17. Postpetiole reduced, shallow in profile, dorsoventrally narrowed posteriorly; helcium very deep, almost or quite as deep as the body of the node.
18. First gastral segment extremely dorsoventrally compressed in profile immediately behind the postpetiole; in dorsal view attachment to the postpetiole broad.
19. First gastral segment in profile almost flat dorsally and strongly convex ventrally, the tergite strongly overlapping the sternite laterally.
20. Sting spatulate.
Queen: unknown.
Male: two poorly preserved specimens of *recurvispinosa* are present in MCZ; first described by Wheeler, W. M. (1927), their salient features have been summarised by Ettershank (1966).
Larva: a characterisation of the larvae of *kemneri* has been given by Wheeler, G. C. & Wheeler, J. (1954).

Recurvidris has a wealth of autapomorphies in the worker caste which establish the monophyly of the genus. In short these are: the specialised dentition; the recurved propodeal spines; the single (unpaired) posteriormost hair on the mesonotal midline; the extremely specialised postpetiole with its deep helcium, reduced node, and constricted articulation with the gaster; the unique structure of the first gastral segment, as listed above.

Recurvidris is one of the many highly specialised myrmicine genera which are relatively easy to define but almost impossible to place in any currently accepted tribe. The last problem is not helped by the fact that the present tribal arrangement within the Myrmicinae is decrepit, mostly non-functional, and in need of a thorough overhaul. Unfortunately the task of putting the tribe-level classification on a good phylogenetic basis is so huge that it would most probably take more time than any one worker would be able to commit to it, under the circumstances in which taxonomy currently finds itself.

In the past *Recurvidris*, under its old name of *Trigonogaster*, has been placed either in the Pheidologetonini (Forel, 1917: 243; Emery, 1922: 210) or in the Solenopsidini (Wheeler, W. M. 1922: 663; 1927: 6). In the latest review of the genus and its supposed relatives, the pheidologetonines and solenopsidines, Ettershank (1966: 158) excluded *Recurvidris* from both. This left the genus in