

colony, while the young queen takes her place with the remaining workers. When he comes to consider the possible occurrence of this phenomenon in the kelep, Dr. Cook increases the confusion by failing to distinguish sharply between 'nest' and 'colony.' A single colony of ants may be confined to a single nest, in which case it has been called monodomous by Forel, or it may extend over several nests, in which case it is polydomous. The latter may have several queens distributed among the different nests. The workers of these are on friendly terms with one another and may visit back and forth. Undoubtedly the inhabitants of such nests occasionally become detached from the parent colony and may be regarded as new colonies formed by a process of budding or stolonization. These conditions are well known in such highly endowed ants as our species of *Formica* and *Camponotus* (*F. rufa*, *sanguinea*, *exsectoides*, *C. maculatus* var. *sansabeanus*, etc.). While there is an unmistakable resemblance between this method of colony formation and the swarming of bees, these ants retain in addition the primitive method of founding colonies by single dealated queens.

Now Dr. Cook's confusion of ideas and lack of information are most flagrantly displayed when he comes to present the facts that seem to him to warrant the separation of the kelep from the true ants and ally it with the honey-bees. Having made the interesting observation that a kelep colony will form new nests by sending out detachments of workers and females or of workers alone, he shuts his eyes to the resemblance between these conditions and those of the higher ants, and forthwith jumps to the conclusion that the kelep can not be a true ant, but must be at least as closely related to the honey-bee.¹ Obviously

¹ "Kelep nests are frequently placed only a few inches apart, the workers of different colonies not