synonymy by ETTERSHANK, 1966), *Strumigenys*, (= **Smithistruma*, synonymy by BARONI URBANI & DE ANDRADE, 1994), *Tapinoma*, *Trachymyrmex*, **Wasmannia* (present also in amber, DE ANDRADE, in preparation), *Zacryptocerus* (= **Paracryptocerus* = **Hypocryptocerus*, synonymies by KEMPF, 1973).

This list is likely to experience further changes in the future for purely taxonomic reasons. At least the following genera may prove to be junior synonyms of others: *Erebomyrma* = *Oligomyrmex*, *Ephebomyrmex* = *Pogonomyrmex*, and *Zacryptocerus* = *Cephalotes*. In case of demonstration of one or more of these synonymies, *Oligomyrmex* would then represent one additional extinct genus distributed in the Old World, the suppression of *Ephebomyrmex* would render *Pogonomyrmex* present in the Recent and fossil fauna, and merging *Zacryptocerus* into *Cephalotes* would change nothing for the purpose of the present analysis.

2. The definition of the variables. – The statistical analysis is based on the presence/absence among Hispaniolan ant genera and subgenera of the following four traits: (a) Flightless queen, (b) Large individuals or colonies, (c) High specialization as predators or social parasites or in nest site, and, (d) Also found in living Old World fauna. Only traits (c) and (d) are found to differ among living and fossil genera in a statistically significant way. The paper does not indicate which genera are attributed to which variable. Variables (a) and (d) are objective ones and there should be no disagreement on their individual generic attribution. On the contrary, under the extant Dominican genera with large colonies (trait b) I would consider at least *Solenopsis* and *Crematogaster*. WILSON considers this trait to be present in 4.5% out of 22 genera (i. e. in only one genus) and I am unable to decide in an objective way which one I should remove from the list and why. Variable (c) is even more heterogeneous and difficult to assess; it groups genera highly specialized either as predators, or as social parasites, or in nest site. One could argue again about the most proper attribution of genera like *Pheidole* comprising perfectly omnivorous species, others restricted to seed predation and others feeding on termites only, or genera like *Crematogaster* embracing "normal" terricolous species together with others constructing only carton nests on trees and others living in hollow rhizomes of epiphytes. Possession or not of these traits appears to be particularly difficult to extend to the fossils. But the trait I had the greatest difficulty in assessing is the social parasitism. Although eleven Hispaniolan ant genera contain a numerically insignificant fraction of social parasitic species world-wide (none of which is known to me from Hispaniola) I have up to recently inquired which Hispaniolan ant genus can be considered under any circumstances as being socially parasitic as a whole. It was only recently that I allayed my doubts while discovering that such genus appears to be unknown to WILSON as well: no one of the 34 Hispaniolan "genera and well marked subgenera" on which WILSON's analysis is based neither a single Hispaniolan species is cited as being exclusively or prevailingly parasitic in the list of parasitic ants of the world published by HÖLLDOBLER & WILSON (1990). Trait (c), hence, has been excluded from the statistical analysis. Discharging variables (a) and (b) because no statistical difference had been demonstrated for them and variable (c), too vaguely defined, the re-analysis presented in this paper will be focused on trait (d) which is objectively definable and of the highest biogeographic interest.

3. The choice of the statistical test. – The choice of the *G*-statistics of independence is not appropriate for a sample of the size of the Dominican amber ant genera and subgenera included in WILSON's analysis (n = 34). SOKAL & ROHLF