Reprinted from Annals of the Entomological Society of America, Vol. 45, No. 3, September, 1952.

## A NEW PHEIDOLE (HYMENOPTERA: FORMICIDAE) FROM FLORIDA<sup>1</sup>

A. C. COLE

University of Tennessee, Knoxville

## Pheidole sitarches littoralis n. subsp.

Holotype, major (Cole collection, No. E-138).—Differing from the typical sitarches and its other known subspecies in the following characteristics: It lacks the transverse delicate rugules on the occipital lobes of the head, giving the head a more shining appearance; the coarse longitudinal cephalic rugae are more irregular and form weak reticulations; the hairs on the occipital lobes of the head are shorter, stouter, and more numerous; the pronotum is more coarsely and irregularly rugose; a few fine rugae extend transversely between the bases of the epinotal spines; the thoracic hairs are more pointed and somewhat more delicate, being not at all clavate.

Paratype, minor.—Differing from previously described forms of sitarches in the posterior half of the head which is striatopunctate and in the much darker color of the entire body.

Type locality.—Lido Beach, Sarasota, Florida. The holotype, 59 paratype majors, and numerous paratype minors were collected by the writer, December 24, 1950.

Deposition of types.—The holotype is in the collection of the writer. Paratypes are to be deposited in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, U. S. National Museum, American Museum of Natural History, and in the collections of Dr. W. S. Creighton and the writer.

Habitat.—Several colonies were found in unshaded areas of pure sand on the upper beach. Each nest was marked by a small flattened crater of sand approximately 3.0 cm. in diameter. The lower nest chambers were at a depth of about 7.0 cm.

Affinities.—After a cursory examination of both castes the writer suspected littoralis of being a member of the pilifera complex. Through the courtesy of the Museum of Comparative Zoology types of sitarches and its subspecies campestris and soritis were examined. The writer became convinced that the new subspecies is most closely related to sitarches and its known subspecies which had been the contention of Dr. W. S. Creighton when he had examined the specimens previously. The new subspecies seems to be much more closely related to sitarches than to pilifera, particularly in the sculpturing and contour of the head and in the shape of the postpetiole and the humeral angles of the prothorax. It seems to be more like the subspecies campestris than soritis. Pheidole pilifera and its subspecies have the occipital margin of the head more deeply excised, the head much less rugo-reticulate,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Contribution No. 50, Department of Zoology and Entomology, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

the lateral connules of the postpetiole very well developed, and the

humeral angles of the prothorax pronounced.

The real problem is that of determining whether the new ant is a subspecies of *sitarches* or a species in its own right. If it is assumed that *sitarches* is the most closely related species to *pilifera*, the writer is more inclined to classify the new ant as a subspecies of *sitarches*. The new ant probably represents a peninsular population which is disjunct from populations of *sitarches* and its other known subspecies. Further collections in other areas may tend better to clarify the matter.

There follows a key for the separation of the known forms of

sitarches.

The writer is grateful to Dr. W. S. Creighton, Dr. M. R. Smith, and Mr. E. O. Wilson for their opinions and suggestions, and to the Museum of Comparative Zoology for the loan of types.