mainly in average smaller size (and size-dependent characters), but the difference is not absolute.

It is also clear that the western samples differ fairly widely among themselves in all of the characters so far considered as diagnostic. Dark, fairly heavily sculptured variants have been found sympatrically with a smooth, light-colored one in southeastern Arizona, but the same is true of Lexington, Massachusetts, and Pittsboro, North Carolina, in the East. It would not be at all surprising to find that dark, heavily-sculptured *Myrmecina* also occur in favorable (moist) habitats in the Pacific Coast states. Meanwhile, it does not seem to me necessary to dignify the predominantly small, light, weakly sculptured *Myrmecina* samples from the West with a separate name, even a subspecies one. We can easily obscure the real situation by trying to force these populations into a conventional subspecies interpretation. Snelling's (1965) paper gives a key to the "subspecies" *texana, californica, americana* and *brevispinosa,* but he had not seen my revisionary notes of 1949 and 1951 at the time he wrote. Even so, *americana* and *brevispinosa* as he gives their ranges are sympatric over most of the eastern United States, and (by inference) over much of the central and western part of the country as well. It should be noted, incidentally, that the range of *M. americana* extends well beyond New York, at least into New England. Smith (1951) also cites a record from Montana.

In summary, the synonymy of *M. americana* is as follows:

Myrmecina americana
= subsp. *quadrispina*
= subsp. *texana*
= var. or subsp. *brevispinosa*
= *M. californica,* new synonymy.

The scatter diagram (Fig. 1) is based on the following worker head lengths (clypeus included) and head widths (excluding the eyes) from full-face view. For each specimen, the measurements (in hundredths of mm) are given separated by a diagonal, with head length first, in the form HL/HW.