

posterior face of propodeum concave; petiolar node elongate, widened posteriorly. All surfaces with abundant erect hairs, decumbent pubescence limited to parts of mesonotum near base of wings, descending face of propodeum and anterior face of petiole. Sculpture is shining and polished, color is dark reddish brown.

Male (measurements of *C. townsendi* lectotype in parentheses): HL 0.83 - (0.85), HW (posterior to eye) (0.78) - 0.80, SL (0.24) - 0.28, SW (0.1) 0.1, EL (0.35) - 0.39, WL (1.79) - 1.85, PW (0.43) - 0.44, PL (0.49) - 0.54. Indices: SI (28) - 34, CI (92) - 96, PI (114) - 123. Mandible without teeth, apex angled; median anterior border of clypeus broadly convex; eyes large, convex; 3 well developed ocelli, diameter less than distance between them; antennae 13 segmented, sides of scape parallel, anterior edge not concave; vertex of head convex; posterior face of petiole broadly concave, petiole shaped as in worker, elongate, wider posteriorly, subpetiolar process shaped as in worker, but not as wide. Genitalia (Fig. 77) unusual for the genus. Parameres large with long slender shaft, hairy apex which is hook-like, pointed ventrally and posteriorly; aedeagus very distinctive, consists of elongate process which terminates in triangular shaped, toothed structure (Fig. 80); volsellae large with round lobe; subgenital plate distinctive, terminating in two broad teeth (Fig. 77). Hairs covering entire surface, most about 0.1 mm long, few up to 0.25 mm, lacking decumbent pubescence. Sculpture mostly smooth, shining, mandibles and head shagreened or finely punctate. Very dark brown in color, mandibles, funiculus, legs, genitalia lighter brown.

*Discussion.* All three castes of this species are easily distinguished from those of the other species. The workers are easily distinguished from all other known species by the relatively large eye (Fig. 3) and the top of the petiole is smooth and strongly shining (found in few other species) Workers of *A. emmae* would be expected to have a more quadrate petiole than those of *A. texanus*, but would otherwise be expected to be similar. The female is easily distinguished as it is one of the few in the genus that would have wings. They are not subdichthadiiform as in other species and are actually very similar to the workers, both in size and form. The top of the petiole is smooth and the petiole is elongate. The female is similar to that of *A. emmae*, but has a narrower head, narrower petiole and smaller ocelli and is thus easily separated. The male is similar to those of other species in the genus, except for the genitalia, which are very distinct (Fig. 79), and it has a 13 segmented antenna. The teeth of the subgenital plate are thickened, which easily and conveniently separates this species from all other known males. The males of *A. emmae* would be expected to be similar,