

San Lucas area. Pergande shared this material, hence its original extent is problematical, but everything indicates that there were fewer than 25 specimens all told. Those from the Cabo San Lucas area were obviously strays, but, while Pergande restricted the type material of *erythropus* to the specimens taken at San José del Cabo, he made no claim that these represented a nest series, for he did not know whether the type material of *erythropus* came from one nest or from several.

In 1896 Emery synonymized *erythropus* with *mina*. There is no reason to question Emery's synonymy, but it is unfortunate that he failed to explain how he arrived at it. Pergande sent much material to Emery, and it is likely that Emery had types of *erythropus* to send to Forel for comparison with the type of *mina*. Emery's synonymy made *mina* much more understandable if specimens of *erythropus* were available for study.

This led Wheeler, who had two cotypes of *erythropus*, to describe the subspecies *zuni* in 1910. In the description of *zuni* Wheeler stated that he had collected "numerous" specimens which were running on the bark of old mesquite trees near Tucson, Arizona, but this statement must be taken with a grain of salt. There are six cotypes of *zuni* in the collection of the American Museum of Natural History and seven in the collection of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy at Harvard. There is also a single media in the collection of the United States National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution which came from the type series of *zuni*. But these 14 specimens appear to be all that Wheeler had when he described *zuni*. Nor are these a nest series for, since they came from more than one tree, more than one nest must have contributed to the series. If Wheeler had been cautious in dealing with these specimens the problem of *zuni* might not have arisen, but Wheeler's treatment of *zuni* was remarkably incautious. He not only limited his comparison to the two cotypes of *erythropus* in his possession but also made such a superficial examination of the type series of *zuni* that several of the characteristics on which he based this subspecies are negated by the types themselves. The worst of this unfortunate business is not that the synonymic subspecies *zuni* was set up but that it was done in such a way as to make both *mina* and *zuni* unrecognizable without an extensive study of type material.

This view is based on 11 colonies of *Myrmobrachys* taken by the present writer in the southwest from 1951 to 1963. The total number of specimens secured was in excess of 500, of which about 250 were mounted for study. More important is the fact that sexual castes were secured in several of the nests. Even in the field it was obvious that two species were represented, a large species taken in northern Sonora and southern Arizona and a small one taken in southern Arizona only, but it was not clear