

On *Eryphus* Perty, 1832 (*Dichophyiini*), *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834 (*Trachyderini*, *Trachyderina*), and *Eryphus* Klug, 1829, with description of a new genus, and corrections on publication dates (*Coleoptera*, *Cerambycidae*)

Antonio Santos-Silva^{1,3}; Juan Pablo Botero^{2,4} & Francisco Eriberto de Lima Nascimento^{1,5}

¹ Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Museu de Zoologia (MZUSP). São Paulo, SP, Brasil.

² Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, Facultad de Ciencias, Departamento de Biología, Laboratorio de Entomología, Grupo de Sistemática Molecular. Bogotá, D.C., Colombia.

³ ORCID: [0000-0001-7128-1418](https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7128-1418). E-mail: toncriss@uol.com.br

⁴ ORCID: [0000-0002-5547-7987](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5547-7987). E-mail: jp_bot@yahoo.com

⁵ ORCID: [0000-0002-5047-8921](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5047-8921). E-mail: eribnascimentofl@gmail.com

Abstract. The validity of two forgotten names, *Eryphus* Klug, 1829 and *E. rubricollis* Klug, 1829, is discussed. The former is considered a *nomen oblitum* and synonymized with *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834, a *nomen protectum*; the latter is revalidated and *Eriphus purpuratus* Chevrolat, 1862 is considered a junior synonym of *Eriphus rubricollis* (Klug, 1829). A lectotype is designated to *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829. The date of the work where *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834 was described is corrected. A new genus is described in *Dichophyiini* Gistel, 1848 to include the species currently allocated in *Eryphus sensu* Napp & Martins (2002). The dates of publication of genera and species described by Fairmaire & Germain (*Révision des Coléoptères du Chili* (suite)) are corrected.

Keywords. Longhorned woodboring beetles; Neotropical region; Taxonomy.

INTRODUCTION

During the process of identifying specimens sent by various institutions, we encountered a problem involving three generic names: *Eryphus* Klug, 1829, *Eryphus* Perty, 1832, and *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834. *Eryphus* Klug (1829) and its type species, *E. rubricollis* Klug, 1829, have been completely omitted from recent catalogues. The biggest hurdle in trying to solve the problems involving these names was the absence of specimens identified as *Eryphus rubricollis* in the ZMHB collection (see acronym below). However, we believe that they are present in this collection as “*coccineus*”. The work where Klug described *Eryphus* and *E. rubricollis* (1829) was a list of duplicate specimens for sale. Thus, even if some specimens of *E. rubricollis* were actually sold, the institution would never have sold all the specimens. The dates of publication of *Eriphus*

Audinet-Serville, and of a work by Fairmaire & Germain are corrected.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Photographs of MZSP specimens were taken with a Canon EOS Rebel T3i DSLR camera, Canon MP-E 65 mm f/2.8 1-5X macro lens, controlled by Zerene Stacker AutoMontage software.

The species were identified using original descriptions, redescrptions, photographs of the types, and comparisons with specimens of the MZSP collection.

The collection acronyms used in the text are as follows: **BMNH** = The Natural History Museum, London, United Kingdom; **MZSP** = Museu de Zoologia, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; **ZMHB** = Museum für Naturkunde – Leibniz Institute for Evolution and Biodiversity Science, Berlin, Germany.

Pap. Avulsos Zool., 2023; v.63: e202363013

<https://doi.org/10.11606/1807-0205/2023.63.013>

<https://www.revistas.usp.br/paz>

<https://www.scielo.br/paz>

Edited by: Simone Policena Rosa

Received: 09/11/2022

Accepted: 27/02/2023

Published: 02/05/2023

ISSN On-Line: [1807-0205](https://doi.org/1807-0205)

ISSN Printed: [0031-1049](https://doi.org/0031-1049)

ISSN: [0000-0004-0384-1825](https://doi.org/0000-0004-0384-1825)

<https://zoobank.org/F9EB7DFA-A659-43EF-8A83-B1631E6B15CF>



RESULTS

On *Eryphus* Klug, 1829, *Eryphus* Perty, 1832, and *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834

Perty (1832) has been wrongly credited as the author of the genus *Eryphus* (Dichophyiini) for the description of *Eryphus bipunctatus* (Figs. 2A-2C) from Brazil (Minas Gerais). However, Perty (1832) was only including a new species in *Eryphus* Klug, 1829. It is evident that Perty (1832) was not describing a new genus because when he did so in the same work, he clearly indicated as in the description of *Tropidosoma*, *Psygmatorcerus*, *Homalopterus* and *Hypselomus*.

Klug (1829) described *Eryphus rubricollis* as follows: "82. *Eryphus rubricollis* Dej. (i. litt.) niger, thorace coleoptrisque coccineus dorso nigris." Accordingly, Klug (1829) was formally describing a new genus and a new species (Trachyderini), and both are available. Agassiz (1846), Sherborn (1926), and Neave (1939) correctly reported Klug as the author of *Eryphus*. Nevertheless, surprisingly, *Eryphus* Klug remained unknown to Cerambycidae researchers.

Eriphus (Trachyderini) has been reported as published in Audinet-Serville (1834b). However, the genus was described in Audinet-Serville (1834a), without the inclusion of species, but with description of the taxon (ICZN 1999: 12.1). Audinet-Serville (1834b) included three species: *Eriphus bisignatus* (Germar, 1823); *E. mexicanus* Audinet-Serville, 1834; and *E. immaculicollis* Audinet-Serville, 1834 (ICZN 1999: 67.2.2). Both Audinet-Serville (1834a) and Audinet-Serville (1834b) were published in March 1834 (e.g., Sherborn (1926: 2189 – on *Eriphus*; 2246 – on *Eurymerus*). Unfortunately, it was not possible to know the day of each publication. However, even if they were published on the same day, it is more coherent to accept that the description of the genus occurred in the lower numbered volume. Chevrolat (1845: 404) designated *Callidium (Clytus) bisignatum* Germar, 1823 as the type species of *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville.

White (1855) indicated Audinet-Serville (1834b) as the author of *Eriphus*. In the same work, he listed *Eriphus sensu* Dejean (1835; part) as a synonym of *Callideriphus* Blanchard, 1851 (Dichophyiini), and included *Eryphus bipunctatus* in *Callideriphus*. Gemminger (1872) listed *Callidium* Fabricius, 1775 (part), *Batyle* Thomson, 1864, and *Eriphus* (part) as synonyms of *Callideriphus*. However, he did not indicate the author of *Eriphus*, and did not state that Perty had used *Eryphus*, although had included *E. bipunctatus* Perty in his list of species of *Callideriphus*. Aurivillius (1912) also did not mention *Eryphus* Perty, and also included *E. bipunctatus* in *Callideriphus*. Napp & Martins (2002) considered *Eryphus* Perty as different from *Callideriphus* and revalidated and transferred some species to the former. Therefore, part of the species considered as belonging to *Callideriphus* by White (1855), Gemminger (1872), and Aurivillius (1912) are currently included in *Eryphus* Perty, 1832 according with Napp & Martins (2002).

Making everything even more complicated, according to Dejean (1835): "ERIPHUS, *Serville*. / *Rubricollis* Dej.

Brasilia = *Bisignatus*. Germar. id. [Brasilia]." Thus, Dejean (1835) synonymized *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829 (wrongly attributing the authorship to himself) with *Eriphus bisignatus* (Germar, 1823). Dejean (1835) simply ignored the use of the name *Eryphus* by Klug (1829). Examination of a specimen of *Eriphus rubricollis* (Figs. 1A-1B) / *Eriphus bisignatus* from Dejean's collection (label handwritten by Dejean himself) makes evident that *Eriphus rubricollis sensu* Dejean is really equal to *E. bisignatus*. However, the original description by Klug makes clear that the pronotum and elytra are reddish with the dorsal area black ("thorace coleoptrisque coccineus dorso nigris."), which does not agree with *E. bisignatus*. Therefore, the synonymy proposed by Dejean (1835) was not correct and made evident that *E. rubricollis* in Dejean (*in litteris*) collection is not equal to *E. rubricollis* Klug.

It is very likely that Joseph Anton Maximilian Perty had seen the specimens identified by Johann Christoph Friedrich Klug as *Eryphus rubricollis*. Klug's brief description (1829) would not allow Perty to recognize the species and not even to which tribe it belonged. In fact, it would only be possible to infer the family, because Klug (1829) listed *Eriphus rubricollis* among known species of Cerambycidae. As Dejean's catalog (1835) listing this species as equal to *Callidium (Clytus) bisignatus* Germar, 1823 had not yet been published, it would not be possible for Perty to make the association. In addition, it is very unlikely that Perty personally knew Dejean's collection, and we were unable to find an indication that Dejean sent him material or a letter describing his *Eriphus rubricollis*.

As the general appearance of *Eryphus bipunctatus* Perty (Figs. 2A-2C) is similar to that of *Eriphus rubricollis sensu* Dejean (= *Eriphus bisignatus* (Germar) (see Bezark, 2022 and Fig. 1), it is possible to infer that *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug also has a similar overall appearance to them. Evidently, this does not allow us to know if the Klug's species was actually of the same genus and tribe as the Perty species.

Although there are specimens identified as *Eriphus bisignatus* (designated as lectotype and paralectotypes by Monné & Monné, 2015) at the ZMHB collection, they could not be present in this collection at the time of Klug if they really belonged to the private collection of Ernst Friedrich Germar. According to Horn & Kahle (1935): "Germar, Ernst Friedrich (1786-1853), Curculionid. an Zool. Univ. Mus., Halle a. S. – Restl. Ins. Via H. Schaum vereinzelt: I. Auswahl Coleopt. an Zool. Mus. Berlin [currently, Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität in Berlin]; Rest ex parte via G. Kraatz an Deutsch. Entom. Institut, Berlin-Dahlem [currently, ZMHB]." Germar died in 1853 and his nephew, Hermann Rudolph Schaum (who kept the collection after Germar's death), died in 1865. Therefore, it is most probable that was only after 1865 that the types of *Callidium (Clytus) bisignatus* were deposited at the ZMHB. One of the labels currently placed in the lectotype indicates that the specimen was collected by Olfers (see Monné & Monné, 2015: 392-393). This collector name appears in several species described by Klug in several works. This may suggest that the "types" at the ZMHB collection are not the true "types", or that they always belonged to

this collection (loaned by Klug to Germar). According to Klug (1829) they were friends (translated): "For the curculionids, I have used the information I requested and received from my friend, Prof. Germar, with few exceptions, and also indicated his determinations where they did not agree with those I had received from Count Dejean." But apparently, Germar also received specimens from Olfers (see Germar, 1823: IX) (translated): "It remains to me as much as possible to thank my friends who have enriched this work by sharing the beauty that they have discovered ... Bescke father and son, ..., Olfers..." These reasoning on the types of *Callidium* (*Clytus*) *bisignatus* are important because if they were present at the ZMHB in 1829, Klug would hardly have described the species again, if *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug really was a synonym of *Callidium* (*Clytus*) *bisignatus* Germar.

There are three possibilities to explain why Klug knew that there were specimens named as *Eriphus rubricollis* in the Dejean collection: Klug personally knew the Dejean collection; Dejean sent him specimens on loan; or Dejean gave him information about the species. In all three cases, it is not possible to know why Klug used *Eryphus* and not *Eriphus* (as was later published by Dejean and was probably written in the specimens of his collection).

There is no evidence that Dejean sent specimens to Klug or that Klug personally saw Dejean's collection. Furthermore, the introduction in Klug (1829) suggests that they just exchanged letters (translated): "Therefore, in identifying the probable new species, I largely followed the advice of my respected correspondents and in particular that of Count Dejean, who was as forgiving as he was insightful and experienced..."

If the third option was the real one, Dejean would probably have described the species in such a way that it was possible for Klug to recognize it, which would undoubtedly include the two circular spots on the pronotum, the general color of the pronotum and elytra. Notwithstanding, he described it as "thorace coleoptrisque coccineus dorso nigris", which means that both the pronotum and the elytra are reddish with dorsal (central) area black. A quick comparison with photographs of the types of Germar's species, as well as specimens of *Eriphus rubricollis* from Dejean's collection reveals that the elytra are not so (and we never saw this type of variation in *Eriphus bisignatus*). However, we already saw another description by Klug with contradictory information on these structures. For example, in the original description of *Chlamys exarata* Klug, 1824 (Coleoptera, Chrysomelidae), he informed: "thorace coleoptrisque rugosus, quadri-sulcatis." However, in the same description he also pointed out: "Thorax ... sulcis quatuor apice coëuntibus nigris exaratus. Elytra ... bi-sulcata." This may suggest that the original description of *E. rubricollis* was inaccurate. However, it is difficult to believe in this mistake, and it is easier to accept that the information from Dejean was inexact or that Klug wrongly interpreted them. Dejean did not write in German, as it is possible to see in a letter from him to Germar in 1818 (Dieckmann, 1986) (translated): "If you are not used to writing in the French, Italian and Latin languages, you can write to me

in German, but using, please, the Latin characters. As for me, I beg your pardon, but I can only write to you in French; besides, I suppose that if you do not understand this language, you will easily find a translator."

Bernd Jaeger (ZMHB) sent us precious information on historical specimens of *Eriphus* present in ZMHB, including photograph of the drawer (Fig. 1F), and copy of some pages of *Eryphus* records section in the catalog of their historical collection (Figs. 1D-1E). According to him, there is no specimen named "*rubricollis*" among the specimens of *Eriphus* (or *Eryphus*), and also no record on the catalog using this name. As the work by Klug (1829) was a list of duplicates of specimens for sale, it is possible that there is at least one syntype specimen in some other museum which may allow recognizing the species. However, even if it(them) survived, it will be extremely difficult to find it(them).

In fact, the species that more perfectly matches the description by Klug (1829) is *Eriphus purpuratus* Chevrolat, which is present in the ZMHB collection as "*coccineus*" (Figs. 1C and 1F). Based on the fact that *Eryphus coccineus* Klug in litteris (= *E. purpuratus*), *Eryphus ruficollis* Klug in litteris (= *E. immaculicollis* Audinet-Serville, 1834, the specimens have a label with "N" after the species name, meaning "*Nobis*") were considered by Klug himself as belonging to *Eryphus*, it is logical to assume that *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834 is a junior synonymy of *Eryphus* Klug, 1829 (type species *Eryphus rubricollis*). However, as both conditions demanded by ICZN (1999: Article 23.9.1.1 and 23.9.1.2) are present, *Eryphus* Klug, 1829 is considered a *nomen oblitum*, and *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834 a *nomen protectum* (for citations using *Eriphus*, exclusively for the genus or in its 23 species see, for example, Monné, 2005, 2022). According to Klug (1829) (translated): "Apart from a few Lepidoptera from Cuba, the present directory contains only Coleoptera, first from southern Brazil, collected by Sellow in the vicinity of Montevideo [Uruguay], Cassapava [probably Caçapava do Sul in the Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul], Porto Alegre [Brazil, Rio Grande do Sul], then from Cuba from a year ago by a certain Maximil." At least six specimens identified as "*coccineus*" in the ZMHB collection were collected by Sellow. As the original description of *Eryphus rubricollis* and the collector (see Figs. 1D and 1F, and introduction in Klug (1829)) agree perfectly with the specimens labeled as "*coccineus*" in ZMHB collection, we think that they are the syntypes of the former. According to Bernd Jaeger (ZMHB, personal communication): "The historical specimens arranged under the *purpuratus* label (written by our former curator Kuntzen) have the manuscript name "*coccineus* N." obviously provided by Klug." It is not possible to know if there was an error in labelling the specimens as "*coccineus*" instead of "*rubricollis*" and, if so, if the error was that of the curator or Klug himself. But we think it is very likely that the specimens are the true syntypes of *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug. However, it is probable that Klug had changed the name of the species, from *E. rubricollis* to *E. coccineus*, after the publication of the catalogue of Dejean (1835). However, as *Eriphus rubricollis sensu* Dejean is equal to



Figure 1. *Eriphus* spp. (A-B) *Eriphus rubricollis sensu Dejean*: (A) Dorsal habitus; (B) Labels. (C) *Eriphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829, lectotype, dorsal habitus. (D-E) Pages of the catalogue of ZMHB listing the species of *Eriphus* present in the old collection. (F) Drawer with species of *Eriphus* at ZMHB.

Eriphus bisignatus (Germar) and not equal to *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, again, the synonymy is not correct, and the latter name is available. Accordingly, *Eriphus purpuratus* Chevrolat, 1862 is a junior synonym of *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829. As only one of the conditions demanded by ICZN (1999: Article 23.9.1) is present (Article 23.9.1.1), *Eriphus purpuratus* Chevrolat, 1862 cannot be considered a *nomen protectum*.

According to ICZN (1999: 72.4.1.1): "For a nominal species or subspecies established before 2000, any evidence, published or unpublished, may be taken into account to determine what specimens constitute the type series." As Klug (1829) mentioned "Dej. (i. litt.)", we think it is necessary to consider the specimens from Dejean's collection, identified as *Eriphus rubricollis*, as syntypes of *Eryphus rubricollis*. As *E. rubricollis sensu* Dejean is not equal to Klug's species, this makes this species an amalgam of species. It is important to record that it is also possible that the specimens in Dejean's collection are also syntypes of *Callidium (Clytus) bisignatum*, becoming them as syntypes of two species. This because Dejean offered specimens for study to Germar (Dieckmann, 1986): "In answering me, have the kindness to let me know approximately what you want and I will have the greatest pleasure to send you everything that will be possible for me..." Unfortunately, we have no evidence that Dejean sent specimens to him except, probably, specimens of Curculionidae.

It is important to mention that the southern region of Brazil, as well as southern Argentina and Uruguay are places where intensive collections of insects were carried out in the last 100 years and no species that agrees with the original description of *Eryphus rubricollis* was found, except *Eriphus purpuratus*, which occurs in the same region.

In short, we are proposing *Eryphus* Klug (1829) as *nomen oblitum*, and *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville (1834) as *nomen protectum*; synonymizing *E. purpuratus* Chevrolat, 1862 with *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829; and transferring *Eryphus rubricollis* to *Eriphus*.

We are designating the specimen currently identified in the ZMHB collection as *Eriphus purpuratus* (Figs. 1C, 1F), first row, specimen located on the left and labeled, as lectotype of *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829. The lectotype has the following labels: 1) white (printed) – 18806; 2) green (handwritten) – coccineus / N. / Bras. Sello.; 3) green (printed) – Hist.-Coll. (Coleoptera) / Nr. 18806 / *Eriphus coccineus* N. / Brasil / Sellow / Zool. Mus. Berlin; 4) red (printed) – Lectotype / *Eryphus rubricollis* Klug, 1829.

Napp & Martins (2002) included 10 species in *Eryphus* Perty, 1832, and reported (translated): "The name *Eryphus* was used by Perty (1832: 91) for *E. bipunctatus*, species described and illustrated, which makes it available. *Eryphus* is not a homonym of *Eriphus* Audinet-Serville, 1834, belonging to the tribe Trachyderini (ICZN 1999: 58, art. 56.2)."

Our conclusion is that Napp & Martins (2002) transferred several species from *Callideriphus* to *Eryphus sensu* Perty (1832), a nonexistent genus. Therefore, it is necessary to erect a new genus in Dichophyiini Gistel, 1848 to include these 10 species.

DICHOPHYIINI GISTEL, 1848

Solangebira Santos-Silva, Botero & Nascimento, gen. nov. (Fig. 2)

Eryphus; Napp & Martins, 2002: 84; Monné, 2005: 290 (cat.); 2012: 30 (cat.); Botero & Monné, 2018; Monné, 2022: 221 (cat.).

Etymology: Fusion of the names of two great deceased Brazilian researchers who dedicated their entire lives to the study of Cerambycidae: Dilma Solange Napp, and Ubirajara Ribeiro Martins de Souza (Bira). Masculine gender.

Type species: *Eryphus bipunctatus* Perty, 1832, here designated.

Description: Frons transverse, flat. Genae shorter than lower eye lobe. Eyes finely faceted, emarginate; lower eye lobes large, occupy nearly entire lateral region of head. Last maxillary and labial palpomeres sub-cuneiform in both sexes (securiform in both sexes of *E. laetus*). Mandibles triangular-shaped, non-angular on external lateral face, acute at apex. Antennae 11 antennomeres, filiform or nearly so, without sulci or carinae; in male, reaching or surpassing elytral apex; in female, not or reaching elytral apex (sometimes, weakly surpassing). Scape sub-cylindrical from basal quarter, from slightly shorter to slightly longer than antennomere III. Antennomere III shorter than V, longer or about as long as IV; antennomeres VIII-XI with similar length, filiform or somewhat serrate; antennomeres lacking apical spine, and dense and long setae ventrally. Prothorax rounded laterally, lacking lateral tubercle, not longitudinally carinate. Pronotum lacking tubercles. Procoxal cavities slightly open laterally, open behind. Prosternal process narrow centrally, expanded posteriorly (almost not expanded in *E. flavicollis*). Mesoventral process as wide as or slightly narrower than mesocoxa, parallel-sided, without articular projections, notched at apex. Mesocoxal cavities closed laterally. Pro- and mesocoxae not distinctly elevated. Elytra parallel-sided, wider than posterior area of prothorax, flattened or slightly convex dorsally; apex variable. Femora pedunculate-clavate (femoral club not abrupt and not strongly widened); apex of metafemora reaching or not elytral apex, not reaching in female. Tibiae not carinate. Metatarsomere I as long or slightly longer than II-III together.

Remarks: *Solangebira* gen. nov. differs from *Allodemus* Zajciw, 1962 and *Erythrochiton* Zajciw, 1957 by the antennomere III shorter than V (longer in *Allodemus* and *Erythrochiton*). It differs from *Eriphosoma* Melzer, 1922 by the antennomere III longer than V (longer or subequal in *Eriphosoma*), and femora pedunculate-clavate (cylindrical or nearly so in *Eriphosoma*). *Solangebira* can be separated from *Homogenes* Thomson, 1862, by the prothorax lacking lateral tubercles (present in *Homogenes*). It can be separated from *Callideriphus* Blanchard, 1851 by the pronotum not longitudinally striate (striate in *Callideriphus*).



Figure 2. *Solangebira* spp. (A-B) *S. bipunctatus* (Perty, 1832), male from Brazil (São Paulo, São Paulo): (A) Dorsal habitus; (B) Ventral habitus. (C) *S. atricollis* (Melzer, 1931), dorsal habitus, lectotype female from Brazil (Minas Gerais). (D) *S. carioca* (Napp & Martins, 2002), dorsal habitus, paratype male from Brazil (Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro). (E) *S. carinatus* (Zajciw, 1970), dorsal habitus, holotype male from Brazil (Rio de Janeiro), by Monné et al. (2022). (F) *S. bivittatus* (Melzer, 1934), dorsal habitus, paratype from Argentina (Tucumán). (G) *S. tacuarembó* (Napp & Martins, 2002), dorsal habitus, paratype female – from Uruguay (Tacuarembó). (H) *S. transversalis* (Fairmaire & Germain, 1864), dorsal habitus, male from Chile (Santiago, Cerro Manquehue).

According to Napp & Martins, 2002 on their new genus *Tacyba* (translated): “*Eryphus* [= *Solangebira*, here named as *Eryphus sensu* Napp & Martins (2002)] differs from *Tacyba* **gen. nov.**: antennomeres VIII-XI long in both sexes, not tumid in females; prothorax wider than long, with sides uniformly rounded; elytra flattened dorsally, parallel-sided and slightly convex close to apex; legs proportionally short; metafemoral club cylindrical; metatibiae cylindrical and just shorter than metafemora. In *Tacyba*: antennomeres VIII-XI shortened in both sexes, tumid in females; prothorax as long as wide, sub-hexagonal; elytra convex dorsally, narrowed about middle and convex at apex; legs proportionally long and stout; metafemora fusiform; metatibiae flattened and slightly longer than metafemora.” However, the antennomeres VIII-XI in females of *Tacyba* is not different from that in males, which means they are not tumid, but they are somewhat wider than the previous segments, which does not occur in *Solangebira* except, apparently, in *S. carinatus* (Zajciw, 1970); the prothorax in *S. carinatus* is very similar to that in *Tacyba*, and is slightly longer than wide; the elytra is distinctly not flattened in *S. tacuaremba* (Napp & Martins, 2002) (Fig. 2G), and *S. bivittatus* (Melzer, 1934) (Fig. 2F), they are convex dorsally, and very weakly flattened in *S. laetus* (Blanchard, 1851); the elytral side is variable in *Solangebira* and can be identical or nearly so to that in *Tacyba* (for example, in *S. carioca* (Napp & Martins, 2002) (Fig. 2D)); the length of the legs in *Solangebira* is variable, as well as the shape, and may be identical or nearly so as in *Tacyba*; the metafemora in *Tacyba* cannot be defined as fusiform, and is very similar to that in *S. transversalis* (Fairmaire & Germain, 1864), gradually widened from base to near apex; and the metatibia is somewhat variable in some specimens of *Tacyba tenuis* (Blanchard, 1851), and may be identical or nearly so as in *Solangebira*, especially regarding the flattening. Accordingly, the only reliable difference between *Solangebira* and *Tacyba* is the length of the antennomeres VIII-XI, which have similar length in the former and X-XI distinctly shorter than VIII-IX in the later. Apparently, *S. carinatus* (Fig. 2E) and *S. transversalis* (Fig. 2H) do not belong to this genus. However, we could not examine specimens of *S. carinatus* and females of *S. transversalis*. Thus, we prefer to keep them provisionally in *Solangebira*.

Included species: *S. bipunctatus* (Perty, 1832), **comb. nov.**; *S. bivittatus* (Melzer, 1934), **comb. nov.**; *S. carinatus* (Zajciw, 1970), **comb. nov.**; *S. carioca* (Napp & Martins, 2002), **comb. nov.**; *S. flavicollis* (Fisher, 1938), **comb. nov.**; *S. laetus* (Blanchard, 1851), **comb. nov.**; *S. marginatus* (Zajciw, 1970), **comb. nov.**; *S. picticollis* (Gounelle, 1911), **comb. nov.**; *S. tacuaremba* (Napp & Martins, 2002), **comb. nov.**; and *S. transversalis* (Fairmaire & Germain, 1864), **comb. nov.**

Correction of dates

The work by Fairmaire & Germain in the “Annales de la Société Entomologique de France” has been reported as published in 1859. However, according to Desmarest

(1860) this work was published in parts in different dates: “3^e trimestre: texte, p. 369 à 512; Bulletin, p. CXXXIX à CLXXVI, et planches 8, 9, 10 et 11, le 9 novembre 1859;” and “Et 4^e trimestre: texte, p. 513 à 680; Bulletin, p. CLXXVII à la fin du volume et planches 12, 13 et 14, le 1^{er} mars 1860.” As the work by Fairmaire & Germain encompasses the pages 483 to 532, the dates of the new Cerambycidae genera and species published in it are as follows:

Adalbus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 490);
Adalbus crassicornis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 490);
Adalbus dimidiatipennis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 492);
Adalbus flavipennis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 491);
Astynomus obliquatus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 511);
Cacostola Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 527);
Cacostola vagelineata Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 527);
Callideriphus testaceicornis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 505);
Callisphyrus apicicornis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 497);
Callisphyrus asphaltinus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 497);
Callisphyrus semicaligatus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 496);
Chenoderus Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 532);
Cycnoderus tricolor Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 502);
Emphytoecia Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 529);
Emphytoecia suturaalba Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 531);
Estola Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 524);
Estola hirsuta Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 525);
Estola unicolor Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 526);
Grammicosum flavonitidum Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 507);
Grammicosum semipolatum Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 508);
Hebestola apicalis Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 529);
Hephaestion flavicans Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 495);
Hephaestion opacus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 494);
Hephaestion pallidicornis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 493);
Hephaestion rufofemoratus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 494);
Hephaestion virescens Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 495);
Hesperophanes inspergatus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 509);
Hesyca Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 523);
Hesyca cribripennis Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 523);
Holopterus araneipes Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 500);
Holopterus compressicornis Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 501);

Hoplonotus subarmatus Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 516);
Leiopus asperipennis Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 513);
Leiopus soricinus Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 512);
Microcleptes variolosus Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 520);
Sibylla flavosignata Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 489);
Sibylla integra Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 488);
Taloepora Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 521);
Taloepora nana Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 522);
Taloepora pusilla Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 521);
Tillomorpha myrmicaria Fairmaire & Germain, 1859 (Page 502);
Zygocera picturata Fairmaire & Germain, 1860 (Page 518).

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTIONS: ASS, JPB, FELM: Conceptualization; ASS: Methodology, Writing – original draft, Visualization, Investigation; ASS, JPB, FELM: Writing – review & editing; ASS: Photographs. All authors actively participated in the discussion of the results, they reviewed and approved the final version of the paper.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Authors declare there are no conflicts of interest.

FUNDING INFORMATION: This project did not use any external financial support.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: We express our sincere thanks to Bernd Jaeger (ZMHB) for sending photographs of old specimens of *Eriphus* and of the catalog, as well as information on the specimens and catalog. Special thanks also to Michael Geiser (BMNH) for the photographs of *Eriphus rubricollis sensu* Dejean, and for the precious information and help during the first steps of this work.

REFERENCES

- Agassiz, L. 1846. Nomina systematica generum coleopterorum, tam viventium quam fossilium, secundum ordinem alphabeticum disposita, adjectis auctoribus, libris in quibus reperiuntur, anno editionis, etymologia et familiis ad quas pertinent. Fasciculo XI. In: Agassiz, L. *Nomenclator Zoologicus continens nomina systematica generum animalium tam viventium quam fossilium, secundum ordinem alphabeticum disposita, adjectis auctoribus, libris, in quibus reperiuntur, anno editionis, etymologia et familiis, ad quas pertinent, in singulis classibus*. Soloduri [= Solothurn, Switzerland], Jent et Gassmann. xi + 170p.
- Audinet-Serville, J.G. 1834a. Nouvelle classification de la famille des longicornes (suite). *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France*, 2(4): 528-573.
- Audinet-Serville, J.G. 1834b. Nouvelle classification de la famille des longicornes (suite). *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France*, 3(1): 5-110.
- Aurivillius, C. 1912. *Coleopterorum Catalogus*, pars 39, Cerambycidae: Cerambycinae. Berlin, W. Junk. 574p.
- Bezark, L.G. 2022. *A photographic Catalog of the Cerambycidae of the World*. New World Cerambycidae Catalog. Available: <http://bezbycids.com/byciddb/wdefault.asp?w=n>. Access: 08/11/2022.
- Botero, J.P. & Monné, M.L. 2018. Cladistic analysis of the tribe Eburiini Blanchard, 1945 and revalidation of the tribe Dychophyiini Gistel, 1848 (Coleoptera, Cerambycidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, 185(4): 1095-1122.
- Chevrolat, L.A.A. 1845. *Eriphus*, In: D'Orbigny, C.V.D. *Dictionnaire universel d'histoire naturelle résumant et complétant tous les faits présentés par les encyclopédies, les anciens dictionnaires scientifiques, les oeuvres complètes de Buffon, et les meilleurs traités spéciaux sur les diverses branches des sciences naturelles; donnant la description des êtres et des divers phénomènes de la nature, l'étymologie et la définition des noms scientifiques, les principales applications des corps organiques et inorganiques, à l'agriculture, à la médecine, aux arts industriels, etc.; dirigé par M. Charles d'Orbigny, et enrichi d'un magnifique atlas de planches gravées sur acier*. Vol. 5. Paris, Langlois & Leclercq, Fortin, Masson & Cie. p. 404.
- Dejean, P.F.M.A. 1835. Cleonis. In: *Catalogue des Coléoptères de la collection de M. le Comte Dejean*. [Livraison 4]. Paris, Méquignon-Marvis. p. 257-360.
- Desmarest, E. 1860. Publications de la Société. *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France*, 3^a. Série, 7(4): CCLXXXIX-CCXC.
- Dieckmann, L. 1986. Aus der Korrespondenz Dejean – Germar, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entomologie. *Beiträge zur Entomologie*, 36(1): 193-200.
- Fairmaire, L. & Germain, P. 1859-1860. Révision des Coléoptères du Chili (suite). *Annales de la Société Entomologique de France*, 3^a. Série, 7(3): 483-532 [pp. 483-512, 1859; pp. 513-532, 1860].
- Gemminger, M. 1872. In: Gemminger, M. & Harold, E. *Catalogus Coleopterorum hucusque descriptorum synonymicus et systematicus*. Monachii, Gummi, v. 9, p. 2669-2988.
- Germar, E.F. 1823. *Insectorum species novae aut minus cognitae, descriptionibus illustratae*. Halae, Hendel & Sons, xxiv + 624p.
- Horn, W. & Kahle, I. 1935. Über Entomologische Sammlungen. Entomologische Beihefte aus Berlin-Dahlem, 2: 1-160 + 16 plates.
- International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN). 1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*. London, ICZN. xxx + 306p.
- Klug, J.C. 1829. *Preis-Verzeichniss vorrathiger Insecten-doupletten des Konigl. Berlin, Zoologischen Museums der Universität*. 18p.
- Monné, M.A. 2005. *Catalogue of the Cerambycidae (Coleoptera) of the Neotropical Region*. Part I. Subfamily Cerambycinae. *Zootaxa*, 946: 1-765.
- Monné, M.A. 2012. Catalogue of the type-species of the genera of the Cerambycidae, Disteniidae, Oxypeltidae and Vesperidae (Coleoptera) of the Neotropical Region. *Zootaxa*, 3213: 1-183.
- Monné, M.A. 2022. *Catalogue of the Cerambycidae (Coleoptera) of the Neotropical region*. Part I. Subfamily Cerambycinae. Available: <https://cerambycids.com/catalog>. Access: 08/11/2022.
- Monné, M.A.; Monné, M.L.; Lingafelter, S.W.; Micheli, C.J. & Nearn, E.H. 2022. *Cerambycid Holotypes of the Museu Nacional Rio de Janeiro (MNRJ)*. Available: <https://cerambycids.com/brazil/mnrj>. Access: 08/11/2022.
- Monné, M.L. & Monné, M.A. 2015. Lectotype designations of Cerambycidae (Coleoptera) described by E.F. Germar in 1824 and J.C. Klug in 1825 and a new synonymy. *Zootaxa*, 3981(3): 385-396.
- Napp, D.S. & Martins, U.R. 2002. *Eryphus* Perty, 1832 e *Tacyba*, um novo gênero de Heteropsini (Coleoptera, Cerambycidae, Cerambycinae). *Revista Brasileira de Entomologia*, 46(1): 83-92.
- Neave, S.A. 1939. *Nomenclator Zoologicus. A list of the names of genera and subgenera in zoology from the tenth edition of Linnaeus 1758 to the end of 1935*. Vol. 2. London, The Zoological Society of London. 1025p.
- Perty, J.A.M. 1832. *De insectorum in America meridionali habitantium vitae genere, moribus ac distributione geographica observationes nonnullae*. In: *Delectus animalium articulorum quae in itinere per Brasilian annis MDCCCXVII-MDCCCXX jussu at auspiciis Maximiliani Josephi I. Bavariae regis augustissime peracto collegerunt Dr. J.B. de Spix et Dr. C.F. Ph. de Martius*. Monachii, iii + 224p., + 40 plates.
- Sherborn, C.D. 1926. *Index Animalium. Sive index nominum quae ab A.D. MDCCCLVIII. Generibus et speciebus animalium imposita sunt. Sectio Secunda. A Kalendis ianuariis, MDCCCL usque ad finem decembris, MDCCCL*. London, British Museum (Natural History). p. 2009-2248.
- White, A. 1855. *Catalogue of the coleopterous insects in the collection of the British Museum. Catalogue of Longicornia, Coleoptera, pt II*. London, British Museum, v. 8, p. 175-412.