

broad, shallow; dorsal face of propodeum gradually slanting towards declivity, basal part longer than declivitous part, propodeal lobes rounded; petiole elongate, length more than twice its width, with parallel sides, arcuate in profile, with a strong antero-ventral tooth; postpetiole longer than broad, posterior part broader than anterior part and forming a node; gaster broadly oval in dorsal view; legs with femora strongly incrassate and tibiae slightly thickened.

Head longitudinally rugose up to vertex, behind which more rugoreticulate, with 12 strong rugae between frontal carinae at the level of eyes; interrugal space punctured and shiny; frontal carinae divergent, long, prominent, continuing to posterior corners of the head; antennal scrobes deep; mandibles longitudinally costulate and rugulose, interrugal space smooth and shiny; clypeus with tiny rugulae posteriorly, shiny, with strong median and a pair of lateral carinae; sides of the head, mesosoma, petiole and postpetiole strongly rugoreticulate; anepisternum and metapleuron smooth and shiny, katepisternum rugoreticulate; propodeal declivity smooth and shiny; gaster smooth and shiny with the basal part of the first segment longitudinally striate; legs shiny, coxae punctured with transverse rugulae on fore coxae, femora smooth and tibiae finely longitudinally striate.

Mesosoma, petiole and postpetiole castaneous; head and gaster blackish brown, scape and legs yellowish brown; whole body covered with abundant, long, obtuse, whitish pilosity.

#### GYNE

##### Dimensions:

HL 1.53-1.59; HW 1.51-1.57; ED 0.33-0.35; SL 0.91-0.97; MFC 0.71; PRNW 1.28-1.33; ML 2.59-2.66; PTL 0.84-0.93; PTW 0.40-0.42; PTH 0.40; PPTL 0.70-0.73; PPTW 0.55-0.57; PPTH 0.50-0.51; GL 1.62-2.29; CI 98.74-98.69; SI 60.26-61.78; PTWI 45.16-47.62; PPTWI 75.34-81.43; TL 7.28-8.20 (2 measured)

Similar to worker except head slightly longer than broad, with three ocelli; mesonotum, katepisternum and scutellum longitudinally rugose while pronotum, anepisternum and metapleuron rugoreticulate; gaster yellowish brown except 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> segment blackish brown.

#### MALE

##### Dimensions:

HL 1.06; HW 1.28; ED 0.39; SL 0.24; PRNW 1.04; ML 2.35; PTL 1.00; PTW 0.35; PTH 0.35; PPTL 0.86; PPTW 0.44; PPTH 0.46; GL 2.80; CI 120.75; SI 18.75; PTWI 35.00; PPTWI 51.16; TL 8.07 (1 measured)

Head much broader than long, sides convex, posterior head margin barely emarginate, with three ocelli; mandibles with well developed pointed teeth; clypeus convex, anterior margin rounded and entire; frontal area distinct, triangular; antennae 13-segmented, longer and without distinct club, funicular segments cylindrical and longer than broad; scape longer than 2<sup>nd</sup> segment but shorter than the rest of the segments; antennal scrobes deep; eyes large, convex and slightly below midlength of head; pronotum not broader than head, its anterior lateral angles acute; scutum broader than pronotum and divided into three plates, scutellum somewhat rounded; dorsal face of propodeum flat and vertical; petiole longer, almost 2.9 times its width, with small blunt antero-ventral tooth; gaster convex, elongate; femora and tarsi less incrassate than in workers.

Head and mesosoma longitudinally rugoreticulate and spaces between them punctured and shiny; mandibles, clypeus and frontal area longitudinally rugose; frontal carinae short and not continuing to the posterior corners of the head; petiole and postpetiole faintly reticulate; gaster smooth; legs finely punctured and shiny; wings transparent.

Head, mesosoma, petiole, postpetiole and coxae blackish; antennae, legs and gaster yellowish brown; body covered with long erect and subdecumbent hairs except antennae, 1<sup>st</sup> gastral tergite, coxae, trochanters, femora and tibiae with short suberect hairs.

REMARKS. *Dilobocondyla fouqueti* was described by Santschi (1910) from Vietnam, based on the worker caste only. Later a variety of this species *D. fouqueti lighti* was distinguished by Wheeler (1927) from China, based on size and colour variation. Wang and Wu (1992), while studying the ant fauna of China, considered that *D. fouqueti lighti* was just a morphological variation