head of the var. *arhuacus* type is proportionately broader (CI 81 *versus* CI ca. 77–78); in profile, the frontal area is abruptly elevated above the base of the clypeus in C. *ustus* but gradually sloping in the var. *arhuacus* type. In the latter, along the side of the head, from the base of the mandible to a point above the lower eye margin, there are conspicuous erect setae. In C. *ustus,* on the other hand, there usually are no such setae, but when present they are limited to one or two situated near the base of the mandible. The type of var. *arhuacus* also has numerous short erect setae on the clypeus in addition to about 6 long erect setae. Six to eight long erect setae are also present in C. *ustus,* but there are no very short setae on the clypeal disc.

In general, the head of the var. *arhuacus* type is much hairier than that of similar-sized individuals of C. *ustus.* Our view at present is that var. *arhuacus* should be considered a separate species, C. *arhuacus* (NEW STATUS), in the subgenus *Tanaemyrmex.* It may utlimately prove to be synonymous with some other Colombian species. In addition, it should be noted that all other known forms assigned to C. *ustus* are limited to the Greater Antilles, far removed from the one known locality for C. *arhuacus.*

Wheeler and Mann (1914) briefly discussed a major worker specimen from Port-au-Prince, Haiti, received from Forel and, perhaps, identified by him as C. *ustus.* This individual was not available to us but is evidently notably hairy and not at all similar either to C. *ustus* syntypes or to other material we have studied. Whatever species this may be, it would seem to be something other than C. *ustus.* In fact, it is possible that this could be the species described below as C. *taino,* although we have seen no specimens of C. *taino* from Hispaniola.

The remaining forms described as varieties of C. *ustus,* all from Hispaniola, are based on trivial differences in color, sculpture, and pilosity. There are, moreover, no consistencies among the material we have been able to examine, with some colony samples including two or more of these varieties. Under the circumstances, any attempt to segregate these seems futile, and all are here reduced to synonymy.

Finally, we have examined syntypes of C. *larvigerus,* described by Wheeler and Mann (1914) from Grand Rivière, Haiti. Although they compared it to the very different C. *ramulorum* Wheeler, no comparison was made to C. *ustus.* We have made that comparison and conclude that the two are conspecific. We have not seen Menozzi's var. *maculifrons,* but the scanty description suggests that this, too, is nothing more than a minor color variant of a species that, like so many *Camponotus,* exhibits considerable variability in color.

In addition to the various syntypes from Hispaniola, we have collected C. *ustus* at a *bona fide* Puerto Rican locality: Mona Island, lying between Hispaniola and Puerto Rico.

The following redescription of the female castes of C. *ustus* is based primarily on our material collected at Mona Island. These specimens have been compared with the type material and, in our opinion, are conspecific. Vouchers are deposited in the BMNH, LACM, MCZC, and MHNG.

DIAGNOSIS. *Female castes.* Head margins (major) distinctly convergent below *or* (media, minor, gyne) subparallel, without standing setae between mandible and dorsolateral angle; antennal scape with sparse erect setae along shaft; free clypeal margin transverse, thick and with median, broadly triangular beveled area; mandible with seven teeth (sometimes obscurely so). *Male.* See Discussion below.

DESCRIPTION. *Major worker, measurements* (mm) (n = 30): HW 1.64–2.26 (2.04); HL 1.95–2.46 (2.14); SL 1.95–2.05 (–); WL 2.6–3.1 (–); TL 7.5–8.7. *Ratios and indices:* CI 105–119 (105); SI 83–103 (–); OI 20–25 (24); OMR 48–60 (56). Note: due to the poor condition of the one major worker in the syntypic series some measurements were not possible, hence the (–).

Head (Fig. 1) slightly longer than wide in frontal view, sides gently curved and strongly convergent below, LHW about 0.68 × HW; vertex concave between distinct dorsolateral lobes. Eyes relatively small and, in frontal view, outer margins short of lateral head margins by more than minimum diameter of scape. Frontal lobes narrow, greatest intercarinal distance about 0.32 × HW; upper intercarinal distance about 0.8 × greatest intercarinal distance. Clypeal midline weakly subangulate for most of its length, terminating below in broadly triangular median beveled area (Fig. 6); free (ventral) margin thick, straight between obtuse lateral angles. Antennal scape moderately broadened distad, apex well beyond summit of dorsolateral lobes; mandible with 7 teeth.

Front of head shiny, surfaces coarsely tessellate, clypeus and lower malar area less shiny, more finely tessellate; entire front of head sparsely and minutely punctate, clypeus with few fine punctures but with coarser setigerous punctures. Mandible about as shiny as clypeus, with obscure minute punctures and scattered coarser setigerous punctures. Posterior surface of head shinier between sparse to scattered minute punctures and coarser piligerous punctures.

Side of head (including malar area) without erect setae; eyes bare; vertex and upper frons with 3–5 erect setae on each side, outermost shortest; frontal lobes with 5 long erect setae along each margin and shorter submedian dorsal pair. Clypeus with usual basal seta pair and 4–6 similar discal hairs; usual fringe of widely spaced long curled setae along free margin; hypostomal area with 2–4 short erect setae. Distal two-thirds of scape shaft with variable number of short erect setae that are shorter than distance between them.

Mesosoma (Fig. 4) robust, dorsum moderately convex in profile, metanotal depression absent; propodeum strongly curved and without definite posterior declivity. Pronotal dorsum about 1.1× as