

The promesonotal rugae are weaker than in *exigua* and reticulate, being in this respect like those of *sculptior*. The epinotal spines of *flavens* point vertically upward in contrast to those of the other ants, which though they stand upright, slope diagonally to the rear. In view of all these differences, it is doubtful if *exigua* can be regarded as a subspecies of *flavens*, as Emery treats it, and therefore shall be designated a full species, *Pheidole exigua* Mayr. On the other hand, *Pheidole flavens sculptior* Forel is less distinct anatomically and its distributional behavior accords well with that of a subspecies. I believe it should remain in that status.

The specimens of *sculptior* from Miami, Florida (Buren det.) and the sample obtained from Brickel Hammock are indistinguishable. Despite the similarities of the scrobes and their sculpture, these ants are not identical, however, with the examples of *sculptior* from Puerto Rico and Martinique, nor with the types from St. Vincent. This is evident especially from the smooth (almost sculptureless) and shining occipital lobes of the Florida ants. In *sculptior*, the cephalic rugae and punctures completely cover the head, making it opaque, except at the extreme posterior margin around the foramen which is smooth and shining. In addition, the epinotal spines of the Brickel Hammock ants are longer and sharper than those of *sculptior*. These two samples of the *flavens* group in Florida cannot represent *Ph. flavens sculptior* (from the West Indies), and unless this subspecies is known from Florida by other specimens, or is there but not yet collected, this discovery requires a revision of the North American list. *Pheidole flavens sculptior* must be dropped, and that is the plan followed in this paper.

The Miami specimens cannot be considered *Ph. exigua* either, because of a number of structural differences. The scrobes are too weak, they are punctate, and the head is shining only posteriorly on the vertex and occiput. The promesonotum is not strongly arched in a transverse direction so that the humeral angles are more prominent as a consequence, and the descent of the mesonotum to the mesoëpinotal suture is sloping and gradual. They differ from *flavens* by having the scrobes slightly more concave and densely punctate (the flattened areas of *flavens* are sparsely punctured and shining), but otherwise these ants seem