

common with the mainland ant assigned to that name. The scape is flattened basally but there is no trace of a lateral lobule. Thus, in Creighton's key it will run directly to *C. vicinus*. At the moment the only thing to separate *C. maccooki*, as here understood and restricted to the type series, from *C. vicinus* is that the majors of the former have a slightly longer scape (extending well beyond the occipital corner) and fewer erect hairs on the body. It seems probable that *C. maccooki* will eventually be recognized as a synonym of *C. vicinus*, but I believe that additional samples from Guadalupe Island are necessary before this can be certain.

Since the name *C. maccooki* has here been restricted to the insular species, the species from the western United States must then be known as *C. semitestaceus* and nearly all mainland records of *C. maccooki* transferred to *C. semitestaceus*. The type locality is here restricted to Plumas County, the first of two California localities mentioned by Emery. This species extends from northern Baja California del Norte, Mexico, north along the Coast Ranges to Mendocino County, California, the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, the foothills of Sierra Nevada and Cascade Mountains (below 5500 ft.) northward into Oregon, and the Great Basin Desert of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington.

I do not regard *C. maculatus dumetorum* as a synonym of *C. semitestaceus*, but believe that it should be accorded specific rank. That *C. semitestaceus* and *C. dumetorum* are closely related cannot be denied, and both are closely related to *C. vicinus* and other members of the subgenus *Tanaemyrmex* in western North America.

Although both species possess a lobe at the base of the antennal scape this is much more variable in *C. semitestaceus* than in *C. dumetorum*; in some specimens of *C. semitestaceus* the lobe may be so reduced that it is barely discernible. In no specimens which I have seen, however, does it approach the condition seen in *C. dumetorum*. In this species the lobe is always prominent, strongly flattened, usually somewhat angulate on its lower margin. This difference, while obvious when both species are available for comparison, is not, of itself, sufficiently clear-cut to prove useful in separating the two.

The two species differ markedly in the shape of the frontal lobes. In *C. semitestaceus* the margins of the lobe are expanded above the antennal sockets, the lyrate condition normal to most species of this group. The frontal area, measured from the clypeal base to its upper margin, is longer than wide, even in the largest specimens available to me. This is not true in *C. dumetorum* in which the lateral margins are arcuately expanded above the level of the antennal sockets, so that when measured in the above manner, the frontal area is broader than long. The two species differ in other cephalic characters, but these are largely of a more subtle nature. In *C. dumetorum* the antennal scape