

had a comically asymmetrical appearance. A tree by the trail had been felled, and in a fork of its branches, at what had been a height of approximately forty feet, I found the nest, an earthy structure, ovate in form, about a foot in length and eight inches in diameter. Fine roots of a plant ramified through this nest in all directions in such a manner as to make it quite firm, despite the nature of its component material. When I dug into the structure, numbers of the *Dolichoderus* rushed out. While collecting these I had a momentary glimpse of another ant, colored similarly to the *Dolichoderus* but much larger, and with long legs. It emerged from one chamber and immediately disappeared into another. Hoping to collect this, as well as all the phases of the *Dolichoderus*, I brought to the place a large quinine can, containing a piece of cotton saturated with chloroform and began to dig and throw into this fragments of the nest. Hereupon numbers of the large ants rushed out, and my hand was severely stung before I realized that two colonies of ants, one of them a stinging form, were occupying the nest. On examination, the fragments thrown into the can were seen to contain large numbers of both species, together with many larvae and pupae of each. The larger one proved to be a Ponerine, of the genus *Odontomachus*. Males and females of *Dolichoderus* were also found, but there were none of these phases of the other. But the presence of many larvae in all stages showed that the sexual forms of both species must have been present. During the two days following I revisited the nest frequently, and stirred it up. Each time both species of ant sallied out. Touching the nest lightly would bring out *Dolichoderus*, but it required a more vigorous prod to excite the other. My first examination had so disarranged the nest that I could make no close study of its structure, but was able to ascertain that the *Odontomachus* were gathered together in its deeper recesses, while the smaller species occupied the peripheral chambers and galleries. No other nest was found, nor did I again find either of the ants. This may be readily explained by the usual inaccessibility of tree tops to the collector, so failure to find more in no wise proves that the species are uncommon."

Mann adds: "The observations here recorded seem to indicate a much closer relation than that of *Dolichoderus* and *Cremastogaster*, for it is evident that both species would derive benefit from the association. In the earthy, arboreal nest of *Dolichoderus*, *Odontomachus* finds a condition similar to that of the ordinary nesting place of the genus, while to the other, a feeble species, the advantage in having a colony of powerful stinging ants in the same nest is obvious, provided of course that it, itself, is not molested. For the reasons stated above, I do not believe that such molestation occurs."

The two ants were described in the paper from which these passages are quoted as *Odontomachus affinis* Guérin subsp. *mayi* Mann and *Dolichoderus* (*Monacis*) *debilis* var. *rufescens* Mann, the latter being, therefore, merely a red variety of the form observed by Forel, Christophersen and