2–7, small, about as long as broad, segments 8–12 longer than broad, the last segment much larger than the others; thorax a little longer than the head, but not as wide; gaster small, about the size of the head. Length of head, 1.6 mm.; scape, 1.2 mm.; funiculus, 1.9 mm.; thorax, 1.8 mm.; gaster, 1.9 mm. Width of head, 1.3 mm.; thorax, 0.9 mm.; gaster, 1.2 mm.

Holotype.— No. 2922, M. C. Z. (S. H. Scudder).

Paratypes.— Nos. 2923–2925, M. C. Z.; no. 17,018a, University of Colorado.

Five other, rather poorly preserved specimens are in the Scudder collection. Even the holotype is not well preserved, but from a careful study of all the specimens at hand, I believe there is no question about the systematic position of the species.

AGROECOMYRMICINI, tribus nov.

LITHOMYRMEX, gen. nov.

Allied to Agroecomyrmex Wheeler (Baltic amber).

Female.— Head subquadrate; mandibles small; clypeus large; antennal scrobes present; antennae short, 12-segmented, with a two-jointed club; epinotum not armed; petiole and postpetiole short and compressed, the forewing with two cubital cells; head, thorax, and pedicel, coarsely sculptured.

Male.— Antennae 13-segmented; scape short, but a little longer than the second segment; sculpturing weaker than that of the female; forewing with two cubital cells.

Worker.— Very similar to the female, apparently differing only in the smaller size.

Genotype.— Lithomyrmex rugosus, sp. nov.

The two species placed in this genus are among the most unusual of the Florissant ants. The nearest relative of *Lithomyrmex* appears to be a Baltic amber genus, *Agroecomyrmex* Wheeler. The single specimen upon which Mayr originally based the species representing the latter genus was a poorly preserved worker, and he placed it in *Myrmica*. Fortunately, Professor Wheeler was able to examine three additional workers as well as a female and consequently to recognize its peculiar characteristics. *Lithomyrmex* is distinguished from *Agroecomyrmex* by the smaller mandibles and the large antennal club, but in other respects the two genera are very similar.

The tribe in which Wheeler placed Agroecomyrmex (1914), has subsequently been restricted so as to embrace only a fraction of the genera