



Scarabaeoidea (Coleoptera) of Portugal: genus-group names and their type species

TRISTÃO BRANCO

Rua de Camões, 788, 2 Dto., P-4000-142 Porto, PORTUGAL. E-mail: tv.branco@clix.pt

Abstract

The type species and nomenclature are discussed in detail of the genus-group names that have been used, correctly or incorrectly, in combination with species recorded from Portugal. This work strictly adheres to the rules of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, in order to promote nomenclatural stability. The contents are strictly nomenclatural as no view is taken on the taxonomic validity or rank of the genus-group names.

A total of 171 available names are examined. Evidence is provided in each case for the reasons why the stated nominal species is believed to be the validly designated type species. Many instances were found in the modern literature of type species statements not in compliance with the requirements of the Code. In most cases it is a senior synonym that is stated as type species, instead of the nominal species originally included when the genus was established. That, fortunately, does not cause nomenclatural instability but should be corrected.

In three cases where nomenclatural stability is threatened, *Anisoplia* Schönherr, 1817, *Phyllopertha* Stephens, 1830, and *Scarabaeus* Linnaeus, 1758, it is suggested that prevailing usage should be maintained until a case is made to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and a ruling is published.

Key words: Scarabaeoidea, Portugal, nomenclature, genus-group names, type species

Introduction

While preparing a monograph on Portuguese Scarabaeoidea, I was confronted with the need to ascertain the validly designated type species for the various genus-group names associated with this fauna. This proved to be an arduous task. The difficulty stems from the fact that most twentieth century European authors (a praiseworthy exception is Dellacasa [1983]) either do not indicate type species or, when they do, they fail to state the reasons why they believe that the indicated nominal species is the type species. Yet, type species are paramount for nomenclatural stability. As highlighted in the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (Article 61.1.1): “No matter how the boundaries of a taxonomic taxon may vary in the opinion of zoologists the valid name of such taxon is determined (Art. 23.3) from the name-bearing type(s) considered to belong within those boundaries.”

Whenever the type species was not originally fixed, I cannot be absolutely sure, despite my best endeavours, that the type species indicated here is the validly designated one. It is possible that I have missed a valid subsequent designation previous to the one I am indicating. I would gratefully accept any corrections to my conclusions.

Two requirements of the Code, in particular, have been often overlooked in subsequent type species designations:

- That a nominal species is only eligible to be fixed as the type species if it is an originally included nominal species (Article 67.2).