

maintains it is so similar to the typical *flavens* that it should rank only as a subspecies of that form.

It will be noticed that there is disagreement among these accounts with regard to the nature of the so-called antennal scrobes, which in most of the forms are not truly scrobes but flattened or slightly concave areas lying beneath the scapes when these are in repose. Emery possessed presumably typical examples from Cayenne (the type locality), but it is not clear whether he also had seen any of Mayr's types for comparison. Wheeler received two workers of *exigua* from Emery, and this may have led him to identify his Puerto Rican material as *exigua* and to the redescription of that ant as outlined in the preceding paragraph. The worker caste among related species and subspecies of *Pheidole* is so often unreliable for specific identification it is surprising that Wheeler would have made use of them (Emery workers) in this way, and it is further possible that Wheeler may not have possessed specimens of the true *exigua* at all. In the American Museum collection a tray labelled *exigua* contains two pins of specimens from British Guiana, but they cannot be that insect, nor even members of the *flavens* group, for the head and thorax of the minors are smooth and shining. Wheeler's 1908 description of *exigua* is supposed to have been based upon a long series of specimens, but if they are in the American Museum, they are not in the tray of *exigua* specimens, and thus far have not been located.

The difficulties with regard to these species, however, are not insoluble. Dr. Charles Ferrière, at the Museum of Natural History in Geneva, Switzerland, generously permitted me to borrow a single cotype soldier of *Pheidole exigua* Mayr, from Cayenne, and several types of *Pheidole flavens sculptior* Forel, from the collections of the museum. I have made careful comparisons of the *exigua* cotype with Wheeler's description of this species as given in the Bulletin of the American Museum, Volume 24, page 134 (1908). The agreement between the two is very good, except for certain apparent discrepancies which can be traced to the difficulties of language and interpretation. Since it is impossible to know precisely what Wheeler meant, we are forced to rely on his probable meaning. The head is stated by Wheeler to be a little longer than broad, and indeed it appears