

reliable as separatory characters for the worker. Three of them will apply to the female as well. The female of *huachucana* is larger than that of *texana* (8-9 mm. in *huachucana*). It is also more heavily sculptured and possesses the same triangular lobe at the base of the antennal scape which marks the worker. In this connection it should be noted that the length given for the female of *texana* in Wheeler's 1915 publication (4) evidently included the wings. Wheeler gave the length of the female of *texana* as 11-11.5 mm. On the same page he gave the length of the dealated female of *furvescens* as 7.5 mm. Needless to say the second figure is the correct one for *texana* if, as is usually the case, the body length is what is being measured. The male of *huachucana* is larger than that of *texana* (4-5 mm. in *texana*, 5.5-6 mm. in *huachucana*). The scutum in the male of *huachucana* does not project so strongly above the pronotum. The basal face of the epinotum in the male of *huachucana* consists of descending anterior portion and a feebly convex posterior portion which form a distinct angle in profile (Plate 7, fig. 2). This face of the epinotum forms a single descending plane in *texana*.

## LITERATURE CITED.

1. CREIGHTON, WM. S.  
Psyche, Vol. 41, No. 4, p.189, 1934.
2. CREIGHTON, WM. S.  
Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., Vol. 104, p.152, 1950.
3. SHREVE, F.  
in Kearney & Peebles, U.S.D.A. Misc. Pub. No. 423, p.19 *et seq.* 1942.
4. WHEELER, W. M.  
Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., Vol. 34, No. 12, p.413, 1915.