On *Myzomorphus* and *M. scutellatus* (Coleoptera, Cerambycidae, Prioninae)
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Abstract. The authorship of *Myzomorphus* is attributed to Sallé (1850) and, consequently, its type species is *Myzomorphus scutellatus* Sallé, 1850. The year of publication of the work by Sallé is changed from 1849 to 1850. Comments on the syntypes of *M. scutellatus* are provided.
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Introduction

The authorship of the genus *Myzomorphus* has been attributed to different authors (Dejean, 1835; Sallé, 1849 [sic]; Thomson, 1857) by different authors (e.g. Sherborn, 1928; Galileo, 1987). In order to clarify the nomenclatural problems of this genus, we are providing considerations on the authorship, year of publication, type species, and type material of the type species.

On the authorship of *Myzomorphus*

Gory (1832) figured and described *Anacolus quadrimaculatus* and did not mention Dejean or his collection: “*Anacolus quadrimaculatus* Gory.”


According to Galileo (1987: 574) (translated): “Dejean (1835) listed in his catalogue the genus *Myzomorphus* containing “*M. quadrimaculatus* Dejean”. Gray (1831) figured *Anacolus quadripunctatus* that was formally described in 1832, senior synonym of *M. quadrimaculatus*, described and figured by Gory in 1832 in the genus *Anacolus*. Thus, *Myzomorphus* Dejean, 1835 becomes a usable name (Barber & Bridwell, 1940) to contain *quadrimaculatus*. Therefore, the subsequent authors (Lameere, 1912, 1913, 1919; Melzer, 1919; Blackwelder, 1946; Gilmour, 1960; Rosales, 1966) were mistaken to consider Thomson (1857a) as the author of the genus.”

Barber & Bridwell (1940) worked on the validity of the genus names of Chrysomelidae in the Dejean catalogues. Their arguments do not support the validity of *Myzomorphus* in Dejean (1935). Instead, they argue that only the generic names published together with known species are valid in Dejean: “If as is customary we recognize a generic name as established by designation of a known species as its genotype or if a name became valid by mere mention of the names of the species to be included, there should be no objection to new generic names proposed in this catalogue for listed species accompanied by bibliographical citation to prior descriptions. The author name following the specific name in the Dejean Catalogue is such a bibliographical citation and, except in rare cases, there can be no doubt as to which old species are included in the new genera.”

We agree that the attribution of authorship of *Myzomorphus* to Thomson (1857) is an incomprehensible mistake,