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Abstract. New synonyms are proposed for: Pethelispa arizonicica Dajoz 1992 = Pycnornerus arizonicicus Stephan 1989 NEW SYNONYMY; Microprius cubanus Slipinski 1985 = Eudesmula california Dajoz 1992 = Microprius rufulus (Motschulsky 1863) NEW SYNONYMIES; and Auloniuln chilense Dajoz 1980 = Auloniulm parallelopedium (Say 1826) NEW SYNONYM. Colobicus parilis Pascoe is recorded from Louisiana, a new distributional record for the New World.

Introduction

While preparing the Colydiidae (=Colydiinae of Slipinski and Lawrence 1999) chapter for Volume II of American Beetles (Arnett et al. 2002), new North American generic records, synonyms, and various other items of nomenclatorial and distributional house-keeping have been discovered. Since new nomenclatural acts will not appear in that work, this paper is aimed at making these changes known. A few extralimital actions required for the family will also be addressed here.

Material examined or cited is deposited in the following collections: Natural History Museum, London [BMNH]; Edward G. Riley personal collection, College Station, Texas [EGRC]; Florida State Collection of Arthropods [FSCA]; Hungarian Natural History Musuem [HNHB]; Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge [LSUC]; Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris [MNHN]; Montana Entomology Collection, Montana State University, Bozeman [MTEC]; Narodni Muzeum v Prahe, Prague [NMPC]; Roger Dajoz personal collection, Brunoy [RDPC]; Bohart Museum, University of California, Davis [UCDC]; Zoological Museum of the Moscow State University (ZMUM).

Part of this paper reflects new findings, honest mistakes, and the normal problems that surface in the course of ongoing taxonomic work. However, the other portion deserves some comment. Few insect taxonomists have so abused the world's systematists that they have been called to task in the scientific literature. The comments of Charles W. Leng (1911) and Hans Roeschke (1907) about Thomas Casey's rampant creation of synonyms are examples, as is Carrington's (1874) obituary of Francis Walker that lamented the lateness of his death. In recent decades only Mohammad Abdullah has rivaled the infamous ecologist/taxonomist Roger Dajoz of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle's Laboratoire d'Ecologie, in Brunoy, France, in this regard. Not to be confused with systematists in the taxonomic laboratories of that same museum's Paris facility, Dajoz' many errors and cavalier ap-
proach to such trivial factors as generic or even familial placement, type localities, character consistency, and the courtesy of labeling of types have been highlighted in several papers over the last 2 decades, including: Iablokoff-Khnzorian (1979), Nikitsky and Belov (1979), and Ivie and Slipinski (1989, 1990). After Slipinski's (1985a) pointed rebuke, one would think he would get the point.

However, in just a few years, he continued with a paper on North American colydiids (Dajoz 1992), where he sank to new lows. First, without comment he described a species in a genus that was synonymized 130 years earlier, a synonymy confirmed and detailed by recent workers (Slipinski 1984, Ivie and Slipinski 1989) and so listed in the latest catalog of the family (Ivie and Slipinski 1990). This species is obviously a conspecific with a species described in a major comprehensive publication covering the entire North American fauna of this family three years earlier (Stephan 1989), and his name created an obligatory, but secondary homonym in the process, because when *Penthelispa arizonica* Dajoz 1992 was placed in the senior generic synonym *Pycnomerus*, it is identical to *P. arizonicus* Stephan 1989. Recommendation I.5.(a) of the ICZN (1985) in force at the time: “A zoologist should not publish a new species-group name identical with one already in use in a closely related or associated genus-group taxon...,” holds no sway over Roger Dajoz! Luckily, the types of these 2 homonyms are conspecific, so the homonym is also a synonym.

Next, he renamed *Microprius rufulus* (Motschulsky), the most common and widespread species of the genus, and indeed, a species he had already dealt with repeatedly, albeit under different names (Dajoz 1977, 1980, 1992). In spite of the fact that the type of its multiple African synonyms are in easy access to Dajoz at the Paris Museum, he placed his latest synonym in a totally unrelated genus (*Eudesma* LeConte) that bears no resemblance, let alone relationship, to this species, using a known unjustified replacement name — *Eudesmula* Cockerell (see Ivie and Slipinski 1990). To date, he has recognized this common species as 3 different species, in 3 separate genera as *Microprius linearis* (Wollaston), *Bitoma rufa* (Reitter), and *Eudesmula california* Dajoz (Dajoz 1977, 1980, 1992) without any indication that he knows they are all the same species!

Lastly, he renamed *Colydium glabriculum* Stephan as *Colydium chiracahuae* Dajoz, also previously described by Stephan (1989) in his review of the North American fauna, but this time he created only a simple synonym (Wegrzynowicz 1999). In addition, he included a purported key to North American *Colydium*, but it included only 3 of the 5 described species (one with an incorrect name), and one that does not occur in the region.

All of this was done without citing a single paper! Could anyone really think that there are 3 North American beetles to be described without a single paper appropriate for citation? Surely the editors and reviewers (if there were any) share some responsibility for allowing such a paper to go to press? It is hoped that the administrators of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle and/or the editors of the *Bulletin Mensuel de la Société Linneéenne de Lyon* will exercise some restraint on his further ability to diminish their reputations with such unprofessional drivel.

**Synonymies**

*Pycnomerus arizonicus* Stephan

*Pycnomerus arizonicus* Stephan 1989: 59, Arizona, holotype FSCA.

*Pethelispa arizonica* Dajoz 1992: 60, Arizona, holotype RDPC. NEW SYNONYMY

This synonymy is confirmed by Dajoz's illustrations and description, as well as by the type locality and reported biology.

*Microprius rufulus* (Motschulsky)

*Bitoma rufus* Motschulsky 1863: 502, Sri Lanka, holotype in ZMUM.

*Microprius rufulus* (Motschulsky), Schuh and Misfud 2001: 261.

*Bitoma linearis* Wollaston 1867: 64, São Tiago Is., Cape Verde Islands, holotype repository unknown.


*Microprodis cubanus* Slipinski 1985b: 81. NEW SYNONYMY, Cuba, holotype NMPC.

*Eudesmula california* Dajoz 1992: 60 NEW SYNONYMY, California, holotype RDPC.

[see Slipinski 1986 and Schuh and Misfud 2001 for further synonymy]
North American material examined: California: Riverside Co.: 6, Cathedral City, various dates June-August 1940, L. W. Issak [MTEC, UCDC]. 1, Indio Hills, 31 August 1981, R. S. Miller [MTEC]. Several series of this species have been examined from desert areas of southern California, indicating this species was introduced and established there for at least 60 years. As currently understood, this species becomes one of the most widely distributed Colydiinae, ranging from India to Syria, Lebanon, Palestine and Egypt across North Africa and south to Madagascar, Natal, and the Transvaal and west to the Cape Verde Islands. In the New World from Cuba, Grand Cayman, and California. It has been intercepted in logs in Germany and Malta, its expected mode of transport to many of its current locales (Schuh and Misfud 2001). Given its proven ability to survive transport, it can be expected to spread more widely. This genus is not included in Stephan’s (1989) key to North American genera.

Auloniumparallelopedium (Say)

Colydiumparallelopedium Say 1826: 263.
Aulonium chilense Dajoz 1980: 335, figs. 5A, B, and C. NEW SYNONYMY, Chile (mislabeled or introduced?). Holotype: “ex coll. Reitter, Chili Museum Paris; 1917; Coll. Grouvelle” MNHN.

Examination of the holotype of A. chilense clearly showed it is a synonym of this well-known North American species. In the absence of further material of this species from South America, the Chile locality should be considered an error in labeling, and Chile dropped from the distribution.

New records for North America

Colobicusparilis Pascoe

Colobicusparilis Pascoe 1860: 202, Batjan Is., Indonesia. Syntypes BMNH.


This Asian species has reportedly been introduced into Hawaii (Hetschko 1930), but has not previously been reported from the New World mainland. Its appearance in Louisiana is of some concern, as it has been implicated in the spread of the fungal disease Diplodia (Coelomycetes) to sweet potatoes, yams, and citrus (Hinton 1945). Its known distribution includes China, Southeast Asia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Samoa, Hawaii, Australia, Mauritius and now Louisiana. This genus is not included in Stephan’s (1989) key to North American genera.
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