

tained except by St. Fargeau\*, although he says apparent analogy induces him to leave them together. To me however it is evident that, with the exception of the small difference in the neururation of the wings, the genera are very much alike, and this affinity is still further proved by means of the new genus I describe below by the name of *Enictus ambiguus*, which deprived of its wings might easily pass for a *Labidus*, it having the same kind of canaliculated peduncle to the abdomen, and legs like the latter, for neither femora nor tibiæ are compressed as in the typical *Doryli*.

In reviewing the arguments urged by St. Fargeau for placing these genera with the Social Ants in opposition to the views of Latreille, I cannot think that founded upon the structure and relative proportions of the antennæ of any value at all, as in the several species of each of these genera the structure and proportions of these organs differ considerably; and besides this, in very many of the males of the Social Ants, indeed, I may say in the majority of them, the scape or first joint of the antenna is not one-third of the length of the entire organ. In the structure of the mandibles, which he also cites in support of his opinion, there are, especially in the genus *Dorylus*, considerable differences in the species, and nothing can be more fallacious than to suppose that the structure of these organs in the genus *Dorylus* can possibly indicate ædificatorial habits; for they are edentate, forcipate, and considerably slighter in proportion than the male mandibles in the great majority of the genera of the well-known solitary Heterogyna: and his argument from the structure of the wing is not so strong as he might have made it if he had adduced the single recurrent nervure, which is a structure never found in the normal solitary Heterogyna, for they have invariably two recurrent nervures†. I admit that the mere absence of the females proves nothing as to the solitary habits of these genera, although I think with Latreille as above cited, that the presumption is in favour of their being so.

In confirmation of St. Fargeau's views, Mr. Haliday, as I observed above, has formed these two genera into a family, and has placed them in the same tribe with the Social Heterogyna, making them equivalent to the whole of this tribe; and in corroboration of St. Fargeau, he says, "*Dorylidas societate victuros more Formicarum contendit Peletierus argumentis equidem gravissimis, quibus adjicienda*

\* Hist. des Hymenopt. vol. i. p. 227.

† Certainly with the exception of the genus *Apterogyna*, which is another anomalous form, and which seems to be also another connecting link at a different point with the Social Heterogyna.