

Regarding the characteristics used by Kutter (1931) to establish *Forelophilus*, it should be noted:

(1) The shape of the antenna (Fig. 1), especially the short, sub-quadrate flagellum segments, are extremely similar in *Forelophilus* and *Overbeckia* and distinguish both genera from *Camponotus*. This characteristic can be well recognized in worker morphs and gynes of various *Forelophilus* species, including undescribed ones illustrated on the Web.

(2) There is a worker polymorphism in *Forelophilus* (compare Figs. 4 and 7). It is interesting to note that Kutter (1931) proposed the lack of a dimorphism from his knowledge of three workers only.

(3) The palp formula 6,4 can be found in all Camponotini except *Camponotus megalonyx* Wheeler (Bolton 2003).

(4) The head of *Forelophilus* is not as truncate as in *Overbeckia*, but roundish in minor workers (Fig. 4) and squared and subtruncate in the major workers (Fig. 7).

(5) The dorsal outline of the mesosoma of the workers (Figs. 5, 8, 14, 17), with deep metanotal furrow, metathoracic spiracular tubercles, and transverse ridge on propodeum, seems to be a very valuable characteristic of *Forelophilus* species, including undescribed ones. However, the most typical component of this feature, the metathoracic spiracular tubercles surpassing the dorsal face of the propodeum (see Bolton 1994), is absent in the major worker (known only in *F. stefanschoedli* sp. nov.).

A comparison of *Forelophilus* and species of *Camponotus* from Southeast Asia, the Pacific islands, and Australia results in the observation that all species have a similar structure of the gaster by having a relatively short first tergite less than half of the gaster length (see definition of *Camponotus* by Bingham 1903). Characteristics used to distinguish certain clades or species of *Camponotus*, like number and length of setae on head parts and dorsum of mesosoma, and density,

length, and angle of elevation of setae on scape and tibiae, do not significantly differ between *Forelophilus* and *Camponotus*. Strong similarities can be observed between *Forelophilus* and *Camponotus* subgenus *Colobopsis*: both groups have wide frontal areas (maximum width between carinae more than one-third of head width) and raised metathoracic spiracles are also present in some *Colobopsis* spp. (A. McArthur, personal communication). However, the truncation of the clypeus is strong in *Colobopsis* (especially in major workers) and weak in *Forelophilus*, and the fore femur of *Forelophilus* is not incrassate as in *Colobopsis*.

The structure of the antenna supports a close relationship of *Forelophilus* and *Overbeckia*, and the structures of the mesosoma support the monophyly of *Forelophilus*. Whether this complex belongs to *Camponotus* s.l. or not, can be judged only after a thorough systematic and molecular study on this, the largest ant genus.

### Zoogeography

Hitherto, the genus *Forelophilus* was known only from Java and Borneo (Kutter 1931, Antweb 2006, Antbase.net 2006 [sub *Camponotus* sp. 18]). The new findings extend the distribution of the genus across the Wallace-Dickerson Line to the Philippine Biogeographic Region.

Alpert *et al.* (2006) recorded 25 described species of *Camponotus* from the Philippines, while the genus *Forelophilus* was hitherto unknown from that country. Guessing from illustrations published on the Web (Antweb 2006, Antbase.net 2006), *Forelophilus* species recorded from Borneo are probably not conspecific with *F. stefanschoedli* sp. nov. or *F. philippinensis* sp. nov. On present knowledge both species appear to be Philippine endemics.

The paucity of records of both new species may indicate that they are rare. However, one reason for that "rarity" could be that they are rarely collected, because in the field minor workers are very similar to the common dolichoderine species *Dolichoderus thoracicus* Smith, 1860, which is known from the Philippines only in its blackish