C. nicobarensis Forel, known only from the female, is not included in the table.

Cryptopone testacea (Motschulsky)

Amblyopone (?) testacea Motschulsky, 1863, Bull. Soc. Nat. Moscou, XXXVI, p. 15, Q.

Cryptopone testacea EMERY, 1893, Ann. Soc. Ent. France, pp. 240, 241, Figs. 3 and 4, \(\beta \). Bingham, 1903, 'Fauna Brit. Ind. Hymen.,' II, p. 105, \(\beta \), \(\beta \). EMERY, 1911, Ponerinae, in 'Genera Insect.,' p. 88, \(\beta \), \(\beta \). Forel, 1913, Zool. Jahrb. Abt. Syst., Bd. 63, p. 10, \(\beta \).

The worker described by Emery was taken by E. Simon at Nawalapitya, Ceylon. Forel possessed specimens of the same caste collected by H. von Buttel-Reepen at Selangor, Malacca, "from an earthy carton termitarium of Capritermes nemorosus Silvestri." According to Emery, the worker measures only 2.5 mm., but Motschulsky's female measured 2 lines (5 mm.). Since the known females of other closely allied species are only slightly larger than their workers, Emery's specimen may not belong to Motschulsky's species. In Emery's figure the sides of the head are represented as decidedly convex, the antennal scapes as reaching nearly to the posterior border, the petiolar node as thick and as having a straight anterior surface. In both workers and females of all the other species of Cryptopone the head is nearly square and the petiolar node is more subcuboidal in profile, with a distinctly concave anterior surface.

Cryptopone nicobarensis Forel

Cryptopone nicobarensis Forel, 1905, Ann. Soc. Ent. Belgique, XLIX, p. 166, Q. Emery, 1911, Ponerinae, in 'Genera Insect.,' p. 88, Q.

Forel described this species from a deälated female specimen, labelled "Nicobars," in the Copenhagen Museum, as having six mandibular teeth and 4–5-jointed antennal clubs. The length is given as 3.5 mm. He remarks that "though it is a female, I believe this species to be quite distinct from testacea Motschulsky, which is smaller, has a paler color, more abundant pilosity and a differently shaped node and mandibles." This contention may be correct, but it should be noticed that Motschulsky's specimen was not smaller but actually twice as long as Forel's nicobarensis female. It is therefore difficult to avoid the suspicion that the latter may be the undescribed female of Emery's "testacea" and that his worker may not belong to the same species as Motschulsky's female.