

The separation of *Biconomyrma* from *Conomyrma* depends upon slight differences in wing venation of the female and thoracic profile of the worker. Since one species (*flavopectus* M. Sm.) possesses worker characteristics of *Conomyrma*, s. str., and female characteristics of *Biconomyrma*, it is obvious that the attempted segregation of *Conomyrma* species into subgenera is untenable. Hence, *Biconomyrma* = *Conomyrma* (NEW SYNONYMY). *Conomyrma*, as a genus, is sufficiently defensible in the characteristic wing venation of the female, the reduced psammophore, and structure of the proventriculus in the worker that it may be recognized as a genus apart from *Dorymyrmex*.

I differ with Kusnezov and prior authors with respect to their use of the word psammophore. These workers claim that a psammophore is present in ants now assigned to *Dorymyrmex* but absent in those placed in *Conomyrma*. I believe that the setalike hairs on the ventral head surface must be considered a psammophore. In those ants which truly lack a psammophore, the hairs present are short, usually irregular in length, and randomly distributed. A psammophore is said to be present when there is a discrete group of elongate hairs, uniform in length, arranged in a definite pattern, the result of which is the presence of a discrete "basket" on the cephalic venter. These hairs are typically flattened and distinctly curved or even curled. Such is the case in both *Conomyrma* (Fig. 5) and *Dorymyrmex* (Fig. 6). The only appreciable difference is that in the latter genus the hairs extend forward over the oral cavity; they are half, or more, as long as the head is wide. In *Conomyrma* the hairs are quite short, much less than half the head width, and end far short of the oral cavity.

*Dorymyrmex*, with its related subgenera and/or genera, was restricted to South America by Kusnezov (1952). *Conomyrma*, together with *Biconomyrma*, was distributed from Argentina and Chile north to the United States and the Caribbean. Kusnezov (1952) listed the species in *Conomyrma-Biconomyrma*. Half of these are South American species and have no direct bearing on our problems, hence are not considered.

Roger (1863) described *Prenolepis pyramica* from a single specimen from Corrientes, State of Bahia, Brazil. The name was transferred to *Dorymyrmex* by Mayr (1866). By 1900 *pyramicus* was assumed to range from Argentina to the southern United States and over the entire Caribbean area. It had acquired a number of varieties and subspecies and had also received a wholly different identity. Wheeler (1902) recognized that *Formica insana* Buckley, 1866, described from central Texas, belonged to *Dorymyrmex* and stated that *insana* was undoubtedly a synonym of *pyramicus*. Buckley's *insana* was uniformly black or brownish black; Roger stated that *pyramicus* possessed a yellowish red head and thorax and brownish gaster. It may be seen from this, then, that *pyramicus* as described by Roger agreed closely with the description of the new variety, *bicolor*, of Wheeler (1906). In 1912 Emery listed four subspecies and five varieties of *pyramicus* throughout its range.

The first attempt to classify our forms was that of Creighton who considered that within the United States there existed the species *pyramicus*, represented by three subspecies: