# THE HABITS AND DISTRIBUTION OF *MACROMISCHA SUBDITIVA* WHEELER (HYMENOPTERA: FORMICIDAE)

By William S. Creighton[1]
Department of Biology, City College New York

Before discussing *Macromischa subditiva* I wish to review some older observations on the habits of this beautiful genus. The nests of Macromischa are seldom easy to find. The one exception to this rule appears to be *M. sallei* Guérin, whose abundant and conspicious carton nests, built around the twigs of bushes, are certain to attract attention. It thus happens that *M. sallei* is the only species in the genus for which adequate field data exist. In 1913 W. M. Mann studied hundreds of nests of *sallei* in Haiti (1). The uniformity of these nests was remarkable; they were invariably constructed of carton and invariably suspended from the branches of bushes or small trees. While Sallé's San Domingan nests had come from bushes growing on marshy plains (2) the Haitian nests occurred on rocky, well-drained ridges, hence there was no reason to suppose that the latter nests had been placed in bushes to avoid water-soaked soil. In short, the nesting habits of *M. sallei* appeared to be not only arboreal but also those of a non-adaptable arboreal.

This circumstance strongly influenced W. M. Wheeler in the nidification list which he published in his 1931 study of Macromischa (3). At that time Wheeler had nesting data for 28 species of Macromischa and he knew that there is a wide range of nesting response within the genus. His list carries eight nesting categories and, while some of these are rather similar, the range extends from strictly arboreal to strictly terrestrial species. This list is invaluable to anyone who is studying Macromischa in the field and, since Wheeler was trying to show no more than the variable nesting habits of different species of Macromischa, he amply accomplished his purpose. The objectionable feature of the nidification list is its failure to give the number of nests on which the inclusions are made. To secure this information it is necessary to consult the authorities whose names are carried after the names of the species whose nests they observed. When this is done it is clear that 17 of the 28 species listed were known from a single nest and hence could appear

[1]Emeritus Professor, Department of Biology, City College.
*Manuscript received by the editor October 3, 1965*