



*Centromyrmex alfaroi* Emery, female: Fig. 1. Petiole in profile. Fig. 2. Petiole in dorsal view. — *Centromyrmex brachycola* Roger, figs. 3-5 worker, figs. 6-7 female: Fig. 3. Petiole in profile. Fig. 4. Petiole in dorsal view. Fig. 5. Mandible. Fig. 6. Fore wing. Fig. 7. Hind wing. — *Centromyrmex gigas* Forel, worker: Fig. 8. Mandible. Fig. 9. Petiole in profile. Fig. 10. Petiole in dorsal view. (Kempf *del.*)

Discussion. — Brown (1953: 8-9) has pointed out that the difference based on the number and development of apical tibial spurs on middle and hind legs in tribe Ponerini is at best precarious and of no practical value at all. As a consequence, the subtribe *Centromyrmecini* Emery, founded precisely on this difference in spur characters, is untenable and falls into synonymy of subtribe Ponerini. As a matter of fact, all the Neotropical specimens of *Centromyrmex*, which I was able to examine, possess only the mesial spur on tibiae II and III, the lateral spur being either absent or so greatly reduced that it defies recognition by ordinary methods of taxonomic examination.

In our region, the ants of genus *Centromyrmex* resemble superficially those of genus *Wadeura* principally on account of the general habitus, the light color and the eyeless condition in the worker caste. *Wadeura*, however, differs in the shape of its extremely long, falcate, 4-5 toothed mandibles, in the finely punctate and subopaque integument, the weak subpetiolar process, the shorter clypeus, the postero-mesial portion of which does not project between the frontal lobes, and in the lighter and sparser armature of spine-like setae on middle and hind legs.

*Typhlomyrmex*, although belonging to a different tribe on account of its discordant larval characters (cf. Brown, 1965), offers in the imaginal stage some likeness to *Centromyrmex*, giving rise to possible confusion as in the case of Santschi, who described as *Centromyrmex sculpturatus* an ant already well known under the name of *Typhlomyrmex rogenhoferi* Mayr. In spite of its amber-colored integument and eyeless worker caste, *Typhlomyrmex* differs from *Centromyrmex* in smaller size, shorter mandibles, lack of the postero-mesial extension of the clypeus between the frontal lobes. The latter are scarcely lobate, not conspicuously projecting laterad. Dense, reticulate-punctate sculpture is present at least on head, which is subopaque. The middle and hind legs lack the burrowing apparatus, i. e. the heavy, spine-like setae.