in *T. punctatum* (Tab. 4). From all listed sites, except the island of Lipari, samples were electrophoretically surveyed with consistent results.

T. punctatum is not a frequent species compared to *T. semilaeve* and *T. diomedeum* whose ecological requirements appear very similar. Despite the very small females, the species most likely is oligo- or even monogynous, as we never discovered any queens within the nests. *T. punctatum* inhabits Sicily, the Eolian Islands and Calabria. It remains unknown if its range extends farther north. Some of the literature records deemed to be *T. semilaeve* may actually pertain to *T. punctatum*. Nonetheless, it is almost impossible to trace these from the scarce publication data alone.

We have seen a number of specimens from Greece and Turkey (A. Schulz leg.) that exhibit only minor morphological differences in all morphs compared with Italian *T. punctatum*. Some published species-group epithets in *Tetramorium* from eastern regions (in particular *lucidulum* Menozzi, 1933 and *nitidissimum* Pisarski, 1967) possibly refer to comparable forms, but none of them would have precedence over *punctatum* Santschi, 1927. It is therefore almost certain that *T. punctatum* will stand as the valid name for the taxon, even after a complete taxonomic revision of the Palaearctic *Tetramorium*. Further, we are unaware of any comparable samples from northern Africa despite our collecting activities in Tunisia and Morocco.

Tetramorium brevicorne Bondroit, 1918 [Figs. 2, 11, 16]

Tetramorium caespitum caespitum var. debilis Emery, 1909 (*partim*; unavailable name)
Tetramorium caespitum subsp. *caespitum var. brevicornis* Emery, 1916 (unavailable name)
Tetramorium caespitum var. *brevicorne* Bondroit, 1918
Tetramorium brevicorne Emery: Baroni Urbani, 1964

We follow the interpretation by Taylor (1986) that the types of a name made available by elevation from infrasubspecific rank are those specimens designated as the so-called "types" when the infrasubspecific entity was first published, except if the author elevating the name explicitly states otherwise. This procedure seems well supported by the Code in Art. 72(b)(iv), which regulates type designation of names made available by "bibliographic reference to a description associated with an unavailable name" [Art. 12(b)(1)] - a wording clearly applicable to the case in question.

Thus the types of *T. caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit, 1918 are those specimens on which "*T. caespitum* subsp. *caespitum var. brevicornis* Emery, 1916" was based. In MCG, one pin with 8☿☿, 2♀♀ and 2♂♂ from Corsica was found which are to be interpreted as syntypes of *T. caespitum brevicorne* Bondroit. These are all in good accord with our samples from Sardinia. We selected one of the ♀♀ (easier to identify to species than ☿☿) as lectotype and remounted it on a new cardboard on a separate pin with the original labels. The other specimens remain associated on a pin with copies of the labels and were designated paralectotypes. 6☿☿ from Asuni (Sardinia) in coll. Emery constitute additional paralectotypes.

There were three more specimens in MCG filed as "*T. brevicorne*". These ☿☿ from Sorgono (Sardinia) were found to represent *T. meridionale*, a fact already denoted on two associated labels by B. Poldi and J. Casevitz-Weulersse, respectively. These specimens do not match the original description of *T. brevicorne* and are thus excluded from the type series.

COLLECTING DATA: