

No. 1.—*Revisionary Notes on the Ant Genus Myrmecia of Australia*

BY WILLIAM L. BROWN, JR.

The ants of the subfamily Myrmeciinae have recently been revised by Mr. John Clark of Melbourne. In many respects, I find myself in disagreement with Mr. Clark's conclusions, and a recent study tour of Australia under the auspices of a Parker Travelling Fellowship from Harvard University, and later of a United States Educational Foundation (Fulbright) Fellowship in Australia has furnished evidence leading to the revisionary notes offered below. On returning to the United States from Australia, advantage was taken of a stay of a few days in London to restudy the *Myrmecia* types of species described by Fabricius and Frederick Smith. Most of Smith's types have already been redescribed by Crawley (1926), but nowhere in Clark's work do I find any mention of Crawley's important contribution. Data supporting certain conclusions I have reached may be found in Crawley's paper, although his paper does not in any way attempt a real taxonomic revision, but merely corrects and amplifies Smith's originally very faulty descriptions and supplies new figures.

I have returned to the original conception of *Myrmecia* as a single genus including the various "jumpers" and "bull-ants" of Australia and New Caledonia; my reasons for rejecting Clark's separation of *Promyrmecia* are fully stated elsewhere (Brown, 1953). Furthermore, I consider Clark's subfamily Nothomyrmeciinae as a tribe of subfamily Myrmeciinae; *Nothomyrmecia* Clark may be regarded as the type genus of tribe NOTHOMYRMECIINI (= Nothomyrmecii Clark, 1934). Subfamily rank for the Myrmeciinae is accepted, and will be discussed elsewhere.

*Myrmecia* Fabricius is a difficult genus taxonomically in the sense that many of its species are very variable in size, color and sculpture, while at the same time the specific differences are often based on characters that appear relatively trivial until their constancy is appreciated through the examination of large series from all parts of their ranges. This being the case, many of the species described by Mr. Clark must be considered as very doubtfully distinct. Since types of a majority of these forms were not available to me during my stay in Australia and have not become so since, no definite statements regarding many of Clark's species may be made at this time. A warning should be issued, however, that in many observed cases, Clark's descriptions and figures will not fit his type specimens that I have managed to see, and will not agree with the normally-collected individuals of species of older authors; since this author largely ignored