

(Brown 1975). The functions of these two structures are unknown, and the groove has apparently been secondarily lost in the female of *A. quadratus*, but not in 3 other species in which the female is known. It may be lost in unknown females of other species. Males also possess the malar groove, although it is difficult to see in some species as the distance between the base of the mandible and the eye may be very short.

The genus has been subjected to a few inadequate revisions. Kusnezov (1962) repeated the mistakes of Wheeler (1934) and added several of his own, some of which were pointed out by Kempf (1964). Kusnezov's revision (1962) is thus completely unreliable and, except for the description of *A. femoralis*, should be disregarded. As a consequence of these works, most identifications in museums are incorrect.

This is a difficult genus which presently contains only twenty two known species. There are few differences among species; the mesosoma and gaster are nearly identical in most species. The petiole is the most important structure for the identification of workers. The form of the subpetiolar process is also very important. Many characters associated with the head are useless. The shape of the scape and the form of the anterior margin of the clypeus are important in some species. Identifications depend on very careful measurements, especially of the petiole and the scape. Without access to a good reference collection, identifications may be impossible. Hopefully this revision will resolve most of the taxonomic tangles and identifications of specimens will be possible with the keys provided.

Members of this genus are rarely collected. They are probably common, but due to their below ground activity and secretive habitats, they are seldom seen. Many species are known from a single series or even a single specimen. Due to the scarcity of material, it is difficult to judge the variability that may occur within a single species. As a consequence, several new species are described in this paper that may prove to be synonyms at a later time when more abundant material from several localities becomes available. On the other hand, some of what I regard to be species may actually be species complexes. I expect there are numerous species yet undescribed. Many species seem to have restricted distributions, thus locality is often important for identifications and distributions are included in the key.

Mixed species are common in series, especially collections of males, which are often taken at lights. This makes identifications impossible unless such mixed series are detected. The key to the males may be easier to use than the worker key, but a number of males that appear different may key to the same couplet. Apparently there are additional