

Measurements (mm) and indices of workers ($n = 4$) in order minimum – maximum, ranges with means and SD in parentheses, data of the holotype in square brackets:

HL 1.34-1.38 (1.355 ± 0.019) [1.34], HW 1.20-1.24 (1.223 ± 0.017) [1.22], FW 0.42-0.43 (0.428 ± 0.005) [0.43], FLW 0.46-0.48 (0.473 ± 0.010) [0.47], SL 1.58-1.62 (1.595 ± 0.019) [1.58], AL 2.16-2.28 (2.195 ± 0.057) [2.16], HTL 1.32-1.36 (1.338 ± 0.021) [1.32], PNW 0.89-0.94 (0.918 ± 0.026) [0.90], PL 0.72-0.74 (0.733 ± 0.010) [0.72], PW 0.31 (of all specimens), PH 0.35-0.36 (0.355 ± 0.006) [0.36], PPL 0.52-0.55 (0.533 ± 0.013) [0.53], PPW 0.48-0.50 (0.490 ± 0.012) [0.48], PPH 0.55-0.56 (0.553 ± 0.005) [0.55], ESL 0.74-0.83 (0.788 ± 0.037) [0.79], ESD 0.64-0.77 (0.713 ± 0.059) [0.75];

CI 1.10-1.12 (1.110 ± 0.008) [1.10], FI 0.34-0.36 (0.350 ± 0.008) [0.35], FLI 1.08-1.14 (1.113 ± 0.028) [1.10], SI₁ 1.16-1.19 (1.178 ± 0.013) [1.18], SI₂ 1.29-1.32 (1.308 ± 0.015) [1.30], PI₁ 2.00-2.09 (2.045 ± 0.039) [2.00], PI₂ 0.59-0.62 (0.600 ± 0.014) [0.59], PI₃ 0.25-0.26 (0.253 ± 0.005) [0.25], PPI₁ 0.94-0.98 (0.960 ± 0.016) [0.96], PPI₂ 1.11-1.14 (1.130 ± 0.014) [1.14], PPI₃ 1.57-1.61 (1.590 ± 0.023) [1.57], PPI₄ 0.39-0.41 (0.400 ± 0.008) [0.39], ESLI 0.60-0.66 (0.645 ± 0.031) [0.65], ESDI 0.86-0.95 (0.903 ± 0.044) [0.95].

Queens, males and ecology are unknown.

Etymology. The species is dedicated to Prof. Carlo Emery, the famous Italian myrmecologist.

Comparative diagnosis. *M. emeryi* clearly belongs to the *ritae*-complex of the *ritae* species-group (see RADCHENKO & ELMES 1998, 2001 a, 2001 b; RADCHENKO *et al.* 2001, 2006) and given the paucity of material until relatively recently, its misidentification as *M. ritae* is not so surprising. *M. emeryi* most resembles *M. margaritae* Emery, *M. formosae* Wheeler, and *M. sinensis* Radchenko, Zhou & Elmes, which are characterised by a very coarse rugosity of the head (frons between frontal carinae level with the eyes with only four coarse longitudinal rugae). The abundant long standing hairs on the alitrunk dorsum and occipital margin of the head well differentiates it from *M. margaritae*, which has only a few standing hairs on these areas. On the other hand, it differs from *M. formosae* and *M. sinensis* by the much less abundant standing hairs on the lateral margins of the head (less than five versus more than 20). Additionally, *M. formosae*, unlike *M. emeryi*, has no reticulation