

found in the nest. They were under a large flat stone, the edges of which they had banked with vegetable débris after the manner of *F. difficilis* and its var. *consocians*. During the past summer (June 30, 1905), on again visiting the colony, I found it to contain several of the minute females (mostly callow), and was thus able to satisfy myself that it represented a distinct and undescribed species. Numerous workers, together with many cocoons, were kept for several weeks in an artificial nest. Dozens of the tiny females but only two males hatched during the first week in July. No workers hatched till July 9, when they appeared in great numbers. The small size of the female seems, therefore, to be correlated with more precocious development than in our common species of *Formica*. The movements of the workers are extremely active and petulant, contrasting with the movements of such forms as *F. integra*, *consocians*, etc., and resembling those of *F. sanguinea*. The females are more phlegmatic except when greatly excited. The approximate date of the nuptial flight is July 11. At any rate, during the early morning hours of that day most of the females managed to escape and ascended to the ceiling of the room in which I had placed their artificial nest. The diminutive size of the females strongly indicates reduced or belated fertility, so that this species, like *F. difficilis* and its var. *consocians*, *F. microgyna*, *nevadensis*, and *montigena*, very probably establishes its colony with the aid of workers belonging to some other species of *Formica*. I suspect that *F. subpolita* var. *neogagates* is the ant used for this purpose, as its workers so closely resemble the female *nepticula* both in size and coloration. I find, moreover, that a small colony of *neogagates* workers can be induced to adopt a dealated female *nepticula*.

#### 4. *Formica nevadensis* Wheeler.

*F. microgyna* var. *nevadensis* WHEELER, Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., Vol. XX, Oct. 11, 1904, p. 373. ♀.

Since both the worker and female of *F. nepticula* are known, it is no longer probable that *nevadensis* should be attached as a variety to *microgyna*. The female *nevadensis* has a very smooth and shining gaster and this is probably also the case in the unknown worker, which would thus differ decidedly from the opaque-bodied worker of *microgyna*. I believe, therefore, that we are justified in raising *nevadensis* to specific rank. The discovery of the worker of this form will enable us to decide whether *nepticula* is to be regarded as an independent species or merely as an eastern subspecies of *nevadensis*.