



<http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3974.1.13>

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:AC597535-68B3-45C5-BBF2-AD0287A15A4C>

***Oniticellus (Liatongus) boucomonti* Balthasar, 1932 (Coleoptera: Scarabaeidae: Scarabaeinae: Oniticellini)—clarification of its taxonomic status by lectotype designation**

ALEŠ BEZDĚK¹, DAVID KRÁL² & FRANTIŠEK X. J. SLÁDEČEK^{1,3}

¹Biology Centre CAS, Institute of Entomology, Branišovská 31, CZ-370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic.

E-mail: bezdek@entu.cas.cz

²Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Science, Department of Zoology, Viničná 7, CZ-128 43 Praha 2, Czech Republic.

E-mail: kral@natur.cuni.cz

³Faculty of Science, University of South Bohemia, Branišovská 31, CZ-370 05 České Budějovice, Czech Republic.

E-mail: franzsladeczek@gmail.com

The dung beetle *Oniticellus (Liatongus) boucomonti* Balthasar, 1932 was described according to an unknown number of specimens labelled “Giufu-Shan, Szechuan” [= Jinfo Shan, ca. 29°04'N, 107°18'E, Chongqing province, China]. Balthasar evidently did not dissect these specimens and simply assumed that specimens with a small horn on vertex were males and specimens without such horn but with two elevated transversal carinae on head were the females of the same species (Balthasar 1932, 1935).

Later, Janssens (1953) claimed that the type series of *O. (L.) boucomonti* was a mixture of two species. Specimens considered males by Balthasar were actually identical to the female of *Liatongus denticornis* (Fairmaire, 1887), and those sexed as females were identical to the female of *L. bucerus* (Fairmaire, 1891). Balthasar himself (1963) fully accepted Janssens's (1953) conclusions and listed *L. boucomonti* as a junior subjective synonym of both *L. denticornis* as well as *L. bucerus*. Since no lectotype has been designated, Bezdek & Krell (2006) considered *L. boucomonti* as a nomen dubium.

During preparation of the catalogue of primary types of Scarabaeoidea deposited in the collection of the National Museum (Natural History) in Prague, Czech Republic (Bezdek & Hájek 2012), two syntypes of *Oniticellus (Liatongus) boucomonti* were found in the Balthasar's collection, both accompanied with identification label written by Balthasar himself. Both these specimens are females and are identical without doubts with *Liatongus denticornis*. In the Balthasar's collection, there is also one more *Liatongus* Reitter, 1892 specimen collected in the same locality. It is also a female and belongs without any doubt to *L. bucerus*, but its type status remains uncertain since this specimen lacks Balthasar identification label.

It is a fundamental principle of nomenclature that the same name must not occur for different taxa. The nomenclatural code (ICZN 1999, Art. 74) allows for the fixing one specimen of a syntypes series as the lectotype when no holotype was selected by the original author. This specimen will thus become the unique bearer of the name, while the other syntypes will become paralectotypes—to enhance stability of nomenclature. This rule should be surely applied to the present case in which a type series is composed by specimens belonging to different taxa and the holotype was not established by Balthasar.

The purpose of this paper is to clarify taxonomic status of *Oniticellus (Liatongus) boucomonti* by designation of its lectotype.

The following codes identify the collections housing the material examined (curator's names are in parentheses):

MNHN Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France (Antoine Mantilleri);

NMPC National Museum, Praha, Czech Republic (Jiří Hájek).

Our remarks about the specimen labels are placed within brackets: [p]—preceding data are printed, [hw]—preceding data are handwritten. Separate labels are indicated by a double slash “//” and lines within each label are separated by a slash “/”.