

*Camponotus sayi* was described by Emery from a limited series of specimens taken at Phoenix, Arizona. These ants were sent to him by Pergande who, typically, retained a portion for his own collection. Six specimens of this series (three major and three minor workers), marked as cotypes, are in the collections of the United States National Museum. These specimens, plus the cotypes of *C. sayi bicolor*, are the basis for the discussion which follows.

Emery's original description, while brief, is straightforward and contains sufficient information to permit recognition of the species. At this time the ant was compared to *C. marginatus discolor* (i.e., *C. caryae discolor*), but was noted to differ in the lack of foveiform punctures on the cheeks. Pergande described *C. sayi bicolor* from a long series of workers, two females and three males from Chuparosa in the Sierra Laguna and San Jose del Cabo, Baja California, Mexico. The name chosen by Pergande was preoccupied and Emery renamed it *C. sayi californicus* in 1925. Pergande characterized his ant as being distinctly larger than *C. sayi* from Arizona (of which he had part of the original series) but I do not think this is important since size is a notoriously poor character in this genus.

Wheeler (1910a) described *C. fallax rasilis* from material taken in Texas, Arizona, Louisiana and Florida. The original description was so vague that any small *Camponotus* with reddish head and thorax and nonpilose cheeks could be assigned to it. The key provided by Wheeler was no better since separation of the various forms depended on color and "average size." In the same year Wheeler published a second paper (1910b) on *Camponotus*. Here, *C. fallax rasilis* was merely listed, while *C. sayi* was redescribed, evidently from a few cotypes and a few strays taken by Wheeler at Phoenix (the type locality of *C. sayi*) and at Prescott, Arizona. Wheeler's redescription of *C. sayi* was reasonably detailed, but in the case of the major workers, it was evidently based upon maximum-sized individuals representing the ideal condition. Further commentary was provided: "This species, as Emery has remarked, is very similar to *C. fallax discolor*. It is even more like *fallax rasilis*, but the head and thorax are more robust, the head is more excised behind, the clypeal notch is smaller, the epinotum more angular and the sculpture is different, the punctures on the sides and front of the head being much smaller and the surface of the head and thorax somewhat more shining. These differences are not very pronounced and it may be necessary, when *sayi* is better known, to reduce it to the rank of a subspecies of *fallax*." Another key was given; this key included *C. sayi*, not included in the earlier paper. Here, *C. sayi* was separated from *C. fallax* forms by its larger, broader head and the non-pubescent gaster.

Creighton (1950) used a different method for separating *C. sayi* from *C. rasilis* (elevated there to specific rank). He utilized the