

Discussion — *Irogera* is closest to *Rogeria*, the workers differing in the clavate shape of the petiole, the more strongly angulate or dentate upper corner of the metasternal lobe, the more elongate habitus of the body. The less inflated segments of the apical club of funiculus, another distinctive character given by EMERY, does not seem to be very helpful, because a similar condition also occurs in larger species of *Rogeria* s. str. Perhaps the number of palpal segments, known only of *I. subarmata* sp. n. (3:2) and of *Rogeria minima* Kusnezov, 1958 (2:1) and the sexual forms will furnish additional characters.

As said before, BROWN (1953) believes that *Irogera* "is either very close to or synonymous with *Hylomyrma*." Whereas the original characterizations of both *Irogera procera* and *tonduzi*, the only evidence at BROWN's disposal, could easily lead to such a conclusion, the examination of true *Irogera* specimens disproves this surmise. *Hylomyrma* workers and females are distinct from *Irogera* by the elongate and striate mandibles with strongly oblique chewing border, the bidentate anterior apron of clypeus, the lateral portions of the latter forming a sharp crest posteriorly in front of the antennal groove, the 4-segmented funicular club, the palpal formula (4:3), the prominent anterior lobe of mesopleura, the barbulate apical spurs on tibiae II and III, the basidorsal costulae on gastric tergite I, to mention just the most obvious features (Cf. KEMPF, 1960).

Irogera procera (Emery)

Rogeria procera Emery, 1896: 92-93, fig. 19 (Worker; Brazil, Pará: Belém).

Rogeria (Irogera) procera Emery, 1915: 191.

Macromischa brasiliensis Borgmeier, 1951 (1953): 107-108, figs. 1-4 (Worker; Brazil, Pará: Rio Cumina, Cachocira do Breu). *New Synonymy*.

A comparison between the original description and figure of *Irogera procera* and the holotype of *Macromischa brasiliensis* (CTB) showed at once that both are not only congeneric but also conspecific. A very slight yet not significant discrepancy consists in the dimensions of the compound eyes; they seem to be a bit larger in *procera* than in *brasiliensis*, if this detail in EMERY's diagnosis and figure is to be trusted.

There is no doubt that *brasiliensis* does not belong to *Macromischa* because it does not have the rounded infero-anterior corner of the pronotum, the slender and indistinct apical funicular club, the distinctive campaniform postpetiole of the latter genus. This case of synonymy eliminates the presence of *Macromischa* in continental South America and, of course, in Brazil, where this genus is hardly to be expected.

The original description of *procera* is not sufficiently clear as regards the proportions of the funicular segments, but the doubt is implicitly removed by the subsequent characterization of the subgenus *Irogera* (Emery, 1922), based