

yond it, other rugae cross the flattened area on the head, which upon initial view appear to disagree with Wheeler's statement. If this is the correct interpretation of Wheeler's treatment, then the above-mentioned inequities among the descriptions of Mayr, Emery, and Wheeler with reference to the scrobe, disappear, and we may conclude that the latter's description of *exigua* was based on specimens belonging actually to that taxon.

It is now necessary to return to the ants which Dr. Smith sent me as representatives of *Ph. flavens sculptior*. Those from St. Croix and Puerto Rico (Smith det.), and from Martinique (Forel det.) fit precisely the characters given in Smith's key to the ants of Puerto Rico (1936). Smith's conception of this species (in litt.) is based upon Wheeler's determined specimens and published descriptions. The specimens of *Ph. flavens sculptior* sent me from Geneva are labelled "Typus" and they are from the Island of St. Vincent, the type locality. Dr. Ferrière cautions, however, that while there are several cotypes of *sculptior*, he sent specimens marked as types because it is not always certain that specimens labelled cotypes in Forel's collection are really from the same locality. Nevertheless, these ants are the only samples of presumably undoubted type material I have been able to examine. Upon comparison of them with Smith's specimens from Puerto Rico, I find there is complete agreement, and we may conclude that Dr. Smith had examples of the true *sculptior* when he wrote his account of the ants of Puerto Rico.

Before attempting to decide what the Miami, Florida ants are, it seems advisable to distinguish between *exigua* and *sculptior*, especially in view of the opportunity for comparing type material. The results of this study may be outlined as follows. The cephalic rugae on *exigua* are coarse, far apart, and cover the anterior $\frac{3}{4}$ of the head, leaving the vertex and occiput smooth and shining. The interrugal sculpture is sparse so even the anterior sculptured part of the head is shining also. The antennal scrobe is distinct, smooth surfaced, bordered by a long frontal carina and a lateral ruga, and appears to be truly a scrobe for the reception of the scape. The flattened area of the head continues the scrobe laterally and is crossed by coarse rugae.

The cephalic rugae on *sculptior* are finer, closer together, and