rest of Australia. Sculptural intergrades were then found in the «right places», in northern Queensland, mostly where high-rainfall coastal areas were giving way to the drier interior. The trouble is that only a few intergradient specimens are known, and we need more of them to be sure of their nature and the details of their geographical distribution.

The picture is complicated by the fact that the available material from the northern third of the Northern Territory of Australia can be separated into two types on the basis of gastric sculpture. In the first type, the first gastric segment is smooth or nearly so to near the posterior border, where a band of more or less distinct shagreening usually intervenes. This type includes some very large workers (HW often $>$ 2.30 mm), usually with the petiolar node slanted caudad and tapering gradually into an apical spine, although series with smaller workers exist.

The second type has the first gastric segment smooth or coriaceous, and more or less shining in the front and middle parts, and longitudinally striate in the posterior part. The most completely (and opaquely) sculptured sample is one from Johnston River, Melville Island (W. Bateman). The «second type» tends to be smaller and to be associated with a shorter, more abruptly tapered node, with stronger striation around the front and sides. The two types have been collected sympatrically, but not from the same nests, in the vicinity of Darwin and at Katherine, Northern Territory (W. L. Brown).

The form of the second type suggests possible intergradation, as one goes northward (toward Melanesia) in the Northern Territory, between *ruficeps* and *cephalotes,* but the lack of intergrades between the two types in the Northern Territory samples we have so far is a problem that can only be settled by more material, particularly nest series, of this complex.

The best I can do with the present resources is to reconfirm the very close (possibly conspecific) relationship between *ruficeps* and *cephalotes,* to list their obvious synonyms, and to indicate a problem within the nominal *ruficeps* of the upper Northern Territory.

There remain two special remarks to be made. First, the dentitional characters emphasized by Crawley (1922) in his analysis of this complex are scarcely to be rated as very important, considering the great variation in apical tooth size and shape in all the larger *Odontomachus* species, due especially to allometry and wear. Second, *O. sharpei* was based on a single