New Nomenclatural and Taxonomic Acts, and Comments

Cupedidae
J. Hájek & I. Löbl

Revalidation of Tenomerga Neboiss, 1984

The genus Tenomerga was established by Neboiss (1984) to accommodate a group of predominantly Southeast Asian species previously placed in Cupes Fabricius, 1801. Kirejtshuk (2009) synonymized Tenomerga with Cupes based on extensive study of Baltic amber fossils, pointing out that the characters mentioned in Neboiss (1984), the development of tarsal grooves on the prosternum and the tubercles on the dorsal surface of the head, are variable in both extant and fossil species attributed to Tenomerga. However, Hörnschemeyer (2009) in his phylogenetic analysis of extant Archostemata showed that Tenomerga, the South African T. leucophaea (Newman, 1839) excluded, forms a distinct monophyletic clade, well characterized by a short median lobe of the aedeagus, not reaching the base of the apical hooks; and a dorso-ventral notch at the apex of median lobe. Although Hörnschemeyer (2009) did not explicitly revoked Kirejtshuk’s synonymisation, he treats Tenomerga as a valid genus, just as all subsequent authors (e.g. Hörnschemeyer, 2010, Yavorskaya et al., 2015 or Yoshitomi, 2016). Therefore, we retain Tenomerga in the present Catalogue as a valid genus.

Carabidae: Nebrini: Leistus
J. Farkač

Comments

The populations of Leistus (Pogonophorus) montanus Stephens, 1827, occurring in southern Moravia and western Slovakia are distinctive, and their subspecific assignments is to be established.

New synonym

Leistus (Neoleistus) brezinae Dvořák, 1994, syn. nov. of Leistus (Leistus) niger Gebler, 1847 (based on study of type material).

Carabidae: Carabini: Calosoma
M. Häckel

New synonyms

A number of subgenera were established and are currently used as valid in some recent catalogues (e.g., Lorenz, 2005, Bruschi, 2013) based on homoplastic characters that obscure relationships (see Osawa et al. 2003, Su et al. 2005). Therefore, the following new synonyms are here established:

Australodrepa Lapouge, 1929, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Callistenia Lapouge, 1927, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Callisthenes Fischer von Waldheim, 1820, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Callitropa Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Calodrepa Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Calopachys Haury, 1880, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Caminara Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Campalita Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Carabomimus H.J. Kolbe, 1895, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Carabomorphus H.J. Kolbe, 1895, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Carabophanus H.J. Kolbe, 1895, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Carabops Jakobson, 1900, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Charmosta Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Chrysostigma Kirby, 1837, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Ctenosta Motschulsky, 1866, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.
Orinodromus H.J. Kolbe, 1895, syn. nov. of Calosoma Weber, 1801.

Comments

Calosoma inquisitor (Linnaeus, 1758) was reported from East Afghanistan: Parun, Nuristan (Häckel, 2012: 62). The sole specimen available for study cannot be assigned to the currently known subspecies. It belongs probably to a distinct lineage.

Carabinae: Carabini: Carabus

C. Huber, I. Löbl & W. Marggi

Comments

The genus Carabus is one of the most popular, but still problem-rich groups of beetles. It comprises over 5,500 subgenera, species-group taxa and their synonyms, and a high number of infrasubspecific names, sometimes used as available. The concepts of the subgenera in the present Catalogue are basically consistent with those in Deuve, 2013a and 2016d. Unlike in the first edition of the Catalogue, the following subgeneric names are now listed as synonyms in the present edition, though some of them were quite recently still in used as valid: Archiplectes Gottwald, 1982, Coptolabrus Solier, 1884, Diocarabus Reitter, 1896, Eucarabus Géhin, 1876, Microtribax Gottwald, 1982, and Titanocarabus Breuning, 1933. The ranks, validities and/or assignments of species-group taxa are often inconsistent in recent papers, and in the Catalogue not necessarily consistent with those in Deuve (2016d). The many “minor” (or “secondary”) subspecies, used to designate distinctive populations within the “main” or “primary” subspecies are obviously informative but cannot be accepted here as such. In the framework of the present Catalogue, we cannot list two different kinds of subspecies unless ignoring provisions of the ICZN. Therefore, all formally recognized subspecies are listed under the respective species names alphabetically, just as it is in all other genera.