0.60 mm and HW is 0.65 mm; according to Cook, the head of *P. californicum* is "broader than in *croceum*," while the above figures show the reverse to be true. Cook's next statement that the antennae are 12-segment is refuted by his figure of a 13-segmented antenna. Male ponerines typically possess 13-segmented antennae and there is no reason to suppose that *P. californicum* is an exception, particularly since the males of other *Proceratium*, so far as known, follow the rule. Unfortunately the type lacks the right funiculus and the entire left antenna. However, in the figure the funicular segments appear much too long (twice as long as broad), while typically they are hardly longer than broad in males of this genus. Since the facial view included only the right scape, the left antenna of the lateral view may be an illustrative addition to make the specimen complete. In the figure of the head the scape is shown distinctly longer than is actually the case. The statement that the scape is "equal in length to the last three segments of the funicle" can be neither proven nor disproven, although the figure shows the scape to be slightly longer; the scape is 0.42 mm long. The remaining cephalic features mentioned are correctly described, *i. e.*, the posterior margin of the head is rounded, three ocelli are present, the eyes are large and prominent, the well-developed mandibles are edentate with pointed apex. These characters are common to all *Proceratium* males. The eye length is 0.37 times HL and the distance from the lower eye margin to the mandibular insertion is about equal to one-third of the eye length (6:19); the upper eye margin is slightly below the midpoint of the HL.

The thorax is said to be short and massive. The thoracic length is 1.5 mm, maximum height is 1.2 mm and maximum width is 0.90 mm. I would not consider the thorax to be "short and massive" since the length exceeds both its height and width. Cook's statement that the pronotum has distinct humeral angles is baffling, for I cannot discern anything resembling humeral angles. The statement that the anteromedian part of the mesoscutum is distinctly truncated is also confusing. I assume that he had reference to the dorsal portion adjoining the promesonotal suture; this however is evenly convex. In spite of the claim that there is a large, rounded tubercule terminating centrally on the mesonotum, no such tubercle exists. Presumably this was in error for the metanotal tubercle, which is not large, and is rounded only in lateral aspect. From above it is pointed behind with a distinct median longitudinal carina.

The remaining gross characters are more or less correctly described, though without offering any distinctive features. In discussing the integument, his remark that most of the body is subopaque is not correct. Everywhere, except on the frons and epinotum, the surface is distinctly shining between the sculpturation. The cephalic sculpture is said to be fine, but the punctures are about equal to those of the thorax, where they are stated to be heavy and well-defined. On the frons and middle portions of the vertex the punctures are a little finer and much denser than elsewhere on the head; here the surface texture is roughened, but still there are sufficient shining raised interspaces that the aspect, on the whole, is that of a somewhat shining surface. The