cubital cell is smaller than the first or third, with the first recurrent nervure a trifle behind its middle. Vachal states that the second cubital cell is almost as large as the first or third, with the first recurrent nervure between its middle and apex, nearer to its middle, however. In *opuntiae* the second cubital cell is scarcely half the length of the first and not more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of the third; the first recurrent nervure enters in the female almost in the middle of the cell, in the male between middle and apex. In *bombiformis* finally, the second cubital cell is described as about $\frac{2}{3}$ the length

*Brèthes considers *Emphor* and part of *Teleutemnesta* as synonyms of *Ptilothrix* Sm. (Bull. Soc. Ent. France, 1910, p. 212). They are certainly related but not identical if the figures given by F. Smith are correct.