

as a dichthadiigyne. A similar diversity is seen in the males of the Cerapachyini. The male of *Acanthostichus afflictus*, recently discovered by Gallardo (1919) in Argentina, is so much like an *Eciton* or *Dorylus* male that even an expert myrmecologist would not hesitate to place it among the Dorylinæ. The males of other genera (*Lioponera*, *Phyracaces*, *Cerapachys*, *Eusphinctus*) on the other hand, though lacking the cerci, have a decidedly Ponerine habitus. It would seem, therefore, that the Cerapachyini are intermediate between the Dorylinæ and Ponerinæ, as Emery has contended, and that we might unite them with either. I should prefer, however, to separate them out as an independent subfamily, which may be ascribed to Forel, who in 1893 first recognized the "Cerapachysii" as a natural tribe. Of course, the name Prodorylinæ Emery cannot be used for the subfamily, because there is no genus *Prodorylus*.

For many years I have deemed it necessary to introduce another nomenclatorial change, namely that of the subfamily name Camponotinæ to Formicinæ. Forel, in his study of the poison apparatus and anal glands of ants, published in 1878, divided the subfamily Formicidæ Mayr (1855) into two subfamilies, which he called Camponotidæ and Dolichoderidæ. This was unjustifiable according to our present rules of nomenclature, for Mayr's name should have been retained and restricted to the group containing the genus *Formica*. At that time, which antedated the use of *inæ* as a subfamily suffix, Forel justified his course on the ground that "Formicidæ" was already in use as a family name.

Owing to the fact that definite rules and conventions in regard to the suffixes of family and especially of subfamily names in Zoölogy have been stabilized only within recent decades, there is considerable confusion concerning the authors to whom our modern names in *idæ* and *inæ* are to be attributed. It seems to be customary to accredit a family or subfamily name to the author who first recognized the group as supergeneric and gave it a Latin or Greek name based on that of one of its genera. If this is done in the case of the Formicidæ the authorities cited in the literature require revision. Frederick Smith (1851), Westwood (1840), Shuckard (1840) and Stephens (1829) all attribute Formicidæ as a family name to Leach. They appear to refer to his article published in the Edinburgh Encyclopædia in 1815, where he used the term