

shows a very different structure in which the dorsal margin of the petiole between the narrow, truncated dorsal teeth is raised into a broad, rectangular prominence. It is apparent that the description and the figure do not refer to the same specimen and as the female labelled as type of *euryta* fits the description I am prepared to accept it as the true holotype and assume the figure to belong to another species.

The figure of the petiole appended to the description of *olena* (fig. 8) is more or less accurate, with a pair of long dorsal spines subtended by a pair of lateral teeth, and the petiole configuration of *euryta* is a reduction of this, as is common in the genus.

Polyrhachis rufipes F. Smith

Polyrhachis rufipes F. Smith, 1858a: 66 pl. 4 fig. 28. Holotype worker. BORNEO: Sarawak (BMNH) [examined].

Polyrhachis exasperatus F. Smith, 1861: 41 pl. 1 fig. 16. Syntype workers. SULAWESI: Tondano (*A. R. Wallace*) (BMNH; UM, Oxford) [examined]. **Syn. n.**

Polyrhachis phipsoni Forel, 1894: 399. Holotype worker. BURMA: Y⁶ Valley (*Bingham*) (probably in MHN, Geneva). **Syn. n.**

Polyrhachis exasperata var. *oblisa* Forel, 1911a: 395. Holotype worker. WEST MALAYSIA: Malacca, Pahang, Batu Caves (*R. Martin*) (probably in MHN, Geneva). **Syn. n.**

Synonymy of *rufipes* and *exasperata* was attained by the direct comparison of types, the only mentional differences between them being details of length and thickness of the petiolar spines. In view of the variation of shape and size of these structures in other workers of the species such characters are of no value in differentiation.

Forel (1911: 395) pointed out that his species *phipsoni* was in fact nothing more than a variant of *exasperata*. Comparison of his description with specimens implies that *phipsoni* is inseparable from *exasperata*, and thus from *rufipes*. The very short original description of var. *oblisa* stated that it differed from the type of *exasperata* only in the narrower petiolar spines. As is now known, such forms fall within the limits of variation of this species.

Polyrhachis rufofemorata F. Smith

Polyrhachis rufofemoratus F. Smith, 1858b: 142. Syntype workers. INDONESIA: Aru Islands (*A. R. Wallace*) (UM, Oxford) [examined].

Polyrhachis merops F. Smith, 1860b: 98 pl. 1 fig. 17. Holotype worker. INDONESIA: Batjan Island (*A. R. Wallace*) (UM, Oxford) [examined]. **Syn. n.**

Emery (1898: 241) indicated that *merops* was a variety of *rufofemorata* and not a distinct species. Examination of the types of both species shows clearly that they are the same and differ slightly in the development of the dorsal pair of petiolar teeth which are more acute and longer in the type of *merops*.

Polyrhachis saevissima F. Smith

Polyrhachis saevissimus F. Smith, 1860a: 71. Holotype worker. SULAWESI: Makassar (*A. R. Wallace*) (UM, Oxford) [examined].

Polyrhachis acantha F. Smith, 1860b: 98 pl. 1 fig. 16. Holotype worker. INDONESIA: Batjan Island (*A. R. Wallace*) (UM, Oxford) [examined]. **Syn. n.**

Polyrhachis acasta F. Smith, 1860b: 100 pl. 1 fig. 23. Holotype worker. INDONESIA: Batjan Island (*A. R. Wallace*) (UM, Oxford) [examined]. **Syn. n.**

Direct comparison of the types shows that these three forms are members of the same rather variable species, and I suspect that *acantha*