

strong angular projections. On the basis of this statement by Wheeler, Kempf evidently was led to expect at least some indication of such a concavity in *C. insularis*. It does exist, but certainly not to the degree that Wheeler's statement implied; the concavity, and it can barely be called that, is no more pronounced in my *C. insularis* samples than it is in *C. rohweri* or *C. wheeleri*.

The above discussion intends to show that the characters by which Kempf separated the three species in this complex are highly variable. This by no means, however, can be considered evidence that there are no good distinctions between them. If Wheeler's original description of *C. insularis* had been less vague, much of the difficulty which Kempf encountered could have been avoided.

Through the courtesy of M. R. Smith and D. L. Smith I have been able to examine the U. S. National Museum's material of *C. wheeleri*; Professor Creighton has sent me samples of *C. rohweri*. With these specimens, plus my material of *C. insularis*, it is now possible to restudy this complex and to affirm the specific nature of all three forms.

The majors of the three species present the most obvious and consistent distinction. That of *C. rohweri* differs from both *C. insularis* and *C. wheeleri* in the presence of a fringe of setae along the lower margins of the cephalic disc; no indication of this fringe is present in available material of the other two. Furthermore the major of the first species has coarser and more close-set foveolae on the cephalic disc; these foveolae, and the spaces between them, are distinctly granulose, and the foveolae lack flattened silvery hairs. Creighton (*in litt.*) has noted these distinctions between *C. rohweri* and *C. insularis*, and the cotypes of *C. wheeleri* available to me show they will separate the former from that species as well.

The floor of the cephalic disc is similarly shaped in *C. rohweri* and *C. insularis*; when viewed from directly above, it is strongly humped in the middle. In *C. wheeleri*, the disc is essentially flat all the way across when viewed in this manner. When the head of *C. rohweri* is viewed from the side, the rim of the cephalic disc appears much more pronounced above than in most majors of either of the other two species. One of our specimens of *C. insularis*, however, has the rim very nearly as well-developed as in *C. rohweri*. This same specimen, and one other from the same colony, has the cephalic foveolae nearly as large and close as they are in *C. rohweri*; but these foveolae all possess the flattened, shining hairs which are absent in *C. rohweri* and the interspaces are not granulose and dull as in that species.

In *C. wheeleri* the transverse pronotal carina is rather strongly humped on either side of the pronounced median excision. In *C. insularis* and *C. rohweri* the carina, when viewed from the front, is distinctly sinuate, but the median excision is barely detectable, and the carina is not humped on either side. In *C. rohweri* the lateral spines of the petiole and post-petiole are longer and sharper than in the other two species.