

Emery emphasized the distinctness of the 4-jointed antennal club, but this does not seem to be a good character. In most of the species that I have examined the club, owing to the greater width and length of the seventh funicular joint, might be more aptly described as indistinctly or even distinctly 5-jointed. This is a character of many species of *Ponera*, while in others (e.g., *lae* Forel, *mina* Wheeler, *japonica* Wheeler, *mumfordi* Wheeler) the antennal club is much more sharply 4-jointed than in any of the species of *Cryptopone* or *Pseudocryptopone*. The shape of the head, as described by Emery, is a more satisfactory character. His remark that it is "relatively short, slightly longer than broad," applies to the species of *Cryptopone*, *sensu stricto*, but not to his *tenuis* nor to Szabó's *mocsaryi*, in both of which the head is fully one-fourth longer than broad. It is quite as long or even longer in the three new species of *Pseudocryptopone* described below.

The two genera seem to me also to have different natural affinities. *Cryptopone*, *sensu stricto*, is obviously most closely related to the subgenus *Trachymesopus* Emery of the genus *Euponera*, as shown by the shape of the head and the short and bristly middle tibiae, whereas *Pseudocryptopone* is most closely related to *Ponera*. Indeed, I confess my inability to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the two genera. One of the species, *incerta*, new species, which I have assigned to *Pseudocryptopone*, might, with equal propriety, be placed in *Ponera*. Since *Cryptopone* is a clearly defined genus, whereas *Pseudocryptopone* merges into *Ponera*, two courses seem to be open to us: we may regard *Pseudocryptopone*, at least provisionally, as a distinct genus or subgenus of *Ponera*, or we may transfer all the species with mandibles and thorax like *Ponera* to that genus. I have adopted the former course for the following reasons. *Ponera* is now a large and very difficult genus in great need of careful revision. The monographer who undertakes this task will very probably divide it into several subgenera or even genera and his definition of these will automatically determine their relations to *Pseudocryptopone* and therefore its true status and affinities. For the present, I prefer to circumscribe the genus *Cryptopone* more sharply and to recognize a generic category for the species closely related to *C. tenuis*, which, after all, have a habitus distinctly different from that of the typical species of *Ponera*. I have, moreover, ventured to withdraw two of Emery's Papuan species (*selenophora* and *clavicornis*) from the genus *Ponera* and to associate with them a closely related, undescribed species from the Philippines (*oreas*, new species) to form another new genus, *Selenopone*.

The only males that I possess belong to two species of *Cryptopone*,