

## WILLIAM L. BROWN

Reprinted from BULLETIN OF THE BROOKLYN ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY,  
Vol. L, No. 4, pp. 98-99. October, 1955.

REMARKS CONCERNING THE TYPES OF FIVE  
SPECIES OF ANTS DESCRIBED BY ROGER OR  
FOREL (HYMENOPTERA, FORMICIDAE).

By MARION R. SMITH<sup>1</sup>, Washington, D. C.

Recently I have had occasion to investigate the locations of the types and the identities of the following ants described by J. Roger and A. Forel, four of which were described as North American species. Types of two of the three species described by Roger are still in the Zoological Museum of the University of Berlin, where they have been examined for me by H. Bischoff. Types of the two species described by Forel should be in the Museum d'Histoire Naturelle, Geneva, Switzerland, but unfortunately that of *Acanthostichus texanus* has apparently been lost. An examination or report of the two was furnished me by Charles Ferriere.

*Discothyrea testacea* Roger, 1863. Berlin Ent. Ztschr. 7: 177, worker, dealate female. Type locality, "North America." (Genotype).

*Discothyrea* workers from Savannah, Georgia, collected by H. T. Vanderford, and from near Holly Springs, Wake County, North Carolina, collected by Merle W. Wing, were compared with Roger's type of *testacea* by Dr. Bischoff, and he believes they represent the same species. He further believes that the type locality of the species is probably one of the Carolinas and that the types were probably collected by Christian Zimmerman. The history, taxonomy, and biology of this species are fully dealt with in a paper to be published by Wing and me in the Journal of the New York Entomological Society.

*Colobopsis impressa* Roger, 1863. Berlin Ent. Ztschr. 7: 160, worker.

Type locality, "United States of North America."

The type of *impressa*, according to Dr. Bischoff, has apparently been lost. As the species was briefly described from a worker (not a soldier) and no specific locality was indicated, it seems wise to disregard Roger's name in future treatments of *Colobopsis*.

<sup>1</sup> Entomology Research Branch, Agricultural Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

*Plagiolepis flavidula* Roger, 1863. Berlin Ent. Ztschr. 7: 162, *worker*. Type locality, "Cuba."

Dr. Bischoff found Roger's type of *Plagiolepis flavidula* to be a *Brachymyrmex*, but he was not able to determine the species. This information, while new, is not very surprising as no *Plagiolepis* is known to be native to the New World, although it is of course possible that Roger might have applied a valid name to an introduced species. So far as I am aware the name *flavidula* is not a homonym; therefore it should now stand as *Brachymyrmex flavidula* (Roger), new combination. It is possible, though, that some of the species described later in *Brachymyrmex* may prove to be a synonym of *flavidula*.

*Acanthostichus texanus* Forel, 1904. Soc. Ent. Belg. Ann. 48: 168, *dealate female*. Type locality, "Brownsville, Texas."

Although the holotype of *texanus* has apparently been lost, the description of the species is complete enough so that W. S. Creighton, Wm. F. Buren, and I have had no difficulty in placing female individuals from several localities in Texas not too distant from the type locality. In a paper to be published in the Bulletin of the Brooklyn Entomological Society I am synonymizing *Ctenopyga townsendi* Ashmead (1906. Ent. Soc. Wash. Proc. 8: 29, *male* and *alate female*. Type locality, La Puerta (probably Chihuahua). Mexico) with *A. texanus*.

*Tetramorium (Cephalomorium) bahai* Forel, 1922. Rev. Suisse de Zool. 30: 91, *worker*. Type locality, "Faisons, North Carolina, United States."

North American myrmecologists have never been able to place the ant described by Forel as *Tetramorium (Cephalomorium) bahai* from Faisons, North Carolina. As no *Tetramorium* is known to be native to North America, it is assumed that either Forel was incorrect in his generic placement of the ant or he had described an introduced *Tetramorium*, or else his locality labels were incorrect. When Santschi (1925. Soc. Ent. Belg. Bul. et Ann. 65: 228) stated that he had examined Forel's type and found the ant to be a *Pheidole (Hendecapheidole)*, it was only natural to assume that Santschi was correct in his generic and subgeneric placement. I was therefore greatly surprised when Charles Ferriere examined the type and found that, although it was a *Pheidole*, it could not possibly be a *Hendecapheidole* since it had 12 instead of 11 antennal segments. As Dr. Ferriere could not send me the holotype for examination and he did not have the time to determine it specifically, we do not yet know what the species is. Perhaps this can be settled at a future date when some North American myrmecologist is visiting the museum in Geneva.