

postpetiole recurs in the East Indian *Cerapachys antennatus* F. Smith, which happens to be the type of the genus.

Emery seems to have regarded the non-clavate antennæ and margination of the petiole as more important characters than the number of antennal joints since he made *Phyracaces* an independent genus and separated *Cerapachys* into four subgenera on this character, namely *Cerapachys* sens. str. with 12, *Parasyscia* with 11, *Oöceræa* with 10 and *Syscia* with 9 joints. But the finding of an intermediate form like *Chrysapace* brings us face to face with a dilemma. Either we must raise all the subgenera mentioned to generic rank and retain *Chrysapace* and *Phyracaces* as independent genera or we must reduce these two genera to subgeneric rank under *Cerapachys*. The "splitters" will probably adopt the former, the "lumpers" the latter alternative. Should the lumpers carry the day the specific name of Crawley's species will have to be changed, because Forel had previously described a *Cerapachys jacobsoni* from Java (Notes Leyden Mus. 34, 1912, p. 103). In that case I suggest that the Sumatran ant be called *Cerapachys (Chrysapace) crawleyi* nom. nov. It is, however, not improbable that we shall do more splitting in the Cerapachyinae in the near future. The subfamily is proving to be more extensive than we had supposed. Mr. James Clark and I have recently brought to light quite a number of species of *Eusphinctus* and *Phyracaces* in Australia and there are several diverse, undescribed species of *Cerapachys* and *Phyracaces* from the East Indies in my collection. The sexual phases, larvæ and pupæ of the great majority of Cerapachyinae are quite unknown. A knowledge of these phases and stages will probably aid materially in a final revision of the genera and subgenera of the subfamily.