#### Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

REPORT ON MR. C. W. SABROSKY'S PROPOSAL FOR THE SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED "NOUVELLE CLASSIFICATION DES MOUCHES A DEUX AILES " BY J. W. MEIGEN, 1800. Z.N.(S).191

By R. V. Melville (Assistant Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

#### Foreword

The subjoined report, as explained in its introductory paragraphs, was designed to show how Mr. C. W. Sabrosky's proposal for the suppression of Meigen's *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches* à *deux Ailes* could be completed; that is, it was envisaged as an integral part of that proposal, and in accordance with that view, was submitted to the Commission for a vote on 7 October 1959. At the close of the Voting Period on 7 January 1960, 24 Commissioners had voted in favour, and 2 against the proposals contained in the report.

Professor J. Chester Bradley, President of the Commission, whilst voting in favour of these proposals, took the view that they constituted virtually a new application to the Commission; that no vote on Mr. Sabrosky's original application (B.Z.N. 6:131-141) had been formally taken; and that an Opinion embodying the result of the vote on the report would be premature and irregular. In his view, the report should first have been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and then presented to the Commission as a proposal alternative to that of Mr. Sabrosky, so that the latter could clearly be seen to have been expressly subjected to a vote. By this course, dipterists who had not already been consulted (see p. 17 below), and workers in the other groups affected, would have been given an opportunity to comment on the issues involved.

In order to avoid the possibility of doubt arising now or in the future as to the validity of the vote taken on this most complicated issue, Mr. Melville's report is now published below and the prescribed public notice of the possible use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers in the manner indicated, is being given. If, after the expiry of six months from the date of this publication, no objection has been received to the proposals embodied in the report, the vote already taken by the Commission will be regarded as rejecting Mr. Sabrosky's original proposal (total suppression of Meigen's 1800 names) and accepting the modified version set out by Mr. Melville below, and an Opinion will be published giving effect to that decision. If, on the other hand, objections are received, these will be circulated to the Commission with a One-Month Voting Paper in which each member of the Commission will be asked whether, in the light of those objections, he wishes to change his previous vote. If the effect of these supplementary votes is to uphold the previous vote by a two-thirds majority the situation will remain unchanged. If, on the other hand, the previous vote is not upheld, the resultant Opinion will give affirmative effect to Mr. Sabrosky's original proposal, and the modified proposals will be lost.

> N. D. RILEY Honorary Secretary, InternationalCommission on Zoological Nomenclature

#### Introduction

This report had been nearly completed by Mr. Francis Hemming at the time when he was compelled by ill-health to resign the office of Secretary to the Commission. The purpose of the report is to present to the Commission proposals for the completion of Mr. Sabrosky's proposal (received in 1951) for the suppression under the Plenary Powers of J. W. Meigen's pamphlet entitled Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à Deux Ailes (1800).

2. Meigen's Nouvelle Classification is probably without rival for the amount of confusion and lack of uniformity in zoological nomenclature to which it has given rise during the last fifty years, and Mr. Sabrosky, as a specialist in Diptera (the group mostly concerned), is to be congratulated on his action in bringing the matter to the attention of the Commission. His proposal, however, although apparently simple, cannot be adopted without the most careful consideration, for the mere suppression of the work in question would have the most far-reaching effects on the nomenclature of other groups of animals. As will be more fully explained below, the fact that Meigen's pamphlet was almost completely overlooked for more than a century after its publication led to many junior homonyms coming into existence, while the rediscovery of the work has led to the replacement of some (but by no means all) of those homonyms by other names which have come into general use. It has therefore been necessary to consider individually each one of the new generic names published in the Nouvelle Classification and to decide whether it should be suppressed only so as to validate its counterpart junior synonym in Diptera; whether it should be suppressed so as to validate a junior homonym in Diptera or in some other group; or whether it should be suppressed so as not to validate a homonym which has been replaced. This report therefore begins with a brief history of the Nouvelle Classification in Section I. Section II summarises the work done by Mr. Sabrosky in analysing the relative usage of Meigen's 1800 names and of later names for the same genera and in ascertaining the wishes of Dipterists on the question of whether the 1800 names should be suppressed. Section III describes the action needed to give effect to Mr. Sabrosky's proposal and Sections IV, V and VI set out the procedure required to place on Official Lists the names validated by the suppression of the 1800 names. Section VII outlines the treatment to be accorded to Meigen's pamphlet and Section VIII explains the way in which the bibliographic references are arranged. Section IX indicates future developments in respect of deficiences in the present report and Section X puts before the Commission the specific proposals required to give effect to Mr. Sabrosky's proposal. Details of the generic, specific and family-group names involved are relegated to a series of Appendices. For convenience of reference, each name is numbered throughout this Report with the number of the Meigen, 1800, generic name with which it is connected.

#### I. The Historical Background

3. Meigen's Nouvelle Classification is an 8vo pamphlet of forty pages published in Paris. On the title page it is dated both according to the French Revolutionary Calendar and according to the Christian Era as "AN VIII (1800 v.s.)". The Revolutionary Year VIII ran from 23 September 1799 to 22 September 1800, so that publication must have taken place before the latter date. Meigen's "Avant-Propos" is dated "le premier Germinal an 7" (i.e. 21 March 1799) and Baumhauer's "Introduction" is dated "le 10 Messidor an 7" (i.e. 28 June 1799). It is therefore reasonable to conclude that this small pamphlet, which need not have taken long to print, was probably published early in 1800.

4. The title-page reads "Nouvelle/Classification/des/Mouches A Deux Ailes/(Diptera L.)/d'après un plan tout nouveau/par J. G. Meigen/(vignette)/à Paris/chez J. J. Fuchs, Librairie, Rue/des Mathurins, No. 334./De l'Imprimerie de H. L. Perronneau/Rue du Battoir, No. 8/(rule)/AN VIII (1800 v.s.)." In this work, which was offered as a "prodrome" to a projected larger work, the Diptera are divided into eighty-eight (88) genera, each provided with a short diagnosis in French and the number of species (all European) which he recognised as belonging to each genus. In no case, however, is any nominal species cited by name. Of these 88 nominal genera, 25 had already been named by previous authors and 63 were new. On further consideration, Meigen seems to have abandoned the "plan tout nouveau" of the Nouvelle Classification, for in 1803, in his "Versuch einer neuen GattungsEintheilung der europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten" (Mag. f. Insektenk. (Illiger) 2:259-281) he put forward a revised scheme in which he made no reference to the Nouvelle Classification of 1800 and in which only two of the new names proposed in 1800 were used. The total number of genera recognised was now 114, each briefly diagnosed, and each (with few exceptions) with one or more nominal species referred to it.

5. Following the publication of the Versuch of 1803, the Nouvelle Classification of 1800 disappeared into obscurity for 105 years. This was no doubt due to the great influence exercised by Meigen's later works, especially his Klassification und Beschreibung der europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten (Diptera) (1804) and his seven-volume Systematische Beschreibung der bekannten europäischen zweiflügligen Insekten (1818–1838), in both of which the system outlined in the Versuch of 1803 was used, while no reference was made to the Nouvelle Classification of 1800. The neglect of this latter work was also no doubt due in part to the rarity of the pamphlet, and the great difficulty of interpreting the new genera established in it through the omission by Meigen of any particulars as to the species referred by him to those genera. In 1908, however, the position was completely changed by the publication by Friedrich Hendel of his "J. G. Meigen : Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à Deux Ailes (Diptera L.)" (Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien), in which, by a close comparison of the German diagnoses of 1803 with the French diagnoses of 1800, he was able to synonymise many of the new genera published in the earlier work with genera published in the later work.

6. Hendel's re-introduction of the Meigen names of 1800 was strongly opposed by most dipterists and shortly afterwards the late Dr. J. M. Aldrich asked the Commission to give a ruling against the availability of those names. At that time—some years before the granting to the Commission of Plenary Powers to suspend the *Règles* in the interests of stability—Dr. Aldrich's application could be judged only on the narrow ground of whether or not the *Nouvelle Classification* had been "published" in the sense of Article 25 of the *Règles*. The Commission found that it had been so published and accordingly in Opinion 28 (1910; *Smithson. Misc. Publ.* 1989: 66–67) it ruled that the generic names in the *Nouvelle Classification* of 1800 were to be given precedence over those of the *Versuch* of 1803 in every case where the names concerned were available names.

7. Opinion 28, taken in conjunction with D. W. Coquillett's "The typespecies of the North American genera of Diptera" (1910; Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 37: 499-622), in which many of Meigen's 1800 names were recognised, led to the acceptance of those names by a number of workers. A much larger number, however, refused to accept these names. An attempt was made to deal with the resultant disastrous confusion and lack of uniformity in the nomenclature of Diptera by the Fifth International Entomological Congress at Paris in 1932, but in a sparsely attended meeting a motion in favour of the acceptance of the 1800 names was carried by a small majority. This resolution was forwarded for consideration by the Commission at its Lisbon session in 1935. By this time, the tide had begun to flow in the direction of favouring stability of nomenclature and the Commission, recognising that this end would not be served by the adoption en bloc of the 1800 names, decided to seek a solution by inviting dipterists to submit proposals in regard to individual cases in which, in their opinion, the acceptance of the 1800 names would lead to greater confusion than uniformity. This decision was published as Opinion 152 (1944; Ops. Decls. Int. Comm. zool. Nomencl. 2: 181-196). The rarity of the Nouvelle Classification was such that very few dipterists had ever seen a copy, the majority having had to rely on Hendel's paper of 1908. It therefore appeared to the Office of the Commission that the intention expressed in Opinion 152 would be promoted if Meigen's pamphlet were re-issued in facsimile, thus providing many zoologists with their first opportunity of judging the work as a whole. The Council of the Zoological Society of London generously placed the Society's copy at the Commission's disposal, and the facsimile was published in September 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1:119–160). The Meigen question was again considered by the Commission at its Paris session in 1948, by which time a larger number, though still only a minority, of dipterists had come to accept the 1800 names. The Commission decided (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4:557-558) to take all practicable steps to promote applications in the terms of Opinion 152 for or against the suppression of the 1800 names, in the hope that, by the issue of a series of Opinions, all the names concerned would eventually be dealt with.

8. The publication of the foregoing decision led to the submission to the Commission of a number of individual applications regarding particular names, and five of these were published in 1951 (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2:134–160). This in turn aroused afresh the interest of dipterists in the Meigen problem and led to the submission by Mr. Sabrosky in September 1951 of the proposal for the suppression of Meigen's Nouvelle Classification which is now laid before the Commission for final settlement.

# II. Mr. Sabrosky's investigation of the relative usage of the Meigen, 1800 names and of later names for the genera concerned and his census of the wishes of dipterists on the question of the suppression of the 1800 names

# (a) Relative usage of the Meigen (1800) names and of later names for the genera concerned

9. In submitting his proposal for the suppression of Meigen's pamphlet (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6: 131-141), Mr. Sabrosky took note of the fact that the dipterists were divided into two groups, those in one group accepting, and those in the second refusing to accept the 1800 names, and he therefore concluded that a quantitative analysis of the relative size of the two groups, in personnel and in output of publications, would provide a useful factor in judging the merits of his application. The results of his investigations were presented in three tables, and these deserve careful study, not only because of their intrinsic interest, but because they show conclusively, contrary to assertions made by some of the supporters of the 1800 names, that the usage of these names, far from constituting a substantial percentage of total usage, formed in fact only a small minority usage. The first table summarises usage in "major publications", divided into (1) the literature of the Order Diptera, (2) the literature of general Entomology and (3) the literature of general Zoology. The second table summarises recent usage as expressed in the Zoological Record for 1939, 1947 and 1948 and the Bibliogr. Agr. for 1950 and the third table compares usage in the years 1911-1930 with that in the years 1931-1950 so as to show changes in practice in those two periods. The tables are reproduced below :

#### Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

Contraction of the second second second	(See Duil. 2001. Nomence. 0. 137)					
				1800 usage	Mixed usage	Usage of later names
Diptera						
Catalogues	1.00				2	7
Manuals, etc	Service.			8	4	35
Faunal Lists	estit.			1	3	21
General Entomology						
Textbooks	sine ?			4		72
Zoological Record				_	- 10	1
Guides and Handboo	oks .			2	10 m - 19 10 m	18
Others	-			3	3	45
General Zoology						34
Totals (263)	-			18	12	233
Proportion of total usag	ge .			6.8%	4.6%	88.6%

#### TABLE I

Summary of usage in major publications (See Bull zool Nomencl 6:137)

#### TABLE III

(See Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6:139)

	1911	-1930	1931-1950	
	Number	Per cent.	Number	Per cent.
	of	using later	of	using later
	papers	names	papers	names
Bull. Ent. Research (England)	 75	95	34	97
Journ. Econ. Entom. (U.S.A.)	 73	89	51	90

10. These tables show convincingly that the 1800 names are accepted by only a small minority of authors in only a small minority of published works over the whole field of zoological literature and in all countries, and that the preponderance of the usage of later names for the same genera tended to increase slightly with the passage of time up to 1950.

#### (b) Census of the wishes of dipterists on the question of the suppression of the 1800 names

11. It does not necessarily follow, from the evidence presented in the tables above, that an equally preponderant majority of workers would favour the suppression of the 1800 names by the use of the Plenary Powers, and it was accordingly judged essential to obtain a representative statement of the wishes of dipterists on this point before submitting Mr. Sabrosky's proposal to the Commission for a decision. For this purpose 400 separates of his paper in the *Bulletin* were made available to Mr. Sabrosky to be circulated to dipterists with a questionnaire. The number actually circulated was 370 (U.S.A. and Canada 112; Latin America 49; United Kingdom 41; Europe 95; Africa 25; Asia 30; Australasia 18). Six months later Mr. Sabrosky sent an analysis of the 188 replies received, representing the following percentages of the copies

	S.		Taxon		Number	of 1	papers	. Record.	1939 107	1947 83	1948 72	liog. Agr. 1950 66
ummary of recent a Type of Publication	ummary o	Type of P	nomic		Per cent.	using later	names		11	76	68	70
	ublication	Non-taz	Number	ot	papers		59	22	32	36		
TAB	usage (See	1 konomic	Per cent.	using later	names		98	95	67	86		
LE II	Bull. 2		Tot		Number	OI	papers		166	105	104	102
	iool. Nomer		als		Per cent.	using later	names		81	80	76	75
	ncl. 6:13		Autho	M	INUMBER U			1111	78	61	82	
	38)		ors		Per cent.	ISING JAVEL	names		83	77	75	74
			Coun	repres	1 200	TOUU	usage		6	10	10	9
			tries	ented	1 202	COOT	usage		24	24	22	16

# Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

of the questionnaire distributed :—U.S.A. and Canada 63%; Latin America 39%; United Kingdom 59%; Europe 44%; Africa 44%; Asia 33%; Australasia 56%. Mr. Sabrosky's report on these replies (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9**: 225–240; 1954) brought out the following salient points. Of the zoologists who replied, 171 (80%) stated that their field of work involved the disputed 1800 names. Of the 171, 114 (70%) stated that they used later names and 49 (30%) the 1800 names. In the two largest areas (U.S.A. & Canada; Continental Europe) 59 and 53% respectively of the zoologists replying said that they used later names and the combined total for the rest of the world (58 replies) showed 91% as using those names. On the crucial question "Do you vote for the present proposal to suppress the Meigen 1800 names ?" 155 (85%) replied "Yes" and 28 (15%) replied "No".

#### III. Action required to give effect to Mr. Sabrosky's proposal

12. From the evidence summarised in paragraphs 8 to 11 above it is clear that current usage and current opinion among Dipterists are alike in favour of the rejection of the Meigen 1800 names so as to validate the names in general use. It has already been explained in the Introduction, however, that to achieve this by simply suppressing the *Nouvelle Classification* under the Plenary Powers would have far-reaching disruptive effects on the current nomenclature of other groups, owing to the existence of many junior homonyms of Meigen 1800 names, some of which have been replaced since Hendel (1908) resuscitated Meigen's work.

13. Each of the new generic names in the Nouvelle Classification has therefore been considered individually, and it has been found that they fall into three principal groups. There are first those names for which no junior homonyms exist; these should be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy so as to validate the junior synonyms applied to the same genera. Secondly, there are the names of which junior homonyms exist, whether in the Diptera or in some other group, and which continue in general use, no replacement names existing; in this group, the Meiger 1800 names should be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority (so as to validace the junior synonyms in Diptera) and for those of the Law of Hommymy (sc) as to validate the junior homonyms). Thirdly, there are those names of which the junior homonyms have been replaced; here the Meigen 1800 names should be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, so as to validate the junior synonyms in Diptera without giving a new lease of life to the junior homonyms in question and so invalidating the replacement names. This task, and the collecting of the data necessary to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the names to be adopted in place of the Meigen, 1800 names has been very laborious, and it is for this reason that so much time has elapsed since the publication in 1954 of Mr. Sabrosky's report on the replies to his questionnaire (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 9: 225-240).

14. The investigations have been carried out in the Commission's office by Miss Diana Noakes, B.Sc. and particular thanks are due to her for the patience, care and skill which she devoted to this work. The closing stages were completed by Miss Margaret Spillane, B.Sc., in the same spirit of devotion. Mr. Sabrosky's public-spirited action in bringing the problem to the attention of the Commission and his strenuous efforts to provide it with objective data to form the basis of a decision have been outlined above. He also submitted a report on consultations between himself and non-entomological colleagues in the United States National Museum in regard to names in other groups which are junior homonyms of the Meigen (1800) names. The warmest thanks are due to the Trustees and Librarians of the British Museum (Natural History) and to the Councils and Librarians of the Zoological and Royal Entomological Societies of London for the facilities granted to Miss Noakes and Miss Spillane and for help in tracing references. Professor L. W. Grensted, the Consulting Classical Adviser to the Commission, furnished a report on the gender of the generic names which are proposed below to be placed on the Official List. In the later stages of the investigation many specialists in the Diptera and in other groups were consulted in respect of particular names, and the grateful thanks of the Commission are due to them. They are : The following members of the staff of the British Museum (Natural History), London :--Mr. E. B. Britton, Dr. W. E. China, Mr. R. L. Coe, Dr. L. R. Cox, F.R.S., the late Dr. F. W. Edwards, Dr. P. Freeman, Mr. H. Oldroyd, Mr. S. Prudhoe, Dr. W. J. Rees, Mr. N. D. Riley, Dr. N. Tebble, Mr. P. E. S. Whalley; Dr. W. J. Hall and the late Dr. F. van Emden, Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London; Mr. A. B. Acton, University of Glasgow, Scotland; the late Professor M. L. Aczél, Tucumán, Argentina, Professor C. P. Alexander, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A., Professor G. W. Byers, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A., J. E. Collin, Esq., Raylands, Newmarket, England, Dr. N. B. Eales, Reading, England, Professor Dr. H. Engel, Amsterdam, Netherlands, the late Capt. E. R. Goffe, King's Somborne, Hants, England, Professor Elmo Hardy, Hawaii, Dr. A. M. Hemmingsen, Copenhagen, Denmark, Dr. W. Hennig, Berlin, Germany, Professor Dr. E. M. Hering, Berlin, Germany, Dr. W. D. Hincks, Manchester, England, Professor Dr. T. Jaczewski, Warsaw, Poland, Dr. E. L. Kessel, San Francisco, California, U.S.A., Dr. G. Kruseman, Amsterdam, Professor J. Lane, Sao Paulo, Brazil, Dr. H. Lemche, Copenhagen, Professor G. Marcuzzi, Padua, Italy, Dr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, London, Dr. E. G. Munroe, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, Professor Dr. J. Nast, Warsaw, Dr. W. F. Rapp, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A., Dr. F. R. Shaw, Amherst, Mass., U.S.A., Dr. J. Smart, Cambridge, England, Dr. A. Stone, Washington, D.C., Professor A. Thienemann, Plon, Germany, Dr. S. L. Tuxen, Copenhagen, Denmark, Dr. J. R. Vockeroth, Ottawa, Canada.

15. In order that the members of the Commission may be able to follow the successive steps needed to deal with the present case, it is necessary that they should first have before them a list of the generic names primarily involved. These are the 88 names published in the *Nouvelle Classification* and they are listed in Appendix I, where the 63 new names first published in that work are given in Part A and the 25 names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen are listed in Part B (see p. 24).

16. Of the 63 new generic names, all of which will be suppressed under the Plenary Powers if Mr. Sabrosky's proposal is put into effect, three have already been suppressed by the Commission. Particulars of these are given in Appendix II (see p. 25). The number of names still to be dealt with is thus reduced to 60.

17. Of these 60 names, three are junior homonyms of names previously published for genera in other groups. Each of the senior homonyms is a valid name in general use and should thus be placed on the Official List. Particulars are given in Appendix III (see p. 25).

- 1 name (Apivora Meigen, 1800) to be placed on the Official Index as a junior objective synonym of a name placed on the Official List in Opinion 441 (Volucella Geoffroy, 1762);
- 26 names without junior homonyms, to be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy (Appendix IV, Part A, p. 26);
- 16 names with junior homonyms which have been replaced, to be suppressed in the same manner (Appendix IV, Part B, p. 26; the replaced junior homonyms, to be placed on the Official Index, are included in Appendix V, Part K, p. 44);
- 14 names with junior homonyms which have never been replaced (with one exception; but the replacement name has never been adopted) to be suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy (Appendix IV, Part C, p. 27).

It may be noted here that the junior homonyms validated by the suppression of this last group of 14 names consist of five generic names in Diptera, two in Scyphozoa, two in Polychaeta, one in Coleoptera, two in Lepidoptera, one in Gastropoda and one in Mammalia.

# IV. Names which would need to be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology in the event of the acceptance by the Commission of Mr. Sabrosky's Proposal

19. In order to complete the action involved in giving effect to Mr. Sabrosky's proposal it is necessary now to consider, first the names to be placed on the Official List as the counterparts in Diptera of the Meigen 1800 names, and secondly, the names (in Diptera and in other groups) validated by the suppression of certain of the Meigen 1800 names for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy. The first step in this part of the investigation is to determine what is the valid type-species of each of Meigen's 63 new genera, each of which was established with a brief description but without any included species. When Hendel first revived those names in 1908, the Code had been in existence only three years and gave no guidance on problems of this nature, and Opinion 46, adopted four years later, did not provide a satisfactory solution. An objective basis for solving such problems was first provided by the Paris (1948) Congress (Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 158-159, 346) when it ruled that the type-species of a genus established without any included species must be that species, or must be chosen from among those species, first subsequently referred to it. In the light of this decision a careful study has been made of Hendel's

paper and of the important works by Coquillett (1910) and Stone (1941) and it has been possible to determine the type-species of all but four of the Meigen 1800 genera in question. In the case of these four exceptions (Orithea, Salpyga, Titia, Cyanea), no species has ever been referred to them nor have they been synonymised with other genera, so that their names remain nomina dubia and no question of a counterpart name in Diptera arises.

20. When these four nomina dubia and the three names already dealt with are subtracted from the 63 new generic names proposed by Meigen in 1800, there remain 56 names for which the valid counterparts in Diptera have to be found. Investigations carried out with the help of specialists have shown that in 31 cases the names currently in use for these genera fulfil all requirements of the Code. These generic names, listed in Appendix V, Part A (p. 27), will be directly validated by the suppression under the Plenary Powers of the corresponding Meigen 1800 names and they can accordingly be placed on the Official List without further delay. Three further cases, briefly set out in Appendix V, Part B (p. 29), are the subjects of applications published in the Bulletin, and require separate consideration for this reason. The counterpart names involved fulfil all the necessary conditions and no Plenary Powers action is called for other than that involved in suppressing the Meigen 1800 names in each case (i.e. other than that involved in approving Mr. Sabrosky's original proposal). These cases are thus segregated from Part A of this Appendix only on formal grounds because separate applications, not yet voted upon by the Commission, have been published on them. In a further 21 cases (including five unpublished applications to the Commission), there are obstacles of one kind or another which cannot be overcome without a more far-reaching use of the Plenary Powers. Summaries of these cases are given in Appendix V, Part C (p. 39) for information only. Action cannot be taken on them until they have been published in the Bulletin and public notice has been given of the possible use of the Plenary Powers. So far as the present ruling is concerned, therefore, it is recommended that the Commission should expressly postpone the consideration of these names to a later occasion.

21. It will readily be seen that counterpart Dipteran names can be found in the terms of the preceding paragraph for only 55 of the 56 names involved. The one remaining case is the counterpart name to replace Apivora Meigen, 1800, and this in fact already exists. The nominal genus Apivora was first provided with included species by Hendel (1908) and the species in question were Musca inanis Linnaeus, 1758, Musca pellucens Linnaeus, 1758, Musca inflata Fabricius, 1794 and Musca bombylans Linnaeus, 1758. Coquillett (1910: 508) selected Musca pellucens as the type-species of Apivora and of Pterocera Meigen, 1803. The same species had, however, already become the type-species of Volucella Geoffroy, 1762 by selection by Curtis (1833, Brit. Ent. 1: pl. 452), so that Apivora Meigen 1800 and Pterocera Meigen 1803 were already junior objective synonyms of Volucella at the time when, in Opinion 441 (1957) the Commission used its Plenary Powers to validate the generic name Volucella Geoffroy, 1762, and placed it on the Official List with Musca pellucens Linnaeus, 1758 as type-species. The attention of the Commission was not then drawn to the fact that Apivora Meigen 1800 and

Pterocera Meigen 1803 were invalid junior objective synonyms of Volucella Geoffroy, 1762, but this defect should now be remedied by placing these two generic names on the Official Index. At the same time Pterocera Meigen, 1803, is a junior homonym of Pterocera Lamarck, 1799 (Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris 1:72) (Class Gastropoda). This name, which is not now in general use, is itself a junior objective synonym of Lambis [Röding], 1798, because the type-species of both is Strombus lambis Linnaeus, 1758 (Syst. Nat. ed. 10:743) (of Lambis by absolute tautonymy and of Pterocera Lamarck by monotypy). Pterocera Lamarck should therefore be placed on the Official Index and Lambis [Röding], with the name of its type-species, on the Official List.

22. Parts D to H of Appendix V (p. 39) are concerned with names involved in the present case through the operations of the Law of Homonymy. Part D lists eight generic names which are junior homonyms of Meigen 1800 names listed in Appendix IV, Part D and which can themselves be placed on the Official List, and Part E gives three further such homonyms for which further particulars are required. Parts F and G give respectively details of one senior homonym of a Meigen 1800 name which can be placed on the Official List and of two other senior homonyms for which information is still sought. Part H lists seven generic names adopted in place of junior homonyms of Meigen 1800 names which are fit to be placed on the Official List.

23. It is convenient at this point to consider the 25 generic names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen in 1800. Seven of these have already been dealt with by the Commission and placed on the Official List, as follows : *Musca* Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 82); *Oestrus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Opinion 106); *Bibio*, *Scatopse* and *Stomoxys* Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 441); *Stratiomys* Geoffroy, 1762 (Opinion 442); and *Hirtea* Scopoli, 1763 (Opinion 441). In the case of eleven of the remaining names, current usage has been found on investigation to be in full agreement with the Code, so that they can be placed directly on the Official List (Appendix V, Part I (p. 42)). The remaining seven names cannot for various reasons be dealt with immediately by the Commission : particulars are given in Section J of Appendix V (p. 42).

24. Finally, part K of Appendix V (p. 44) lists a large number of names which are objectively invalid for various reasons and which can therefore be placed on the Official Index in the event of Mr. Sabrosky's essential proposal being approved. These names consist of junior homonyms, junior objective synonyms, unjustified emendations and erroneous subsequent spellings of names involved in other parts of the present case.

#### V. Names to be placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology in the event of the acceptance by the Commission of Mr. Sabrosky's proposal

25. It is necessary now to consider the type-species of each of the genera considered in the preceding section and to determine whether the name which is, under the Rules, that of the type-species, is the oldest available name for the species in question. In 58 cases this requirement is met and these specific names can be placed directly on the Official List; they are listed in Part A of Appendix VI (p. 50). In Section B of that Appendix (p. 53) are given names which are subjectively considered to be senior synonyms of the type-species of

others of the genera involved, and it is recommended that these names, as the valid names for their species, be also placed on the Official List.

#### VI. Family-group name problems

26. As might be expected, the existence over the last fifty years of two names for a large number of genera (a Meigen 1800 name and another name) has led to the duplication of a number of family-group names. If the proposal to suppress the 1800 names is accepted, then the family-group names will, under the provisions of Declaration 20, be automatically rejected. In nearly every case, however, these names were already invalid as junior synonyms of earlier names based on the generic names in use prior to Hendel's paper of 1908. Part A of Appendix VII (p. 53) gives those of the names in this group which are recommended for addition to the Official Index, and names based on the generic names listed in Appendix V, Part B are listed in Appendix VII, Part B (p. 54). Various invalid spellings of family-group names based on generic names involved in this case are listed in Appendix VII, Part C (Order Diptera) (p. 54) and one invalid spelling of a family-group name in Polychaeta is given in Part D (p. 56). Both these groups of names should be placed on the Official Index.

27. Particulars are given in Appendix VIII of the family-group names involved in this case which are currently regarded as valid and which should thus be placed on the Official List. These are divided into :—Part A (p. 56), names in the Order Diptera based on counterparts of Meigen 1800 generic names; Part B (p. 57), names based on generic names established by earlier authors; Part C (p. 58), names for which the original references are still wanted; Part D (p. 58), one name in a group other than Diptera based on a junior homonym of a Meigen 1800 name.

#### VII. Treatment to be accorded to Meigen's Nouvelle classification (1800)

28. It is an essential part of the proposals contained in this report that a number of the new generic names proposed by Meigen in 1800 should be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy. It follows from this that the work itself must continue to exist in relation to the rights which those names will retain under the Law of Homonymy. It is therefore proposed that the title of the Nouvelle Classification be placed on the Official List of Works Approved as Available in Zoological Nomenclature subject to an endorsement that, in view of the action taken by the Commission under its Plenary Powers, the work is available only for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy in relation to those names first published in it which have been suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

#### VIII. Bibliographic references

29. In order to simplify the reading of this report and of the Appendices, all the bibliographic references concerned have been gathered into a separate Appendix (Appendix IX, p. 58), where they are listed in alphabetical order of authors and in chronological sequence of successive works by the same author.

#### IX. Future developments

30. In spite of all the help received from specialists, and in spite of the work done in the Commission's office, there still remain (April, 1959) a number of names of which the status is doubtful and for which the original reference is unknown or incomplete (see Appendix V, Parts C, E, G, and J and Appendix VIII, Sections C, D, and E). Efforts to fill these gaps continue and any further results obtained will be communicated to the members of the Commission should, if it accepts the proposals set out in the following paragraph, state in the ruling to be delivered on this case, that those names are expressly postponed for further consideration.

#### X. Recommendations

31. In order to give effect to Mr. Sabrosky's proposal, it is recommended that the Commission should :---

(1) use its Plenary Powers :

- (a) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the 42 generic names in the Order Diptera published by Meigen in 1800 and listed in Appendix IV, Parts A and B;
- (b) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy the 14 generic names in the Order Diptera published by Meigen in 1800 and listed in Appendix IV, Part C;
- (2) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology :
  - (a) the 42 generic names proposed in (1)(a) above to be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;
  - (b) the 14 generic names proposed in (1)(b) above to be suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy;
  - (c) the three generic names listed in Appendix III (invalid junior homonyms published by Meigen in 1800);
  - (d) the 124 invalid generic names listed in Appendix V, Part K;
- (3) place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :
  - (a) the 31 generic names in Diptera listed in Appendix V, Part A, each to replace one of the names proposed in (1) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;
  - (b) the generic names Chironomus Meigen, 1803, Dilophus Meigen, 1803 and Pipunculus Latreille, [1802–1803] as defined in Appendix V, Part B;
  - (c) the seven generic names listed in Appendix V, Part D (junior homonyms in Diptera or in other groups validated through the proposed suppression in (1)(b) above of certain Meigen, 1800 names under the Plenary Powers for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy);

- (d) the generic name *Petaurista* Link, 1795, as defined in Appendix V, Part F;
- (e) the nine generic names defined in Appendix V, Part H (to replace junior homonyms of Meigen, 1800 names);
- (f) the eleven generic names established by authors prior to Meigen, 1800 and listed in Appendix V, Part I;
- (g) the generic name Lambis [Röding], 1798 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Strombus lambis Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Gastropoda) (see paragraph 22 above);
- (4) postpone for further consideration the generic names listed in Appendix V, Parts C (except *Platypeza* Meigen, 1803), E, G and J;
- (5) place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology :
  - (a) the 58 specific names listed in Appendix VI, Part A, each representing the type-species of a genus whose name is recommended in (3) above to be placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
  - (b) the six specific names listed in Appendix VI, Part B, each being the oldest name subjectively available for the type-species of such a genus;
- (6) place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-group Names in Zoology :
  - (a) the thirteen family-group names listed in Appendix VII, Part A, each based on a generic name proposed in (1) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;
  - (b) the two family-group names listed in Appendix VII, Part B, each based on a generic name proposed in (1) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;
  - (c) the 61 incorrect original spellings of family-group names listed in Appendix VII, Parts C and D;
- (7) place on the Official List of Family-group Names in Zoology:
  - (a) the fifteen family-group names listed in Appendix VIII, Part A, each based on the counterpart of a Meigen, 1800 name proposed in (1) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;
  - (b) the thirteen names listed in Appendix VIII, Part B, based on generic names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen in 1800;
- (8) postpone for further consideration the 12 family-group names listed in Appendix VIII, Parts C and D;
- (9) place the title of the work "Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à Deux Ailes " published by J. W. Meigen in 1800 on the Official List of Works Approved as Available in Zoological Nomenclature subject to an endorsement that the work is available only for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy in relation to the generic names proposed to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers in (1)(a) above for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

#### APPENDIX I

#### LIST OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHT GENERIC NAMES CONTAINED IN MEIGEN'S "NOUVELLE CLASSIFICATION DES MOUCHES A DEUX AILES" (1800) Part A

	63	names first published	in the "Nou	velle Classification '
: 13	1	Flabellifera	: 29	52 Omphrale
: 14	3	Polymeda	: 30	53 Clythia
	4	Liriope		54 Musidora
	5	Pales		55 Cleona
: 15	6	Orithea	: 31	56 Cypsela
	7	Amphinome		57 Dorilas
	8	Petaurista		58 Atalanta
: 16	9	Euphrosyne		59 Tylos
	10	Phryne	: 32	61 Chrysogaster
	11	Zelmira		62 Antiopa
	12	Fungivora	: 33	65 Tritonia
: 17	13	Lycoria	: 34	66 Zelima
	14	Tendipes		67 Lampetia
: 18	15	Pelopia		68 Tubifera
	16	Helea	: 35	69 Cinxia
	17	Phalaenula		70 Penthesilea
	18	Itonida		71 Trepidaria
: 19	20	Polyxena		72 Titania
	21	Melusina	: 36	73 Scopeuma
: 20	22	Amasia		74 Statinia
	25	Philia		75 Euribia
: 21	26	Erinna	: 37	76 Apivora
	28	Eulalia		78 Salpyga
: 22	30	Potamida	: 38	79 Titia
	31	Hermione		80 Salmacia
: 23	33	Chrysops	: 38	81 Echinodes
	34	Chrysozona		82 Larvaevora
: 24	37	Dionaea	: 39	83 Rhodogyne
: 25	40	Lapria		84 Crocuta
: 27	44	Coryneta		85 Calirrhoe
	45	Noeza		88 Cyanea
	46	Iphis		Contraction of the second second
		-		

#### Part B

# 25 names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen, 1800

- : 14 2 Tipula Linnaeus, 1758 : 585
- : 19 19 Culex Linnaeus, 1758 : 602
- : 20 23 Scathopse Geoffroy, 1762: 450
  - 24 Hirtea Scopoli, 1763 : 367
- : 21 27 Sicus Scopoli, 1763 : 369
- : 22 29 Stratiomys Geoffroy, 1762 : 449, 475
- : 23 32 Ceria Fabricius, 1794 : 277
- : 24 35 Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758 : 601

	36 Bibio Geoffroy, 1762 : 450, 568
: 25	38 Empis Linnaeus, 1758 : 603
	39 Asilus Linnaeus, 1758 : 605
: 26	41 Erax Scopoli, 1763 : 359
	42 Conops Linnaeus, 1758: 604
	43 Myopa Fabricius, 1775 : 798
: 28	47 Sargus Fabricius, 1798 : 549
	48 Rhagio Fabricius, 1775 : 761
	49 Anthrax Scopoli, 1763 : 358
: 29	50 Oestrus Linnaeus, 1758 : 584
	51 Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758 : 606
: 32	60 Rhingia Scopoli, 1763 : 358
: 33	63 Thereva Latreille, 1796 : 167
	64 Syrphus Fabricius, 1775: 762
: 37	77 Musca Linnaeus, 1758 : 589
: 40	86 Stomoxys Geoffroy, 1762: 449, 53
	87 Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758 : 607

#### APPENDIX II

# THREE GENERIC NAMES ALREADY SUPPRESSED BY THE COMMISSION

46 Iphis Meigen, 1800, suppressed under the Plenary Powers in Direction 49 in order to validate Iphis Leach, 1817 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) which had been placed on the Official List in Opinion 73, 1922, when it was not realised that Leach's name was a homonym of Meigen's name.

59 Tylos Meigen, 1800, suppressed under the Plenary Powers in Opinion 369 in order to validate (a) *Micropeza* Meigen, 1803 (Order Diptera) and (b) *Tylos* Audouin, 1826 (Class Crustacea, Order Isopoda). The family-group names involved were dealt with in Direction 41.

72 Titania Meigen, 1800, suppressed under the Plenary Powers in Opinion 348 in order to validate *Chlorops* Meigen, 1803. The family-group name involved was dealt with in Direction 28.

	APPENDIX III	
THREE JUNIOR H	OMONYMS PUBLISHED BY ME	EIGEN IN 1800 TO BE
PLACED ON THE	OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJE	CTED AND INVALID
2 State Birtule . S. M.	<b>GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOG</b>	<b>Y</b>
Meigen, 1800 name	A junior homonym of	For counterpart name
		in Diptera see
7 Amphinome	Amphinome Brugière, [1792] : ix, 44 (Class Polychaeta) see Appendix V G	Appendix V A
8 Petaurista	Petaurista Link, 1795 : 52–78 (Class Mammalia) see Appendix V F	Appendix V C
65 Tritonia	Tritonia Cuvier, 1798:387 (Class Gastropoda) see Appendix V G	Appendix V A

#### APPENDIX IV

### 56 MEIGEN 1800 GENERIC NAMES TO BE SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

#### Part A

26 names without junior homonyms to be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy

Meigen, 1800	For counterpart	Meigen, 1800	For counterpart
name	name in Diptera	name	name in Diptera
	see		see
1 Flabellifera	Appendix V A	52 Omphrale	Appendix V C
3 Polymeda	Appendix V C	54 Musidora	Appendix V A
6 Orithea	none (a nomen	55 Cleona	Appendix V A
	dubium)	56 Cypsela	Appendix V C
11 Zelmira	Appendix V C		
12 Fungivora	Appendix V C	57 Dorilas	Appendix V B
13 Lycoria	Appendix V A	68 Tubifera	Appendix V C
14 Tendipes	Appendix V B	71 Trepidaria	Appendix V A
16 Helea	Appendix V C	73 Scopeuma	Appendix V A
17 Phalaenula	Appendix V C	74 Statinia	Appendix V C
	When the for my thin	78 Salpyga	none (a nomen
18 Itonida	Appendix V A		dubium)
34 Chrysozona	Appendix V A	80 Salmacia	Appendix V C
40 Lapria	Appendix V A	82 Larvaevora	Appendix V A
44 Coryneta	Appendix V C	83 Rhodogyne	Appendix V A

#### Part B

#### 16 names to be suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy as senior homonyms of other names for which replacement names are in current use

			the second se
Meigen, 1800	For counterpart	Meigen, 1800	For counterpart
name	name in Diptera	name	name in Diptera
	see		see
9 Euphrosyne	Appendix V A	53 Clythia	Appendix V C
10 Phryne	Appendix V A	58 Atalanta	Appendix V A
15 Pelopia	Appendix V C	62 Antiopa	Appendix V A
20 Polyxena	Appendix V A	66 Zelima	Appendix V C
21 Melusina	Appendix V C	67 Lampetia	Appendix V A
22 Amasia	Appendix V C	69 Cinxia	Appendix V A
25 Philia	Appendix V B	79 Titia	none (a nomen dubium)
30 Potamida	Appendix V C	85 Calirrhoe	Appendix V A

#### Part C

14 names to be suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy so as to validate junior homonyms which have not been replaced

For counterpart Meigen, 1800 For counterpart Meigen, 1800 name name in Diptera name name in Diptera see see Appendix V A 45 Noeza Appendix V A 4 Liriope Appendix V C 5 Pales Appendix V A 61 Chrysogaster 26 Erinna Appendix V A 70 Penthesilea Appendix V A Appendix V A 75 Euribia Appendix V C 28 Eulalia Appendix V A 81 Echinodes Appendix V A 31 Hermione Appendix V A 84 Crocuta Appendix V A 33 Chrysops none (a nomen 37 Dionaea Appendix V C 88 Cyanea dubium)

#### APPENDIX V

GENERIC NAMES TO BE PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OR (IN ADDITION TO THOSE IN APPENDIX IV) ON THE OFFICIAL INDEX

#### Part A

#### 31 generic names which represent the counterparts of Meigen 1800 names suppressed under the Plenary Powers in Appendix IV

1 Ctenophora Meigen, 1803: 263 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 442, 379, *Tipula atrata* Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of *Flabellifera* Meigen, 1800

4 Ptychoptera Meigen, 1803: 262 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 442, 379, *Tipula contaminata* Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of *Liriope* Meigen, 1800

5 Nephrotoma Meigen, 1803: 262 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Tipula dorsalis* Fabricius, 1781. Counterpart of *Pales* Meigen, 1800

7 Limonia Meigen, 1803 : 262 (gender : feminine), type-species by selection by Westwood, 1840 : 129, *Tipula tripunctata* Fabricius, 1781. Counterpart of Amphinome Meigen, 1800

9 Macrocera Meigen, 1803: 261 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Curtis, 1837: pl. 637, Macrocera lutea Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Euphrosyne Meigen, 1800

13 Sciara Meigen, 1803: 263 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Tipula thomae* Linnaeus, 1767. Counterpart of *Lycoria* Meigen, 1800

18 Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803: 261 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Tipula pini* De Geer, 1776. Counterpart of *Itonida* Meigen, 1800

20 Cordyla Meigen, 1803: 263 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Cordyla fusca Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Polyxena Meigen, 1800

26 Xylophagus Meigen, 1803: 266 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, Nemotelus cinctus De Geer, 1776. Counterpart of Erinna Meigen, 1800 28 Odontomyia Meigen, 1803: 265 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Westwood, 1840: 130, Musca hydroleon Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Eulalia Meigen, 1800

31 Oxycera Meigen, 1803 : 265 (gender : feminine), type-species, by selection by Curtis, 1833 : pl. 441, Musca trilineata Linnaeus, 1767. Counterpart of Hermione Meigen, 1800

33 Chrysops Meigen, 1803: 276 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Tabanus caecutiens Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Chrysops Meigen, 1800

34 Haematopota Meigen, 1803 : 267 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, *Tabanus pluvialis* Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of *Chrysozona* Meigen, 1800

40 Laphria Meigen, 1803: 270 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 389, Asilus gibbosus Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Lapria Meigen, 1800

45 Hybos Meigen, 1803 : 269 (gender : masculine), type-species, by selection by Curtis, 1837 : pl. 661, Hybos funebris Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Noeza Meigen, 1800

53 Platypeza Meigen, 1803: 272 (gender:feminine), type-species, by selection by Blanchard, 1849: pl. 170, fig. 7, Platypeza fasciata Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Clythia Meigen, 1800

54 Lonchoptera Meigen, 1803: 272 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Lonchoptera lutea Panzer, 1809. Counterpart of Musidora Meigen, 1800

55 Callomyia Meigen, 1804: 311 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Callomyia elegans Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Cleona Meigen, 1800

58 Clinocera Meigen, 1803: 271 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Clinocera nigra Meigen, 1804. Counterpart of Atalanta Meigen, 1800

62 Chrysotoxum Meigen, 1803: 275 (gender: neuter), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 396, Musca bicincta Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Antiopa Meigen, 1800

65 Spilomyia Meigen, 1803: 273 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Williston, 1886: 244, Musca diophthalma Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Tritonia Meigen, 1800

67 Merodon Meigen, 1803: 274 (gender: masculine), type-species, by selection by Westwood, 1840: 137, Syrphus clavipes Fabricius, 1781. Counterpart of Lampetia Meigen, 1800

69 Sericomyia Meigen, 1803: 274 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 394, Musca lappona Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Cinxia Meigen, 1800

70 Criorrhina Meigen, 1822: 236 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Westwood, 1840: 136, Syrphus asilicus Fallén, 1816. Counterpart of Penthesilea Meigen, 1800

71 Calobata Meigen, 1803: 276 (gender: feminine), type-species, by

monotypy, Musca petronella Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Trepidaria Meigen, 1800

73 Scathophaga Meigen, 1803: 277 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Musca merdaria Fabricius, 1794. Counterpart of Scopeuma Meigen, 1800

81 Eriothrix Meigen, 1803: 279 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Musca lateralis* Fabricius, 1775, *Eriothrix lateralis* Hendel, 1908. Counterpart of *Echinodes* Meigen, 1800

82 Tachina Meigen, 1803: 280 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Wachtl, 1894: 142, Musca grossa Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Larvaevora Meigen, 1800

83 Gymnosoma Meigen, 1803: 278 (gender: neuter), type-species, by monotypy, Musca rotundata Linnaeus, 1758. Counterpart of Rhodogyne Meigen, 1800

84 Bucentes Latreille, 1809: 339 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, Bucentes cinereus Latreille, 1809, a replacement name for Musca geniculata De Geer, 1776. Counterpart of Crocuta Meigen, 1800

85 Prosena St. Fargeau & Serville, 1828: 499, 500 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, *Stomoxys siberita* Fabricius, 1775. Counterpart of *Calirrhoe* Meigen, 1800.

#### Part B

# Three counterpart names in Diptera concerning which specific proposals have been published in the "Bulletin "

14 Chironomus Meigen, 1803: 260 (counterpart of Tendipes Meigen, 1800), see Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2: 151-152, 1951. Z.N.(S.) 469

The two generic names involved here are objective synonyms, for *Tipula plumosa* Linnaeus, 1758 : 587, is the type-species of *Tendipes* by selection by Coquillett, 1910 : 260, and of *Chironomus* by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 442, 377. The particular proposal before the Commission (by Dr. John Smart) is that the Plenary Powers be used to suppress *Tendipes* so as to validate *Chironomus*—that is, in the same sense as Mr. Sabrosky's primary proposal. He is supported by Dr. Alexander and Dr. Shaw, by Dr. Marcuzzi and by Mr. Acton. The opposite view (that *Tendipes* should be placed on the Official List and *Chironomus* rejected) is taken by Mr. Alan Stone and Dr. Hennig.

In an unpublished contribution on this case, Dr. G. Kruseman asks that the Plenary Powers be used to set aside all designations of a type-species hitherto made for *Tendipes* so as to designate *Chironomus barbipes* Staeger, 1839 : 561. This proposal is defective in two respects : (a) Dr. Kruseman is of the opinion that no valid type-designation has ever been made for *Tendipes*, and he overlooks Coquillett's selection of *Tipula plumosa*; (b) under the Rules *Tendipes* and *Chironomus* are objective synonyms, and they have always been so regarded. Dr. Kruseman adduces no evidence that they have been, or should in future be, used as independent names. Substantially, therefore,

the choice before the Commission is simply between Dr. Smart's proposal (which is in line with the main Sabrosky proposal) to suppress *Tendipes* and validate *Chironomus*, and Dr. Stone's proposal in the exactly opposite sense.

This is perhaps one of the most important individual cases in the whole complex. The family CHIRONOMIDAE is very large and widely distributed, as is the genus *Chironomus* itself, and the confusion caused by the resuscitation of the name *Tendipes* (which has given rise to the family-name TENDIPEDIDAE) is therefore all the greater. There is stronger support for the suppression of *Tendipes* than there is for its addition to the Official List.

# 25 Dilophus Meigen, 1803: 264 (counterpart of Philia Meigen, 1800), see Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2: 153-155, 1951. Z.N.(S.) 498

This is another case of a choice between two objective synonyms, for *Tipula febrilis* Linnaeus, 1758 : 588, is the type-species of *Philia* by selection by Coquillett, 1910 : 588, and of *Dilophus* by Latreille, 1810 : 422, 381. Professor Elmo Hardy originally asked that *Philia* be placed on the Official List and *Dilophus* rejected, but he has since withdrawn this proposal which was in consequence supported only by the late Professor Aczél. Dr. Stone, Dr. Hennig, Dr. Alexander and Dr. Shaw all wish to see *Philia* suppressed under the Plenary Powers and *Dilophus* validated (in line with Mr. Sabrosky's main proposal) and in this they are now supported by Professor Hardy.

57 Pipunculus Latreille, [1802–1803] (counterpart of Dorilas Meigen, 1800), see Bull. zool. Nomencl. 2: 140–149, 346–348, 1951. Z.N.(S.) 221

The type-species of *Dorilas*, by designation by Coquillett, 1910: 535, is *Pipunculus campestris* Latreille, [1802–1803]: 463. This is also the type-species of *Pipunculus*, by monotypy, and of *Microcera* Meigen, 1803: 273, by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 569. *Microcera*, however, has never come into use since Meigen himself (1824: 19) synonymised it with *Pipunculus*.

Mr. Rapp proposes that *Dorilas* be suppressed under the Plenary Powers so as to validate *Pipunculus* (in line with Mr. Sabrosky's main proposal) and he is supported by Dr. Smart, Dr. Alexander, Dr. Shaw and Mr. Oldroyd. The opposite view is taken by Dr. Stone, Professor E. D. Hardy, Professor Aczél and Dr. Hennig.

#### Part C

# Brief particulars of names which represent the counterparts of Meigen 1800 names and which should be postponed for further consideration

3 Erioptera Meigen, 1803: 262 (counterpart of Polymeda Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1406

*Erioptera* was established without included species. In 1804 (: 50-52) Meigen referred six species to it, including *E. grisea* Meigen, 1804: 51, *E. lutea* Meigen, 1804: 52, and *E. ater* [*sic*] Meigen, 1804: 50. Curtis (1835: pl. 557) designated *Tipula flavescens* Linnaeus, 1758 as type-species, but this is invalid because the species was not one of those originally included. The first valid designation was of E. grisea by Blanchard, [1846] : pl. 163, fig. 3 (see Stone, 1941 : 413), and Coquillett (1910 : 540) selected E. lutea. These two species are not now regarded as congeneric.

Molophilus Curtis, 1833 : pl. 444, has as type-species, by original designation, M. brevipennis Curtis, 1833 (*ibid.*) and this is a junior subjective synonym of Erioptera atra Meigen, which is still regarded as congeneric with E. grisea Meigen but not with E. lutea. Current usage seems to adopt Erioptera in the sense of E. lutea and Molophilus in the sense of M. brevipennis (=ater), and specialists are asked to say whether they wish the Plenary Powers to be used to stabilise this usage.

8 Trichocera Meigen, 1803: 262 (counterpart of Petaurista Meigen, 1800).
 21 Atractocera Meigen, 1803: 263 (counterpart of Melusina Meigen, 1800).
 Z.N.(S.) 1407

The type-species of *Trichocera* (by monotypy) and of *Petaurista* (by monotypy : the sole species referred to the genus by Hendel, 1908 : 47) is *Tipula hiemalis* De Geer, 1776 : 360. This is currently considered congeneric with *Tipula regelationis* Linnaeus, 1758 : 587, which is the type-species of *Atractocera* by monotypy, and of *Melusina* by selection by Hendel, 1908 : 50. Of these four genera, *Petaurista* is invalid as a junior homonym of *Petaurista* Link, 1795, (see Appendix III) and the other three are synonyms of one another.

In 1818 (: 290) Meigen said that he had misidentified *Tipula regelationis* in 1803 and proposed *Simulia* [sic] ornata for the species which he had then had before him, but under the Rules, he must be presumed to have correctly identified his species (see Stone, 1941 : 412), so that the true regelationis is the valid type-species of Atractocera. Coquillett (1910 : 512, 567) and other authors, however, regard Simulium ornatum as the type-species of Atractocera, which thus becomes a subjective junior synonym of Simulium Latreille, [1802–1803] : 426 (type-species, by monotypy, Rhagio colombaschensis Fabricius, 1787 : 333), and these authors regard ornatum and colombaschensis as distinct species of Simulium. Under the Rules, however, Atractocera (which is not in general use) is a synonym of Trichocera, not of Simulium.

It is not at present clear how stability would best be preserved in this case, but specialists are asked to comment on the following : that *Trichocera* (typespecies *Tipula hiemalis*) and *Simulium* (type-species *Rhagio colombaschensis*) be placed on the Official List of Generic Names and that the specific names *hiemalis, colombaschensis, regelationis* and *ornata* be placed on the Official List of Specific Names. No action is called for in respect of *Atractocera*.

10 Anisopus Meigen, 1803: 264 (counterpart of Phryne Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1408

Anisopus was first established without any included species, and of the two species first referred to it by Meigen in 1804, Anisopus fuscus Meigen, 1804: 103 (a junior subjective synonym of Tipula fuscata Fabricius, 1775: 755) was selected as type-species by Coquillett in 1910 (: 507). Anisopus thus became a senior subjective synonym of Rhyphus Latreille, [1804–1805]: 291

(type-species, by monotypy, *Tipula fenestrarum* [sic] = T. fenestralis Scopoli, 1763: 322); and a junior subjective synonym of Sylvicola Harris, 1776: 100, by virtue of Coquillett's (1910: 610) selection of Sylvicola brevis Harris, which is a junior synonym of fenestralis Scopoli, as type-species of Sylvicola. [The generic name Sylvicola was established in the Index to Harris's work as the name for thirteen species described in his text as "Dipterae Sylvicolae".]

Sylvicola thus becomes the oldest available name for the genus to which Tipula fenestralis Scopoli, Sylvicola brevis Harris, Tipula fuscata Fabricius and T. fusca Meigen are all referred, but it is not known whether it or one of the junior synonyms is in general use. Specialists are asked to comment on the three following alternatives :—

- that Sylvicola Harris (type-species S. brevis Harris) be placed on the Official List of Generic Names, with *fenestralis* Scopoli on the Official List of Specific Names as the oldest available name for that species;
- (2) that Anisopus be placed on the Official List of Generic Names with A. fuscus Meigen as type-species and with fuscata Fabricius on the Official List of Specific Names as the oldest available name for that species;
- (3) that *Rhyphus* Latreille and the name of its type-species (*fenestralis* Scopoli) be placed on the Official Lists.

If either of the last two choices is preferred, then some means will have to be found of suppressing the senior synonym or synonyms involved.

11 Platyura Meigen, 1803: 264 (counterpart of Zelmira Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1409

Platyura was established without any included species, and of the five species first referred to it by Meigen in 1804 (:101-102), P. marginalis Meigen, 1804: 101, was selected as type-species by Blanchard, [1846] : pl. 164, fig. 10. Usage has, however, generally followed a later and therefore invalid selection of P. fasciata Meigen, 1804 : 101, made by Zetterstedt, 1851 : 4077, which was also designated as type-species of Zelmira by Coquillett in 1910 (: 621). Under the first selection, Platyura becomes a senior objective synonym of Apemon Johannsen, 1909: 20 (type-species, by original designation, Platyura pectoralis Coquillett, 1895: 199) and, assuming the suppression of Zelmira in accordance with Mr. Sabrosky's primary proposal, there is no name available for the genus containing Platyura fasciata) Meigen. Thus if the Rules are strictly followed, Zelmira (type-species fasciata) and Platyura (type-species marginata) would be placed on the Official List and Apemon would become a junior synonym of Platyura. Alternatively the Plenary Powers could be used to designate fasciata as the type-species of Platyura and to place Apemon (type-species pectoralis) on the Official List. The specific name marginalis Meigen, 1804 could at the same time be placed on the Official List of Specific Names as a valid specific name in its own right.

12 Mycetophila Meigen, 1803 : 263 (counterpart of Fungivora Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 717

Professor John Lane and Dr. Paul Freeman, in an unpublished application

to the Commission, point out that Meigen (1803:263) originally included two species in *Mycetophila*, namely, *Tipula fungorum* "De Geer" and *Tipula agarici seticornis* "De Geer" [of which the latter should apparently be cited as *Tipula agarici* de Villers, 1789: 393]. De Geer's *Tipula fungorum* included (a) larval stages of at least two species of ? *Mycetophila* and (b) the adult male of the species now known as *Mycetophila fungorum* (De Geer, 1776). *T. agarici seticornis* De Geer, 1776: 367, is a nomen dubium, but the description appears to refer to a species of *Trichonta* Winnertz, 1863: 847.

Confusion has been introduced by later authors, for Olivier (1811) described material of *Tipula fungorum* as *agarici*. Winnertz (1863 : 879) placed *fungorum* in his new genus *Exechia* and Johannsen (1909) designated *fungorum* as typespecies of *Exechia* and *agarici* as type-species of *Mycetophila*. The latter selection was adopted by Coquillett (1910 : 545). Thus under the Rules *Trichonta* must give place to *Mycetophila*, with type-species the indeterminate *agarici*, and *Mycetophila* must give place to *Exechia*, with type-species *fungorum*, while *Exechia* must give way to its earliest available synonym, which appears to be *Brachydicrania* Skuse, 1888.

In 1804 (: 91) Meigen renamed his Mycetophila fungorum of 1803 as M. fusca. This species is always regarded as a species of *Exechia*, and the true fungorum De Geer as a species of Mycetophila. The applicants therefore seek the use of the Plenary Powers to set aside all designations of type-species for Mycetophilaand *Exechia* hitherto made and to designate *Tipula* fungorum De Geer, 1776, as type-species of Mycetophila and Mycetophila fusca Meigen, 1804, as typespecies of *Exechia*.

15 Tanypus Meigen, 1803: 261 (counterpart of Pelopia Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1410

The type-species of *Tanypus* (by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 442,377) and of *Pelopia* (by selection by Coquillett, 1910 : 586) is *Tipula cincta* Fabricius, 1794 : 246, but this species is unrecognisable, so that both generic names are nomina dubia. Thienemann (1916) suggests that the Plenary Powers could be used to designate *Tipula monilis* Linnaeus, 1758 : 587, as type-species of *Pelopia*, and either *T. culiciformis* Linnaeus, 1767 : 978, or *Tanypus punctipennis* Meigen, 1818 : 61, as type-species of *Tanypus*, but there is no evidence at hand to put before the Commission to justify overriding the fact that the two generic names are objective synonyms of one another.

16 Ceratopogon Meigen, 1803: 261 (counterpart of Helea Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1411

The type-species of *Ceratopogon*, by monotypy, is *Tipula barbicornis* Linnaeus, 1767 : 974, but this species is unrecognisable, so that the generic name is a nomen dubium. Coquillett (1910 : 520, 549) and other authors have regarded *Ceratopogon communis* Meigen, 1804 : 27, as the valid name for the species cited as *barbicornis* Linnaeus by Meigen in 1803 and have taken it as the type-species of *Ceratopogon*. Thienemann (1916), however, suggests that *Ceratopogon lucorum* Meigen, 1818 : 72, should be taken as the type-species. Comments are sought on the merits of these two proposals, either of which would require the use of the Plenary Powers to bring it into effect.

#### 17 Psychoda Latreille, 1796 : 152 (counterpart of Phalaenula Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1412

Psychoda was established without any included species, but in [1802-1803]: 424 Latreille referred a single species to it, and this species (*Tipula phalaenoides* Linnaeus, 1758 : 588) is therefore the type-species by monotypy. *Trichoptera* Meigen, 1803 : 261, has the same type-species, by selection by Coquillett, 1910 : 616. In the same paper (: 587) Coquillett designated *Trichoptera ocellaris* Meigen, 1804 : 44, as the type-species of *Phalaenula*, but this was invalid, because the species was not among those first referred to *Phalaenula* by Hendel in 1908; these species were *Tipula phalaenoides* "Fab." (i.e. Linnaeus, as above) and *T. hirta* "Fabricius" (i.e. Linnaeus, 1761 : 438). The specific name *ocellaris* was proposed by Meigen for the species which he had identified as *Tipula hirta* in 1803, but this does not alter the fact that he must be presumed, under the Rules, to have identified his species correctly in the first instance, so that *T. ocellaris* (which is now referred to *Clytocerus* **Eaton**, 1904, a genus far removed from *Psychoda*) is not eligible for selection as the type-species of either *Trichoptera* or *Phalaenula*.

Coquillett's designation of the type-species of *Trichoptera* was made in the form "*Psychoda alternata* Say (as *Tipula phalaenoides* Fabricius)" because P. alternata Say (1824:358) is generally agreed to be the valid name for *Tipula phalaenoides* Fabricius, non Linnaeus. This again does not alter the fact that, under the Rules, the species identified by Fabricius must be presumed to be the true *phalaenoides*, and that that species is the valid type-species of *Trichoptera*.

Latreille, [1802–1803], in the passage referred to above, stated under *Psychoda* "Exemples. *Tipula phalaenoides* Linn., ou le genre psychodes de mon Précis . . . Celui de phalaenule de Meigen ", and although this establishes the type-species of *Psychoda*, it does not do so for *Phalaenula*, because the generic name was cited in the vernacular. Dr. Paul Freeman, to whom the above information is due, presents three alternative solutions to this problem, and specialists are asked to comment on them (he prefers the first alternative) :—

- assuming the suppression of *Phalaenula* under the Plenary Powers (in conformity with Mr. Sabrosky's main proposal), to place *Psychoda* on the Official List with *Tipula phalaenoides* Linnaeus as typespecies, and *Trichoptera* on the Official Index as a junior objective synonym of *Psychoda*;
- (2) to use the Plenary Powers to designate *Trichoptera ocellaris* Meigen as type-species of *Trichoptera*, thus displacing *Clytocerus*;
- (3) to use the Plenary Powers to designate *Psychoda alternata* Say as the type-species of *Trichoptera*, thus making that genus a junior subjective synonym of *Psychoda*.
- 21 Atractocera Meigen, 1803: 263 (counterpart of Melusina Meigen, 1800), see above under 8 Trichocera Meigen, 1803.

22 Penthetria Meigen, 1803 : 264. Z.N.(S.) 548

Professor Elmo Hardy points out that this genus was synonymised with Amasia Meigen, 1800, by Hendel, 1908 (: 50). But the generic name Amasia

#### Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

has never been used, no species have ever been referred to it, and Hendel's synonymy has never been accepted, so that *Amasia* is generally considered to be a nomen dubium, never having been defined in terms of an included species. Penthetria was also established without included species, but in 1804 (: 104) Meigen referred the single species P. funebris Meigen, 1804 to it and this is the type-species by monotypy. This unpublished application thus involves the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress Amasia (in line with the Sabrosky proposal) and to place Penthetria, as defined above, on the Official List.

30 Chippium Latreille, [1802–1803]: 448 (counterpart of Potamida Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1413

Chippium was established with two included species, Stratiomys ephippium and S. microleon Fabricius, 1775: 759, neither of which was designated or indicated as type-species. In [1804–1805] (: 341) Latreille emended the generic name to Ephippium (a junior homonym of Ephippium [Röding], 1798) and in 1810 (: 442, 384) stated that Stratiomys ephippium was the type-species. Some authors have given Ephippium Latreille priority over Clitellaria Meigen, 1803: 265, of which S. ephippium is also the type-species, by monotypy. In 1902 (: 191) Bezzi proposed Ephippiomyia as a replacement name for Ephippium Latreille, non [Röding]. The four names Chippium Latreille, [1802–1803], Clitellaria Meigen, 1803, Ephippium Latreille, [1804–1805], and Ephippiomyia Bezzi, 1902 are thus all objective synonyms of one another, but the first and oldest has never been used and the third is an invalid junior homonym.

Specialists are asked to comment on the tentative proposal that the Plenary Powers be used to suppress *Chippium*; that *Clitellaria* be placed on the Official List; and that *Ephippium* Latreille and *Ephippiomyia* Bezzi be placed on the Official Index.

37 Platyptera Meigen, 1803: 269 (counterpart of Dionaea Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1414

The type-species of *Platyptera* is *Empis platyptera* Panzer, 1794: tab. 23, by absolute tautonymy. This specific name is considered to be a junior synonym of *Empis marginata* Fabricius, 1784: 364, which is placed in the subgenus *Rhamphomyia* Meigen, 1822: 42. English zoologists generally use *Platyptera* as a subgenus of *Empis* for the group of *Empis borealis* Linnaeus, 1758: 603, and *Rhamphomyia* either as a subgenus of *Empis* or as a separate genus. There is not yet enough information on this case to frame tentative proposals for the criticism of specialists.

44 Tachydromia Meigen, 1803: 269 (counterpart of Coryneta Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1415

Tachydromia was established with two included species, Musca cursitans Fabricius, 1775: 782, and M. cimicoides [sic] Fabricius, 1779: 253. In 1822 (: 70) Meigen stated that he had misidentified Musca cimecoides Fabricius in 1803 and renamed his species Tachydromia connexa. Curtis, 1833: pl. 477, selected Musca arrogans Linnaeus, 1767: 995, (which he regarded as a synonym of M. cimicoides [sic]) as type-species of Tachydromia, but this is, of course, invalid. Coquillett (1903, 1910) selected T. connexa as type-species, but this is equally invalid. According to Mr. Oldroyd, Musca arrogans is still regarded as the valid name of the true M. cimecoides Fabricius, and M. arrogans and T. connexa are both currently placed in Tachydromia. Specialists are therefore asked to comment on the tentative proposal that the Plenary Powers be used to designate Tachydromia connexa Meigen, 1822, as the type-species of Tachydromia Meigen, 1803.

#### 52 Hypselura Meigen, 1803: 273 (counterpart of Omphrale Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 549

The type-species of Hypselura, by monotypy, is Musca senilis Fabricius, 1794: 33, a junior synonym of M. fenestralis Linnaeus, 1758: 597. This latter is the type-species, by monotypy, of Scenopinus Latreille, [1802–1803]: 463, so that Hypselura and Scenopinus are subjective synonyms. Since Scenopinus is in general use, there seems to be no obstacle to placing it on the Official List, but the advice of specialists is sought on the current status of Hypselura and as to whether M. fenestralis Linnaeus and M. senilis Fabricius should be regarded as congeneric (following Kertész, 1909) or not (following Kröber, 1937). In the latter case, Hypselura can also be placed on the Official List.

53 Platypeza Meigen, 1803: 272 (counterpart of Clythia Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 542

This is a simple case of a choice between two objective synonyms, for *Platypeza fasciata* Meigen, 1804 : 310, is the type-species of *Clythia*, by designation by Coquillett, 1910 : 525, and of *Platypeza* by selection by Blanchard, 1849 : pl. 170, fig. 7. Professor Kessel, in an unpublished application, asks that *Clythia* be placed on the Official List and *Platypeza* rejected (in direct opposition to Mr. Sabrosky's primary proposal).

This case can in fact be dealt with in the course of the present ruling; for if Mr. Sabrosky's proposal is accepted, *Platypeza* will be automatically validated and can be placed on the Official List, while if his proposal is rejected, *Clythia* will be placed on the Official List and *Platypeza* on the Official Index.

56 Borborus Meigen, 1803: 276 (counterpart of Cypsela Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1416

The type-species of *Borborus*, by selection by Curtis, 1833 : pl. 469, is *Musca subsultans* Linnaeus, 1767 : 993, which is a nomen dubium. Coquillett (1910 : 530) selected *M. subsultans* Fabricius, 1794 : 392, as the type-species of *Cypsela*; this species is recognisable and it is clear that Fabricius misapplied the Linnean name. The Fabrician species is, however, regarded as congeneric with *Sphaerocera curvipes* Latreille, [1804-1805]: 394, the type-species, by monotypy, of *Sphaerocera* Latreille, 1804 : 24. The advice of specialists is sought as to whether *Borborus* and *Sphaerocera* are used in competition for the same genus, and if so which is the more widely used; or whether they are treated as distinct genera, and if so what should be taken as the type-species of *Borborus*? Should the Plenary Powers be used to suppress *Musca subsultans* Linnaeus, 1767 so as to validate *M. subsultans* Fabricius, 1794 ? 61 Chrysogaster Meigen, 1803: 274 (counterpart of Chrysogaster Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1417

Meigen in 1803 placed three species in this genus, coemiteriorum, metallinus and umbrarum, all attributed to Fabricius. Zetterstedt (1843:816) selected Chrysogaster solstitialis Fallén, 1817:56, as type-species, but this was invalid because the species was not one of the originally included species and because he synonymised it with doubt with "Musca coemiteriorum Linn. Fn. svec. 1842?" (a name published before 1758). Specialists are asked to say whether Musca coemiteriorum Linnaeus, 1758: 597, M. coemiteriorum Fabricius, 1787:339, and M. coemiteriorum Meigen, 1803, are identical or not. Should M. coemiteriorum Linnaeus, 1758, be designated as type-species of Chrysogaster, or should the Plenary Powers be used to designate C. solstitialis Fallén?

66 Eumeros Meigen, 1803: 273 (counterpart of Zelima Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1418

Meigen established *Eumeros* with two included species, *Musca segnis* Linnaeus, 1758: 595, and *Musca pipiens* Linnaeus, 1758: 594. Syritta St. Fargeau & Serville, 1828: 808, was established with *M. pipiens* as typespecies by monotypy, so that under Opinion 6, *M. segnis* became the typespecies of *Eumeros*. This species was designated type-species of *Zelima* by Coquillett (1910: 621) and of *Xylota* Meigen, 1822: 211, by Curtis (1832: pl. 409). Thus *Zelima*, *Eumeros* and *Xylota* are objective synonyms.

Mr. J. E. Collin points out in an unpublished application that Xylota was proposed as a replacement name for *Heliophilus* Meigen, 1803: 273, on account of a supposed homonymy with *Heliophila* in Botany, so that under the Rules the two genera should have the same type-species. The type-species of *Heliophilus* is *Musca sylvarum* Linnaeus, 1758: 592, by designation by Coquillett, 1910: 550. Mr. Collin proposes that *Heliophilus* (which is technically available) should be suppressed under the Plenary Powers in order to avoid confusion with the Syrphid genus *Helophilus* Meigen, 1822: 368, and that Curtis's typeselection for *Xylota* be validated.

It appears that Xylota is more widely used than its senior objective synonym *Eumeros*. This may be because in 1804 (: 20) Meigen emended *Eumeros* to *Eumerus* and then, in 1822 (: 202), proposed *Eumerus* for an entirely different genus (again a Syrphid) for which *Eumerus* Meigen, 1822, non 1804 is consistently used. It is therefore proposed that *Eumeros* Meigen, 1803 be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, that the unjustified emendation *Eumerus* Meigen, 1804 be placed on the Official Index and that *Eumerus* Meigen, 1822, be validated under the Plenary Powers and placed on the Official List (its typespecies is *Syrphus tricolor* Fabricius, 1798: 563, by designation by Curtis, 1839: pl. 749); and that *Xylota* (with type-species *M. segnis*) be also validated under the Plenary Powers.

68 Elophilus Meigen, 1803: 274 (counterpart of Tubifera Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1419

The type-species of *Elophilus*, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 395, is *Musca tenax* Linnaeus, 1758: 591. The same species is the type-species of *Tubifera* by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 618. In 1832, however (: pl. 432),

Curtis selected that species as the type-species of *Eristalis* Latreille, 1804: 194, and chose *Musca pendula* Linnaeus, 1758: 591, as the type-species of *Elophilus*, and this invalid action has been generally followed. Mr. Collin states in an unpublished application that *Elophilus* and *Eristalis* are invalid under the Rules as junior objective synonyms of *Tubifera*, and that the rejection of *Elophilus* would necessitate the proposal of a new name for the *pendula*-group. He also states that Fabricius (1805: 233) emended *Elophilus* to *Helophilus* and that this emendation has been universally adopted (it is not clear, however, how this name is related to *Helophilus* Meigen, 1822, mentioned under the preceding item). He supports Mr. Sabrosky's proposal to suppress *Tubifera* Meigen, 1800, and suggests that the Plenary Powers be used to validate Curtis's designation of *Musca pendula* as type-species of *Elophilus* and to validate Fabricius's emendation of this name to *Helophilus*. *Eristalis* (with *M. tenax* as type-species) and *Helophilus* (*M. pendula*) could then be placed on the Official List.

74 Dictya Meigen, 1803: 277 (counterpart of Statinia Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1420

Sack (1939:56) selected *Musca umbrarum* Linnaeus, 1758:599, as typespecies of *Dictya*, but it is not known if this is the earliest type-designation for this genus. Hendel's selection (1924:211) of *Musca marginata* Fabricius, 1775:784, as type-species of *Statinia* was invalid, because this was not one of the two species ("*M. cucullaria, umbrarum* Fab.") which he had first attributed to the genus in 1908, and Stone (1941:414) was in error in following this. An unfortunate result has been that some authors have needlessly discarded *Coremacera* Rondani, 1856:106, (type-species, by original designation, *M. marginata* Fabricius) as though it were a junior objective synonym of *Statinia*.

Hendel (1908 : 64) synonymised *Dictya* not only with *Statinia* but also with *Tetanocera* "Duméril, 1798, sens. lat.", but this latter name cannot be traced (it may perhaps refer to the French vernacular "Tétanocère" Duméril, 1798; see Cresson, 1920 : 55). The earliest use of *Tetanocera* appears to be by Latreille, 1804 : 196 (type-species, by monotypy, *Musca graminum* Fabricius, 1775 : 785). In 1920 (: 54) Cresson published *Chaetomacera* (type-species, by original designation, *M. elata* Fabricius, 1781 : 441) as a replacement name for "*Tetanocera* Duméril, 1806", but the name then used by Duméril (: 282) was *Tetanocera*, wrongly attributed to Duméril, 1806 (and as such a junior homonym of *Tetanocera* Latreille, 1804) is in general use with *M. elata* Fabricius treated as its type-species. The advice of specialists is therefore sought on the following questions :—

- (1) Should *Dictya* be placed on the Official List with *Musca umbrarum* Linnaeus, 1758, as type-species ?
- (2) Should Coremacera Rondani, 1856, be placed on the Official List with Musca marginata Fabricius, 1775, as type-species ?
- (3) Should the Plenary Powers be used to suppress *Tetanocera* Duméril, 1798, (acheirony m) and *Tetanocera* Latreille, 1804, so as to validate that name from whatever author so emended *Tetanocerus* Duméril,

1806, and to designate Musca elata Fabricius, 1781, as its type-species?
(4) Should Chaetomacera Cresson, 1920, be placed on the Official Index (as a junior objective synonym of "Tetanocera")?

- (5) Should any of these questions be modified by reason of the fact that any or all of the following species are regarded as congeneric : Musca umbrarum Linnaeus, 1758, M. graminum Fabricius, 1775, and M. elata Fabricius, 1781 ?
- 75 Trypeta Meigen, 1803: 277 (counterpart of Euribia Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1421

The type-species of Trypeta, by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 618, is Musca artemisiae Fabricius, 1794: 351, and according to Mr. Oldroyd this is the oldest available name for the species and the generic name, thus defined, is in general use. Spilographa Loew, 1862:39, (type-species, by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 607, Trypeta hamifera Loew, 1846:496) is treated as a junior synonym of Trypeta, since the oldest available name for this species is Tephritis immaculata Macquart, 1835, considered congeneric with M. artemisiae. It is not clear, however, whether or no Trypeta and Spilographa are currently employed in different senses and the advice of specialists is sought on this point.

80 Gonia Meigen, 1803: 280 (counterpart of Salmacia Meigen, 1800). Z.N.(S.) 1422

Gonia contained no species until Meigen (1826: 2-7) referred thirteen species to it. One of these, *Musca capitata* De Geer, 1775: 3, was selected as type-species by Curtis (1835: pl. 533) and is usually so regarded. It seems, however, that Wiedemann (1819: 25) had already, before Meigen, referred his two new species *G. bimaculata* and *G. fasciata* to the genus, so that one of these must be the typespecies, but it is not clear whether *Gonia* Wiedemann is to be treated as a subsequent usage or as a junior homonym of *Gonia* Meigen, 1803. Specialists are asked to say whether they wish the Plenary Powers to be used to designate *M. capitata* as type-species of *Gonia* or whether either *G. bimaculata* or *G. fasciata* Wiedemann should be regarded as its type-species.

#### Part D

# Seven generic names which are junior homonyms of names suppressed for both priority and homonymy (see Appendix IV, Part D) and which can thus be placed on the Official List

26 Erinna H. & A. Adams, 1855: 120 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, Erinna newcombi H. & A. Adams, 1855 (Class Gastropoda)

37 Dionaea Robineau-Desvoidy, [1830]: 253 (gender: feminine), typespecies, by selection by Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863: 54, Tachina forcipata Meigen, 1824 (Order Diptera) 45 Noeza Walker, 1866 : 1839 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Noeza telegraphella Walker, 1866 (Order Lepidoptera)

70 Penthesilea Ragonot, [1891]: 439 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Penthesilea sacculalis Ragonot, [1891] (Order Lepidoptera)

75 Euribia Latreille, [1802–1803]: 458 (gender : feminine), type-species, by selection by Hendel, 1927: 37, Musca cardui Linnaeus, 1758 (Order Diptera)

81 Echinodes Zimmermann, 1869: 253 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, Hetaerius setiger Leconte, 1859 (Order Coleoptera)

84 Crocuta Kaup, 1818:1145 (gender: masculine), type-species, by monotypy, Canis crocuta Erxleben, 1777 (Class Mammalia)

#### Part E

#### Three names of the same sort as those in Part D above postponed for further consideration

4 Liriope Lesson, 1843 : 39 (Class Scyphozoa). Z.N.(S.) 1423

This genus was established with two included species, L. cerasiformis Lesson, 1843 and Medusa proboscidalis Forskål, 1775. The latter is the typespecies of Geryonia Peron & Lesueur, 1810, by selection by Mayer, 1910 and this, under Opinion 6, would make L. cerasiformis the type-species of Liriope, in accord with current practice. The Commission needs to be assured, however, that there is no earlier type-selection for Liriope or for Geryonia, and the advice of specialists is needed on this point.

28 Eulalia Savigny, 1822: 45 (Class Polychaeta). Z.N.(S.) 104

This genus was established with two included species, Nereis viridis and N. maculata O. F. Müller, 1776. The former is currently regarded as the type-species of Eulalia, but it is not known on what grounds. Moreover, both the specific names mentioned appear to be homonyms rather than subsequent usages of N. viridis and N. maculata Linnaeus, 1767 : 1086. Information is therefore needed on the earliest type-designation for Eulalia and on the relationship of the Müllerian and Linnean specific names.

31 Hermione Blainville, 1828: 457 (Class Polychaeta). Z.N.(S.) 1424

The type-species, by monotypy, of this genus is *Halithea hystrix* Lamarck, 1818: 307, but it is not known whether this is the oldest available name for the species nor whether it is in current use.

#### Part F

#### A senior homonym of a Meigen 1800 name to be placed on the Official List

8 Petaurista Link, 1795 : 52-78 (gender : feminine) type-species, by absolute tautonymy, Sciurus petaurista Pallas, 1766 : 54 (Class Mammalia).

#### Part G

#### Two senior homonyms of Meigen 1800 names postponed for further consideration

7 Amphinome Bruguière, [1792]: ix, 44 (Class Polychaeta) Z.N.(S.) 1425 The type-species of this genus is reported to be "Aphrodite rostrata Pallas, 1780", but it is not known why, nor whether this is the oldest available name for the species in question and in current use.

65 Tritonia Cuvier, 1798 : 387 (Class Gastropoda). Z.N.(S.) 1215

This genus was established without any included species, but in 1801 Lamarck referred the single species *Doris clavigera* O. F. Müller, 1776, to it, and this is therefore the valid type-species, by monotypy. This species is now, however, referred to *Limacia* O. F. Müller, 1781, while *Tritonia* is interpreted by reference to *T. hombergii* Cuvier, 1803. In an unpublished application, Dr. Henning Lemche, a specialist in the group concerned, asks that the Plenary Powers be used to designate *Tritonia hombergii* Cuvier, 1803 as the type-species of *Tritonia* Cuvier, 1798.

#### Part H

#### Nine generic names to replace junior homonyms of Meigen 1800 names and to be placed on the Official List

10 Triphysa Zeller, 1850: 308, 311 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Phryne* Herrich-Schaeffer, [1844]: 90, *Papilio tircis* Stoll, [1782] (Order Lepidoptera)

10 Calybia Kirby, 1892: 446 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Phryne* Grote, 1865, *Phryne immaculata* Grote, 1865 (Order Lepidoptera)

21 Melusinella Metcalf, 1952: 230 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Funkhouser, 1927: 214, through Melusina Stål, 1867: 552, Ceresa nervosa Fairmaire, 1846 (Order Hemiptera)

58 Cerogenes Horváth, 1909: 532 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through Atalanta Stål, 1861: 149, Phenax auricoma Burmeister, 1835 (Order Hemiptera)

62 Antiopula Bergroth, 1894:163 (gender: feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through Antiopa Stål, 1863:47, Antiopa pumila Stål, 1863 (Order Hemiptera)

66 Graphium Scopoli, 1777 : 433 (gender : neuter), type-species, by selection by Hemming, 1933 : 199, Papilio sarpedon Linnaeus, 1758 (Order Lepidoptera) (a generic name regarded as a senior synonym of Zelima Fabricius, 1807).

67 Xanthia Latreille, 1818: 29 (gender: feminine), type-species, through Lampetia Curtis, 1830, Noctua croceago [Dennis & Schiffermüller], 1775 (Order Lepidoptera) 69 Madates Strand, 1910 : 19 (gender : masculine), type-species, by original designation, through Cinxia Stål, 1862 : 105 and Datames Horváth, 1909 : 631, Cimex limbatus Fabricius, 1803 (Order Hemiptera)

79 *Titiella* Bergroth, 1920 : 29 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, through *Titia* Stål, 1866 : 105, *Acocephalus punctiger* Stål, [1855] (Order Hemiptera).

#### Part I

### Eleven names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen, 1800, to be placed on the Official List

19 Culex Linnaeus, 1758: 602 (gender: masculine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 442, 376, Culex pipiens Linnaeus, 1758

35 Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758 : 601 (gender : masculine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 443, 385, Tabanus bovinus Linnaeus, 1758

38 Empis Linnaeus, 1758:603 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810:443, 390, Empis pennipes Linnaeus, 1758

39 Asilus Linnaeus, 1758:605 (gender: masculine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810:443, 389, Asilus crabroniformis Linnaeus, 1758

42 Conops Linnaeus, 1758: 604 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Curtis, 1831: pl. 377, Conops flavipes Linnaeus, 1758

47 Geosargus Bezzi, 1907: 53 (a replacement name for Sargus Fabricius, 1798: 549 non Walbaum, 1792: 586) (gender: masculine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 442, 384, through Sargus Fabricius, 1798, Musca cuprarius Linnaeus, 1758

48 Rhagio Fabricius, 1775: 761 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 387, Musca scolopacea Linnaeus, 1758

51 Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758 : 606 (gender : masculine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 443, 392, Bombylius major Linnaeus, 1758

60 Rhingia Scopoli, 1763 : 358 (gender : feminine), type-species, by monotypy, Conops rostrata Linnaeus, 1758

63 Thereva Latreille, 1796: 167 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810: 443, 388, Musca plebeia Linnaeus, 1758

87 Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758:607 (gender: feminine), type-species, by selection by Latreille, 1810:444,407, Hippobosca equina Linnaeus, 1758

#### Part J

#### Seven generic names established by earlier authors and used by Meigen in 1800, postponed for further consideration

2 Tipula Linnaeus, 1758 : 585. Z.N.(S.) 896

The placing of this important generic name on the Official List is delayed by a taxonomic problem, for the nomenclatorial status of the name is clear. The type-species of the genus is *Tipula oleracea* Linnaeus, 1758 : 585, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 442, 379, and this is the oldest available name for the species and is in current use. Dr. Lemche points out, however, in an unpublished application, that the specific name has been applied to three different, though closely related species, and that the conservation of the name in the sense of majority-usage requires the designation of a neotype.\* Further advice on this point from specialists in the Tipulid flies is desirable.

27 Sicus Scopoli, 1763 : 369. Z.N.(S.) 1426

The type-species of this genus is Conops ferruginea Linnaeus, 1761: 468, by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 605, and this is the oldest available name for the species and is in current use. Before the generic name can be placed on the Official List, however, the status of Sicus Latreille, 1796: 158, and Sicus Fabricius, 1798: 547, 554, must be made clear. The type-species of Sicus Latreille, by monotypy, is Musca cimecoides Fabricius, 1779: 253, and the generic name is a senior synonym of Tachydromia Meigen, 1803 (see Part C above). No type-selection is known for Sicus Fabricius. Conops ferruginea Linnaeus is one of the included species, so that the generic name could be a junior objective synonym of Sicus Scopoli were it not that Fabricius seems to have misidentified Conops ferruginea Linnaeus. See also 43 Myopa below.

32 Ceria Fabricius, 1794 : 277. Z.N.(S.) 1427

This genus was established without any included species. The typespecies is *Cina* [*sic*] *clavicornis* Fabricius, 1798 : 557, by selection by Latreille, 1810 : 443, 396, but the specific name is invalid as a junior primary homonym. Moreover, *Ceria* Fabricius is itself a junior homonym of *Ceria* Scopoli, 1763 : 351, which is a junior subjective synonym of *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762. See 64 *Syrphus* below.

41 Erax Scopoli, 1763 : 359. Z.N.(S.) 1435

The type-species of this genus is Erax barbatus Scopoli, 1763: 360, by selection by Coquillett, 1910: 539. This species is congeneric, or even conspecific, with Asilus punctatus Fabricius, 1781 (placed in Dasypogon by Meigen, 1804: 251), which in turn is the same as Asilus punctipennis Meigen, 1820: 330. A. punctatus is regarded as the type-species of Protophanes Loew, 1860: 143, which originally included A. punctipennis also. Macquart, 1838, used Erax in a widely different sense from Scopoli, and Hine, 1919, designated Erax rufibarbis Macquart, 1838: 232, as type-species of Erax Macquart non Scopoli. Erax is currently used in this strictly invalid sense, allowing Protophanes, which is technically a synonym of Erax, to be used for the Palaearctic species for which Scopoli originally intended Erax. It seems, however, that other generic names are involved in this case and it is not yet clear how or to what extent the Plenary Powers may need to be invoked in order to conserve current usage.

43 Myopa Fabricius, 1775 : 798. Z.N.(S.) 1428

The first valid type-designation for this genus was made by Latreille, 1810: 444, 398, who selected *Conops ferruginea* Linnaeus, 1761. The generic name thus became a junior objective synonym of *Sicus* Scopoli, 1763 (see above), but in fact it is generally interpreted according to a later designation of *Conops buccata* Linnaeus, 1758: 605, by Curtis, 1838: pl. 677. The Plenary Powers may thus be needed to conserve current usage of *Myopa* and *Sicus*.

<sup>\*</sup> A neotype has been designated since this report was drafted. See Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 209-213. N.D.R.

#### 49 Anthrax Scopoli, 1763 : 358. Z.N.(S.) 1429

The type-species of this genus, by monotypy, is *Musca morio* Linnaeus, 1758 : 590, but it is not known whether this is the oldest available name for the species nor whether it is in current use.

#### 64 Syrphus Fabricius, 1775 : 762. Z.N.(S.) 1430

Curtis (1839: pl. 753) designated Musca lucorum Linnaeus, 1758: 592, as the type-species of this genus. The same species is type of Leucozona Schiner, 1860: 214, by monotypy. Westwood, 1840: 137, designated "Musca ruficornis Linnaeus" as type-species of Syrphus; he presumably intended Musca ruficornis Fabricius, 1794: 314. Rondani, 1844: 459, designated Musca ribesii Linnaeus, 1758: 593, as type-species. In spite of efforts by Coquillett (1910: 611) and Goffe (1933: 78) to re-establish Curtis's prior designation, usage has consistently followed Rondani, because this fixes the generic name to a group of species preying on aphids in the sense in which Meigen had used the name. Mr. Collin proposes, in an unpublished application, that the Plenary Powers be used to designate ribesii as the type-species of Syrphus and lucorum as the type-species of Leucozona, but no comments from other specialists are available at present on this suggestion.

#### Part K

#### 124 invalid generic names to be placed on the Official Index

1 Tanyptera Latreille, 1804 : 188, a junior objective synonym of Ctenophora Meigen, 1803

1 Ctenophora Blackwall, 1870: 401 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Ctenophora Meigen, 1803

4 Liriope Rathke, 1843:60 (Class Crustacea), a junior homonym of Liriope Lesson, 1843

4 Liriope Gistl, [1847]: 563; 1848: 171 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Liriope Lesson, 1843

4 Liriope Gegenbaur, 1856 : 256 (Class Scyphozoa), a junior homonym of Liriope Lesson, 1843

4 Ptychoptera Christoph, 1880 : 83 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Ptychoptera Meigen, 1803

5 Pales Dejean, 1835: 408 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Pales Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 and a nomen nudum

5 Pales Koch, 1850:64 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Pales Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830

5 Pales Gray, 1867: 234 (Class Zoantharia), a junior homonym of Pales Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830

7 Limnobia Meigen, 1818:116, a junior objective synonym of Limonia Meigen, 1803

7 Limonia J. L. R. Agassiz, 1846 : 211 (Order Lepidoptera), an unjustified emendation of Lemonia Hübner, [1820] 7 Limonia Thorell, 1870 : 190 (Class Arachnida), an unjustified emendation of Leimonia Koch, 1847

8 Petaurista Desmarest, 1820 : 268 (Class Mammalia), a junior homonym of Petaurista Link, 1795

8 Petaurista Berthold, 1827 : 400 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Petaurista Link, 1795

8 Petaurista Reichenbach, [1863]: 105 (Class Mammalia), a junior homonym of Petaurista Link, 1795

8 Trichocera de Haan, [1833] in Siebold : 16 (Class Crustacea), a junior homonym of Trichocera Meigen, 1803

9 Euphrosyne Savigny, 1822:45 (Class Polychaeta), a junior homonym of Euphrosyne Meigen, 1800 and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Euphrosine Lamarck, 1818

9 Euphrosyne Gray, 1866: 214 (Class Mammalia), a junior homonym of Euphrosyne Meigen, 1800

9 Macrocera Latreille, 1810: 339, 439 (Order Hymenoptera), a junior homonym of Macrocera Meigen, 1803

10 Phryne Oken, 1816: 210 (Class Amphibia), a junior homonym of Phryne Meigen, 1800

10 Phryne Herrich-Schaeffer, [1844]: 90 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Phryne Meigen, 1800

10 Phryne Grote, 1865: 246 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Phryne Meigen, 1800

12 Mycetophila Gyllenhal, 1810 : 541 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Mycetophila Meigen, 1803

15 Pelopia H. Adams, 1868 : 16 (Class Pelecypoda), a junior homonym of Pelopia Meigen, 1800

15 Tanypus Oppel, 1812 : 159 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Tanypus Meigen, 1803

15 Tanypus Keyserling, 1882 : 1415 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Tanypus Meigen, 1803

17 Trichoptera Lioy, 1864: 1109 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Trichoptera Meigen, 1803

17 Trichoptera Strobl, 1880: 64 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Trichoptera Meigen, 1803

18 Cecidomia Passerini, 1849:70, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803

18 Cecidomyza Zetterstedt, 1850: 3673, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803

20 Polyxena Blainville, 1834: 278 (Class Scyphozoa), a junior homonym of Polyxena Meigen, 1800, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Polyxenia Eschscholtz, 1829

20 Cordyla Billberg, 1820: 96 (Order Odonata), a junior homonym of Cordyla Meigen, 1803, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Cordulia [Leach], [1815]

21 Melusina Stål, 1867: 552 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Melusina Meigen, 1800 21 Melusina Haekel, 1880 : 534 (Class Scyphozoa), a junior homonym of Melusina Meigen, 1800

21 Simulia Meigen, 1818: 289, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Simulium Latreille, [1802-1803]

22 Amasia Dejean, 1835: 411 (Order Coleoptera), a nomen nudum and a junior homonym of Amasia Meigen, 1800

22 Amasia Chapuis in Lacordaire, 1874: 313 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Amasia Meigen, 1800

22 Penthetria Cabanis, 1847: 331 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Penthetria Meigen, 1803

22 Penthetria Edwards, 1881 : 80 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Penthetria Meigen, 1803

25 Philia [Oken], 1829:1111 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Philia Meigen, 1800 and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Philine Ascanius, 1772

25 Philia Schioedte, (1842): 279 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Philia Meigen, 1800 and an unnecessary replacement name for Calliphara Germar, 1839

25 Philia Koch, 1846 : 54 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Philia Meigen, 1800

25 Dilophus Vieillot, 1816 : 34 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Dilophus Meigen, 1803

26 Erinna Moerch, 1865: 387 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Erinna H. & A. Adams, 1855 and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Eremina Pfeiffer, 1855

27 Coenomyia Latreille, 1796: 159, a junior objective synonym of Sicus Scopoli, 1763

28 Odontomya Latreille, 1809: 274, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Odontomyia Meigen, 1803

28 Odonthomya Rondani, 1856: 170, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Odontomyia Meigen, 1803

28 Odonthomyia Bellardi, 1859: 232, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Odontomyia Meigen, 1803

30 Potamida Schweigger, 1820: 720, 770 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Potamida Meigen, 1800, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Potamides Brongniart, 1810

30 Potamida J.L.R. Agassiz, 1846: 306 (Class Pelecypoda), a junior homonym of Potamida Meigen, 1800, and an unjustified emendation of Potomida Swainson, 1840

31 Hermione Forbes & Goodsir, (1840): 82 (Class Polychaeta), a junior homonym of Hermione Blainville, 1828

31 Hermione Gray, 1852: 306 (Class Pelecypoda), a junior homonym of Hermione Blainville, 1828

31 Hermione Meyrick, 1883 : 526 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Hermione Blainville, 1828

31 Oxycera Giebel, 1875: 785 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Oxycera Meigen, 1803, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Oxycerca Gray, 1842

37 Platyptera Panzer, 1809 : tab. 20, a junior homonym of Platyptera Meigen, 1803, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Platypeza Meigen, 1803

37 Platyptera Cuvier, 1829:248 (Class Pisces), a junior homonym of Platyptera Meigen, 1803

37 Platyptera Valenciennes in Cuvier & Valenciennes, 1837 321 (Class Pisces), a junior homonym of Platyptera Meigen, 1803

37 Dionnaea Hendel, 1908: 54, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Dionaea Meigen, 1800

39 Asilus Moehring, 1758 : 28 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Asilus Linnaeus, 1758

39 Asilus Brisson, 1760, 3: 479 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Asilus Linnaeus, 1758

39 Asilus Bechstein, 1802 : 173 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Asilus Linnaeus, 1758

41 Dasypogon Leconte, 1861: 170 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Dasypogon Meigen, 1803

42 Conops Walckenaer & Gervais, 1847: 382 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Conops Linnaeus, 1758, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Oonops Templeton, [1833]

44 Tachydromya Oken, 1815:486, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Tachydromia Meigen, 1803

44 Tachydromyia Macquart, 1823: 152, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Tachydromia Meigen, 1803

47 Sargus Fabricius, 1798 : 549 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Sargus Walbaum, 1792 (Class Pisces)

47 Sargus Lacépède, 1802 : 167, a junior homonym of Sargus Walbaum, 1792

48 Leptis Fabricius, 1805 : 69 (Order Diptera), a junior objective synonym of Rhagio Fabricius, 1775

51 Bombylius Fauvel, 1902: 42 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758

53 Clythia H. Milne Edwards, 1836: 132 (Class Hydrozoa), a junior homonym of Clythia Meigen, 1800, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Clytia Lamouroux, 1812

53 Clythia Berendt, 1845: 56 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Clythia Meigen, 1800

53 Clythia Menge, 1854: 45 (Class Arachnida), a junior homonym of Clythia Meigen, 1800

55 Callomya Oken, 1815: 490, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Callomyia Meigen, 1804

55 Callimyia J. L. R. Agassiz, 1846: 59, an unjustified emendation of Callomyia Meigen, 1804

55 Calomyia Rossi, 1848 : viii, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Callomyia Meigen, 1804

57 Microcera Meigen, 1803 : 273, a junior objective synonym of Pipunculus Latreille, [1802-1803] 57 Microcera Mannerheim, 1831 : 486 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Microcera Meigen, 1803

57 Microcera Zetterstedt, 1837 : col. 33; 1838 : 572 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Microcera Meigen, 1803

57 Microcera Lioy, 1864: 906 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Microcera Meigen, 1803

58 Atalanta Stål, 1861: 149 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Atalanta Meigen, 1800

58 Atalanta Seeley, 1864: 50 (Class Pelecypoda), a junior homonym of Atalanta Meigen, 1800

58 Atalanta Knocker, 1869: 617 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Atalanta Meigen, 1800, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Atlanta Lesueur, 1817

58 Clinocera Deyrolle, 1864 : 116 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Clinocera Meigen, 1803

58 Clinocera Reitter, 1906: 459 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Clinocera Meigen, 1803, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Clinocrara Thomson, 1859

60 Rhyngia Rondani, 1844 : 459 (Order Diptera), an erroneous subsequent spelling of Rhingia Scopoli, 1763

62 Antiopa Alder & Hancock, 1848: 190 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Antiopa Meigen, 1800

62 Antiopa Stål, 1862:47 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Antiopa Meigen, 1800

65 Tritonia Turton, 1825: 365 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Tritonia Cuvier, 1798

65 Tritonia Geyer, 1832 : 25 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Tritonia Cuvier, 1798

65 Spilomya Oken, 1815 : 513, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Spilomyia Meigen, 1803

66 Zelima Fabricius, 1807: 279 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Zelima Meigen, 1800

66 Zetides Hübner, [1819]: 85 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior objective synonym of Graphium Scopoli, 1777

66 Chlorisses Swainson, 1832 : pl. 89 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior objective synonym of Graphium Scopoli, 1777

67 Lampetia Stephens, 1829: 43 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Lampetia Meigen, 1800

67 Lampetia Curtis, 1830 : pl. 153 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Lampetia Meigen, 1800

67 Lampetia Boie, 1837 : 536 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Lampetia Meigen, 1800

67 Lampetia Chun, 1880 : 282 (Class Ctenophora), a junior homonym of Lampetia Meigen, 1800

68 Elophilus Labbé, 1935 : 312 (Class Gastropoda), a junior homonym of Elophilus Latreille, 1804

69 Cinxia Stål, 1862 : 105 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Cinxia Meigen, 1800

69 Sericomya Oken, 1815:515, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Sericomyia Meigen, 1803

69 Sericomya Rondani, 1844: 451, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Sericomyia Meigen, 1803

69 Sericomyza Zetterstedt, 1838: 589, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Sericomyia Meigen, 1803

70 Criorhina Williston, 1886: 209, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Criorrhina Meigen, 1822

70 Chriorhyna Rondani, 1844: 456, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Criorrhina Meigen, 1822

72 Titania J. L. R. Agassiz, [1846]: 67 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of *Titania* Meigen, 1800, and an unjustified emendation of *Titanio* Hübner, [1825]

73 Scatophaga Fabricius, 1805 : 203, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Scathophaga Meigen, 1803

74 Dictya J. L. R. Agassiz, 1846: 123 (Order Diptera), a junior homonym of Dictya Meigen, 1803, and an unjustified emendation of Dyctia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830

74 Dictya de Chaudoir, 1871 : 123 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Dictya Meigen, 1803

74 Dictya Kobayashi, 1933: 137 (Class Trilobita), a junior homonym of Dictya Meigen, 1803

75 Euribia Rang, 1827 : 320, 328 (Class Pteropoda), a junior homonym of Euribia Latreille, 1802

76 Pterocera Lamarck, 1799:72 (Class Gastropoda), a junior objective synonym of Lambis [Röding], 1798

76 Pterocera Meigen, 1803: 275, a junior homonym of Pterocera Lamarck, 1799 and a junior objective synonym of Volucella Geoffroy, 1762

76 Apivora Meigen, 1800, a junior objective synonym of Volucella Geoffroy 1762

79 Titia Hermann, 1804 : 135 (Class Aves), a junior homonym of Titia Meigen, 1800

79 Titia Stål, 1866 : 105 (Order Hemiptera), a junior homonym of Titia Meigen, 1800

80 Gonia Heinemann, [1870] : 331 (Order Lepidoptera), a junior homonym of Gonia Meigen, 1803

81 Echinodes Trouessart, 1879 : 274 (Class Mammalia), a junior homonym of Echinodes Zimmermann, 1869

81 Echinodes Jacquet, [1889]: 1888 (Order Coleoptera), a junior homonym of Echinodes Zimmermann, 1869

81 Eriothryx Schiner, [1868]: 292, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Eriothrix Meigen, 1803

82 Echinomya Latreille, [1804–1805]: 377, a junior objective synonym of Tachina Meigen, 1803

83 Gymnosoma Quatrefages, [1866]: 482 (Class Polychaeta), a junior homonym of Gymnosoma Meigen, 1803

83 Gymnosomia Latreille, 1829: 511, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Gymnosoma Meigen, 1803

85 Calirrhoe Reichenbach, 1828 : 99 (Class Cephalopoda ?), a junior homonym of Calirrhoe Meigen, 1800, and an erroneous subsequent spelling of Callirhoe Montfort, 1810

87 Hippoboscus Gray, 1832: 778, an erroneous subsequent spelling of Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758

#### APPENDIX VI

#### SPECIFIC NAMES TO BE PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL LIST

#### Part A

#### 58 specific names of type-species of genera listed in Appendix V

1 atrata Linnaeus, 1758 : 586, as published in the binomen *Tipula atrata* (type-species of *Ctenophora* Meigen, 1803)

4 contaminata Linnaeus, 1758 : 586, as published in the binomen Tipula contaminata (type-species of Ptychoptera Meigen, 1803)

5 dorsalis Fabricius, 1781 : 403, as published in the binomen Tipula dorsalis (type-species of Nephrotoma Meigen, 1803)

7 tripunctata Fabricius, 1781 : 405, as published in the binomen Tipula tripunctata (type-species of Limonia Meigen, 1803)

8 petaurista Pallas, 1766 : 54, as published in the binomen Sciurus petaurista (type-species of Petaurista Link, 1795)

9 lutea Meigen, 1804 : 46, as published in the binomen Macrocera lutea (typespecies of Macrocera Meigen, 1803)

10 immaculata Grote, 1865: 246, as published in the binomen Phryne immaculata (type-species of Calybia Kirby, 1829)

14 plumosa Linnaeus, 1758: 587, as published in the binomen Tipula plumosa (type-species of Chironomus Meigen, 1803)

18 pini De Geer, 1776 : 417, as published in the binomen Tipula pini (typespecies of Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

19 pipiens Linnaeus, 1758 : 602, as published in the binomen Culex pipiens (type-species of Culex Linnaeus, 1758)

20 fusca Meigen, 1804 : 93, as published in the binomen Cordyla fusca (typespecies of Cordyla Meigen, 1803)

21 nervosa Fairmaire, 1846: 289, as published in the binomen Ceresa nervosa (type-species of Melusinella Metcalf, 1952) 25 febrilis Linnaeus, 1758: 588, as published in the binomen Tipula febrilis (type-species of Dilophus Meigen, 1803)

26 cinctus De Geer, 1776: 183, as published in the binomen Nemotelus cinctus (type-species of Xylophagus Meigen, 1803)

26 newcombi H. & A. Adams, 1855: 120, as published in the binomen Erinna newcombi (type species of Erinna H. & A. Adams, 1855)

28 hydroleon Linnaeus, 1758: 589, as published in the binomen Musca hydroleon (type-species of Odontomyia Meigen, 1803)

31 trilineata Linnaeus, 1767: 980, as published in the binomen Musca trilineata (type-species of Oxycera Meigen, 1803)

33 caecutiens Linnaeus, 1758 : 602, as published in the binomen Tabanus caecutiens (type-species of Chrysops Meigen, 1803)

34 pluvialis Linnaeus, 1758 : 602, as published in the binomen Tabanus pluvialis (type-species of Haematopota Meigen, 1803)

35 bovinus Linnaeus, 1758 : 601, as published in the binomen Tabanus bovinus (type-species of Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758)

37 forcipata Meigen, 1824: 272, as published in the binomen Tachina forcipata (type-species of Dionaea Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830)

38 pennipes Linnaeus, 1758: 604, as published in the binomen Empis pennipes (type-species of Empis Linnaeus, 1758)

39 crabroniformis Linnaeus, 1758 : 605, as published in the binomen Asilus crabroniformis (type-species of Asilus Linnaeus, 1758)

40 gibbosus Linnaeus, 1758 : 605, as published in the binomen Asilus gibbosus (type-species of Laphria Meigen, 1803)

42 flavipes Linnaeus, 1758: 604, as published in the binomen Conops flavipes (type-species of Conops Linnaeus, 1758)

45 telegraphella Walker, 1866 : 1839, as published in the binomen Noeza telegraphella (type-species of Noeza Walker, 1866)

47 cupraria Linnaeus, 1758: 598, as published in the binomen Musca cupraria (type-species of Geosargus Bezzi, 1907)

48 scolopacea Linnaeus, 1758: 590, as published in the binomen Musca scolopacea (type-species of Rhagio Fabricius, 1775)

51 major Linnaeus, 1758: 606, as published in the binomen Bombylius major (type-species of Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758)

53 fasciata Meigen, 1804 : 310, as published in the binomen Platypeza fasciata (type-species of Platypeza Meigen, 1803)

54 lutea Panzer, 1809 : tab. 20, 21, as published in the binomen Lonchoptera lutea (type-species of Lonchoptera Meigen, 1804)

55 elegans Meigen, 1804: 311, as published in the binomen Callomyia elegans (type-species of Callomyia Meigen, 1804)

57 campestris Latreille, [1802–1803]: 463, as published in the binomen Pipunculus campestris (type-species of Pipunculus Latreille, [1802–1803])

58 nigra Meigen, 1804: 292, as published in the binomen Clinocera nigra (type-species of Clinocera Meigen, 1803)

58 auricoma Burmeister, 1835: 168, as published in the binomen Phenax auricoma (type-species of Cerogenes Horváth, 1909) 60 rostrata Linnaeus, 1758: 604, as published in the binomen Conops rostrata (type-species of Rhingia Scopoli, 1763)

62 bicincta Linnaeus, 1758 : 592, as published in the binomen Musca bicincta (type-species of Chrysotoxum Meigen, 1803)

62 pumila Stål, 1863 : 47–48, as published in the binomen Antiopa pumila (type-species of Antiopula Bergroth, 1894)

63 plebeia Linnaeus, 1758: 589, as published in the binomen Musca plebeia (type-species of Thereva Latreille, 1796)

65 diophthalma Linnaeus, 1758 : 593, as published in the binomen Musca diophthalma (type-species of Spilomyia Meigen, 1803)

66 sarpedon Linnaeus, 1758: 461, as published in the binomen Papilio sarpedon (type-species of Graphium Scopoli, 1777)

67 clavipes Fabricius, 1781: 427, as published in the binomen Syrphus clavipes (type-species of Merodon Meigen, 1803)

67 croceago [Dennis & Schiffermüller], 1775 : 86, as published in the binomen Noctua croceago (type-species of Xanthia Latreille, 1818)

69 lappona Linnaeus, 1758: 591, as published in the binomen Musca lappona (type-species of Sericomyia Meigen, 1803)

69 limbatus Fabricius, 1803: 176, as published in the binomen Cimex limbatus (type-species of Madates Strand, 1910)

70 asilicus Fallén, 1816 : 22, as published in the binomen Syrphus asilicus (type-species of Criorrhina Meigen, 1822)

70 sacculalis Ragonot, [1891] : 439, as published in the binomen Penthesilea sacculalis (type-species of Penthesilea Ragonot, [1891])

71 petronella Linnaeus, 1758: 598, as published in the binomen Musca petronella (type-species of Calobata Meigen, 1803)

75 cardui Linnaeus, 1758 : 600, as published in the binomen Musca cardui (type-species of Euribia Latreille, [1802–1803])

76 lambis Linnaeus, 1758: 743, as published in the binomen Strombus lambis (type-species of Lambis [Röding, 1798])

79 punctiger Stål, [1855]: 98, as published in the binomen Acocephalus punctiger (type-species of Titiella Bergroth, 1920)

81 setiger Leconte, 1859 : 316, as published in the binomen Hetaerius setiger (type-species of Echinodes Zimmermann, 1869)

82 grossa Linnaeus, 1758 : 596, as published in the binomen Musca grossa (type-species of Tachina Meigen, 1803)

83 rotundata Linnaeus, 1758: 596, as published in the binomen Musca rotundata (type-species of Gymnosoma Meigen, 1803)

84 geniculata De Geer, 1776: 38, as published in the binomen Musca geniculata (type-species of Bucentes Latreille, 1809)

84 crocuta Erxleben, 1777 : 578, as published in the binomen Canis crocuta (type-species of Crocuta Kaup, 1828)

85 siberita Fabricius, 1775: 798, as published in the binomen Stomoxys siberita (type-species of Prosena St. Fargeau & Serville, 1828)

87 equina Linnaeus, 1758: 607, as published in the binomen Hippobosca equina (type-species of Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758)

#### Part B

#### Six specific names which are senior subjective synonyms of nominal type-species and which are the oldest available names for the species concerned

5 pavida Meigen, 1824: 398, as published in the binomen Tachina pavida (the oldest available name for the type-species of Pales Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830)

10 phryne Pallas, 1771: 470, as published in the binomen Papilio phryne (the oldest available name for the type-species of Triphysa Zeller, 1850)

13 hemerobioides Scopoli, 1763 : 324, as published in the binomen Tipula hemerobioides (the oldest available name for the type-species of Sciara Meigen, 1803)

45 grossipes Linnaeus, 1767: 988, as published in the binomen Musca grossipes (the oldest available name for the type-species of Hybos Meigen, 1803)

73 stercoraria Linnaeus, 1758 : 599, as published in the binomen Musca stercoraria (the oldest available name for the type-species of Scathophaga Meigen, 1803)

81 rufomaculata De Geer, 1776: 28, as published in the binomen Musca rufomaculata (the oldest available name for the type-species of Eriothrix Meigen, 1803)

#### APPENDIX VII

#### FAMILY-GROUP NAMES TO BE PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL INDEX OF REJECTED AND INVALID FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY

#### Part A

Thirteen names based on Meigen 1800 generic names and invalidated by the suppression of those generic names under the Plenary Powers

4 LIRIOPEIDAE Goffe, 1932: 61 (type-genus Liriope Meigen, 1800)

8 PETAURISTIDAE Lindner, 1930: 11 (type-genus Petaurista Meigen, 1800)

10 PHRYNEIDAE Lindner, 1930: 1 (type-genus Phryne Meigen, 1800)

12 FUNGIVORIDAE Landrock, 1926 : 1 (type-genus Fungivora Meigen, 1800)

13 LYCORIIDAE Lengersdorf, 1928: 1 (type-genus Lycoria Meigen, 1800)

16 HELEIDAE Goetghebuer & Lenz, 1933: 1 (type-genus Helea Meigen, 1800)

18 ITONIDIDAE Felt, 1913: 127 (type-genus Itonida Meigen, 1800)

21 MELUSINIDAE Goffe, 1932: 61 (type-genus Melusina Meigen, 1800)

52 OMPHRALIDAE Kröber, 1926 : 1 (type-genus Omphrale Meigen, 1800)

53 CLYTHIDAE Czerny, 1930 : 1 (type-genus Clythia Meigen, 1800)

54 MUSIDORIDAE Goffe, 1932: 62 (type-genus Musidora Meigen, 1800)

56 CYPSELIDAE Goffe, 1932 : 64 (type-genus Cypsela Meigen, 1800)

82 LARVAEVORIDAE Goffe, 1932: 64 (type-genus Larvaevora Meigen, 1800)

#### Part B

# Two family-group names based on generic names concerning which specific proposals are laid before the Commission (see Appendix V, Part B)

14 TENDIPEDIDAE Goffe, 1932 : 61 (type-genus Tendipes Meigen, 1800)

57 DORILAIDAE Kertész, 1910 : 367 (type-genus Dorilas Meigen, 1800)

#### Part C

# Incorrect original spellings of family-group names in Diptera

2 TIPULARIAE Latreille, [1802–1803] : 419 (type-genus Tipula Linnaeus, 1758)

2 TIPULARIDES [Leach], [1815]: 161 (type-genus Tipula Linnaeus, 1758)

7 LIMNOBIINA Rondani, 1856 : 38 (type-genus Limnobia Meigen, 1818)

9 MACROCERINA Rondani, 1856: 40 (type-genus Macrocera Meigen, 1803)

10 RHYPHITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 387 (type-genus Rhyphus Latreille, [1804–1805])

10 RHYPHII Zetterstedt, 1842 : 9, 85 (type-genus Rhyphus Latreille, [1804–1805])

10 RIPHIDAE Rondani, 1856: 18 (type-genus Rhyphus Latreille, [1804-1805])

12 MYCETOPHILITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 386 (type-genus Mycetophila Meigen, 1803)

14 CHIRONOMITES Newman, (1834) : 379 (type-genus Chironomus Meigen, 1803)

16 CERATOPOGONITES Newman, (1834): 379 (type-genus Ceratopogon Meigen, 1803)

17 PSYCHODITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 388 (type-genus Psychoda Latreille, 1796)

17 PSYCHODIDES Zetterstedt, 1840 : vi, 824 (type-genus Psychoda Latreille, 1796)

18 CECIDOMIITES Newman, (1834): 379, 386 (type-genus Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

18 CECIDOMYITES Newman, 1835: 181 (type-genus Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

18 CECIDOMYIADAE Harris, 1841 : 421 (type-genus Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

18 CECIDOMYZIDES Zetterstedt, 1842 : 10, 90 (type-genus Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

19 CULICITES Newman, (1834): 379, 388 (type-genus Culex Linnaeus, 1758)

21 SIMULIITES Newman, (1834): 379 (type-genus Simulium Latreille, [1802-1803])

21 SIMULIDES Zetterstedt, 1842 : 9, 85 (type-genus Simulium Latreille, [1802-1803])

26 XYLOPHAGITES Newman, (1834): 379, 393 (type-genus Xylophagus Meigen, 1803)

28 ODONTHOMYNA Rondani, 1856: 35 (type-genus Odontomyia Meigen, 1803) 35 TABANII Latreille, [1802-1803]: 438 (type-genus Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758) 35 TABANIDES [Leach], [1815]: 161 (type-genus Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758) 35 TABANITES Newman, (1834): 379, 389 (type-genus Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758) 38 EMPIDES [Leach], [1815]: 161 (type-genus Empis Linnaeus, 1758) 38 EMPITES Newman, (1834): 379, 392 (type-genus Empis Linnaeus, 1758) 39 ASILICI Latreille, [1802-1803]: 432 (type-genus Asilus Linnaeus, 1758) 39 ASILIDES [Leach], [1815]: 161 (type-genus Asilus Linnaeus, 1758) 39 ASILITES Newman, (1834): 379, 392 (type-genus Asilus Linnaeus, 1758) 40 LAPHRIINA Rondani, 1856 : 32 (type-genus Laphria Meigen, 1803) 41 DASYPOGONINA Rondani, 1856 : 32 (type-genus Dasypogon Meigen, 1803) 42 CONOPSARIAE Latreille, [1802-1803]: 442 (type-genus Conops Linnaeus, 1758) 42 CONOPSIDES [Leach], [1815] : 162 (type-genus Conops Linnaeus, 1758) 42 CONOPITES Newman, (1834): 379, 390 (type-genus Conops Linnaeus, 1758) 43 MYOPINA Rondani, 1856 : 21 (type-genus Myopa Fabricius, 1775) 44 TACHIDROMYNA Rondani, 1856 : 30 (type-genus Tachydromia Meigen, 1803)48 RHAGIONIDES Latreille, [1802-1803]: 440 (type-genus Rhagio Fabricius, 1775) 49 ANTHRACIDES [Leach], [1815]: 162 (type-genus Anthrax Scopoli, 1763) 50 OESTRIDES [Leach], [1815] : 162 (type-genus Oestrus Linnaeus, 1758) 50 OESTRITES Newman, (1834): 379, 391 (type-genus Oestrus Linnaeus, 1758) 51 BOMBYLARII Latreille, [1802-1803]: 427 (type-genus Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758)51 BOMBYLIDES [Leach], [1815]: 162 (type-genus Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758) 51 BOMBILIITES Newman, (1834): 379, 389 (type-genus Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758)51 BOMBYLIADAE Harris, 1841 : 406 (type-genus Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758) 52 SCENOPINII Meigen, 1824 : xi, 111 (type-genus Scenopinus Latreille, [1802 - 1803])54 LONCOPTERIDAE Rondani, 1856: 13 (type-genus Lonchoptera Meigen, 1803)56 BORBORITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 396 (type-genus Borborus Meigen, 1803) 57 PIPUNCULINI Zetterstedt, 1842 : 4, 45 (type-genus Pipunculus Latreille, [1802 - 1803])62 CHRYSOTOXITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 394 (type-genus Chrysotoxum Meigen, 1803) 63 THEREVITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 391 (type-genus Thereva Latreille, 1796) 68 ERISTALITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 394 (type-genus Eristalis Latreille, 1804) 72 CHLOROPINA Rondani, 1856: 26 (type-genus Chlorops Meigen, 1803) 73 SCATOPHAGITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 395 (type-genus Scatophaga Meigen, 1803)

#### Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature

74 TETANOCERITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 395 (type-genus Tetanocera Latreille, 1804)

80 GONIDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863: 728 (type-genus Gonia Meigen, 1803)

82 TACHINARIAE Macquart, 1835: 59 (type-genus Tachina Meigen, 1803)

82 TACHINADAE Harris, 1841: 411 (type-genus Tachina Meigen, 1803)

82 ECHINOMYDAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 : 610 (type-genus Echinomya Latreille, [1802-1803])

87 HIPPOBOSCITES Newman, (1834) : 379, 397 (type-genus Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758)

87 HIPPOBOSCADAE Harris, 1841: 18 (type-genus Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758)

#### Part D

#### One incorrect original spelling of a family-group name not in Diptera

7 AMPHINOMAE Savigny, [1822]: 822 (type-genus Amphinome Bruguière, [1792], Class Polychaeta)

#### **APPENDIX VIII**

#### FAMILY-GROUP NAMES TO BE PLACED ON THE OFFICIAL LIST OF FAMILY-GROUP NAMES IN ZOOLOGY

#### Part A

#### Fifteen names validated through the suppression of Meigen 1800 generic names

4 PTYCHOPTERIDAE Kertész, 1902: 275 (type-genus Ptychoptera Meigen, 1803)

13 SCIARINAE Zetterstedt, 1840: 825 (type-genus Sciara Meigen, 1803)

14 CHIRONOMIDAE Newman, (1834) : 379 (correction of CHIRONOMITES) (type-genus Chironomus Meigen, 1803)

16 CERATOPOGONIDAE Newman, (1834): 379 (correction of CERATOPOGONITES) (type-genus Ceratopogon Meigen, 1803)

18 CECIDOMYIIDAE Newman, (1834): 379, 386 (correction of CECIDOMIITES) (type-genus Cecidomyia Meigen, 1803)

26 XYLOPHAGINAE Newman, (1834): 379, 393 (correction of XYLOPHAGITES) (type-genus Xylophagus Meigen, 1803)

40 LAPHRIINAE Rondani, 1856 : 32 (correction of LAPHRIINA) (type-genus Laphria Meigen, 1803) 44 TACHYDROMIINAE Rondani, 1856 : 30 (correction of TACHIDROMYNA) (type-genus Tachydromia Meigen, 1803)

45 HYBOTINAE Meigen, 1820 : x, 346 (type-genus Hybos Meigen, 1803)

54 LONCHOPTERINAE Macquart, 1835: 13 (type-genus Lonchoptera Meigen, 1803)

57 PIPUNCULIDAE Zetterstedt, 1842 : 4, 45 (correction of PIPUNCULINI) (typegenus Pipunculus Latreille, [1802–1803])

59 MICROPEZIDAE Loew, 1862: 38 (type-genus Micropeza Meigen, 1803)

72 CHLOROPIDAE Rondani, 1856 : 26 (correction of CHLOROPINA) typegenus *Chlorops* Meigen, 1803). [Correction of the original reference for this family-group name given in Direction 28]

80 GONIINAE Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 : 728 (correction of GONIDAE) typegenus Gonia Meigen, 1803)

82 TACHINIDAE Macquart, 1835 : 59 (correction of TACHINARIAE) (typegenus Tachina Meigen, 1803).

#### Part B

# Thirteen names based on generic names established by authors earlier than Meigen, 1800

2 TIPULIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803]: 419 (correction of TIPULARIAE) (typegenus *Tipula* Linnaeus, 1758)

19 CULICIDAE Newman, (1834) : 379, 388 (correction of CULICITES) (typegenus Culex Linnaeus, 1758)

35 TABANIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803] : 438 (correction of TABANII) (typegenus Tabanus Linnaeus, 1758)

38 EMPIDIDAE [Leach], [1815] : 161 (correction of EMPIDES) (type-genus Empis Linnaeus, 1758)

39 ASILIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803]: 432 (correction of ASILICI) (type-genus Asilus Linnaeus, 1758)

42 CONOPIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803] : 442 (correction of CONOPSARIAE) (type-genus Conops Linnaeus, 1758)

43 MYOPINAE Rondani, 1856 : 21 (correction of MYOPINA) (type-genus Myopa Fabricius, 1775)

48 RHAGIONIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803] : 440 (correction of RHAGIONIDES) (type-genus Rhagio Fabricius, 1775)

49 ANTHRACINAE [Leach], [1815] : 162 (correction of ANTHRACIDES) (typegenus Anthrax Scopoli, 1763)

51 BOMBYLIIDAE Latreille, [1802–1803] : 427 (correction of BOMBYLARII) (type-genus Bombylius Linnaeus, 1758)

63 THEREVIDAE Newman, (1834) : 379, 391 (correction of THEREVITES) (type-genus Thereva Latreille, 1796)

87 HIPPOBOSCIDAE Newman, (1834): 379, 397 (correction of HIPPOBOSCITES) (type-genus Hippobosca Linnaeus, 1758)

#### Part C

# Eleven names for which information is required

3 ERIOPTERINI; 7 LIMONIINAE; 8 TRICHOCERIDAE; 10 ANISOPODIDAE; 15 TANYPODINAE; 30 CLITELLARIINAE; 34 HAEMATOPOTINAE; 56 SPHAERO-CERIDAE; 58 CLINOCERARINAE; 71 CALOBATINAE; 75 TRYPETIDAE

#### Part D

#### One name in a group other than Diptera

7 AMPHINOMIDAE Savigny, [1822] : 822 (correction of AMPHINOMAE) (typegenus Amphinome Bruguière, [1792], Class Polychaeta)

#### APPENDIX IX

#### References

Adams, H., 1868, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 1868 : 14-17 ---- & Adams, A., 1854-1858, The genera of Recent Mollusca 2, London - & ----, 1855, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 23 : 119-124 Agassiz, J. L. R., 1846, Nomencl. zool. Index univ., Solothurn \_\_\_\_, 1846, Nomencl. zool. Lepidoptera, Solothurn -, 1862, Contrib. nat. Hist. U.S.A. 4 Alder, J., & Hancock, A., 1848, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (2) 1:189-192 Bechstein, J. M., 1802, Orn. Taschenb. 1 Bellardi, L., 1859, Saggio Ditt. Messic. 1 (Mem. R. Accad. Torino 19: 201-277) Berendt, C., 1845, Bernst. bef. org. Reste 1(1), Berlin Bergroth, E., 1894, Rev. ent. France 13: 152-163 \_\_\_\_, 1920, Ark. Zool. 12 (17) Berthold, A. A., 1827, in Latreille, Nat. Fam. Thierr., Weimar Bezzi, M., 1902, Z. syst. Hym. Dipt. (Konow) 2:190-192 \_\_\_\_, 1907, Wien. ent. Ztg., 26: 51-56 Billberg, G. J., 1820, Enum. Ins. Mus. Billberg, Stockholm Bjerkander, C., 1778, K. svensk. Vetensk.-Akad. Handl. 39: 240-241 Blackwall, J., 1870, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (4) 5:394-405 Blainville, H. M. D. de, 1828, Dict. Sci. nat. 57, Paris \_\_\_\_, 1834, Man. Actin., Paris Blanchard, C. E., [1846], in Cuvier, Règne anim. [ed. 3 (Disciples' ed.)] 14 (Ins. Atlas 2), Paris -, 1849, ibid. 7 (Ins. 3) Boie, F., 1837, Naturh. Tidsskr. 1: 521-549 Brisson, M. J., 1760, Ornithologia, 6 vols., Paris Bruguière, J. G., [1792], Ency. méth. Vers 1

- Burmeister, C. H. C., 1835, Handb. Ent. 2, Berlin Cabanis, J., 1847, Arch. Nat. 13(1): 308-352 Chapuis, F., 1874 in Lacordaire, Hist. nat. Ins., Gen. Col. 10 Chaudoir, M. de, 1871, Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou 43(2): 111-255 Christoph, H., 1880, Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou 55(2): 33-121 Chun, C., 1880, F. Fl. Neapol. 1 (Naples, zool. Stat.) Coquillett, D. W., 1895, Canad. Ent. 27: 199-201 -----, 1903, Proc. ent. Soc. Washington 25 : 245-272 -----, 1910, Proc. U.S. nat. Mus. 37: 499-622 Cresson, E. T., 1920, Trans. ent. Soc. Amer. 46: 27-89 Curtis, J., 1826, Brit. Ent., pl. 106, London —, 1830, Brit. Ent., pl. 153 -, 1830, Guide brit. Ins., London -----, 1831, Brit. Ent., pl. 377 -, 1832, Brit. Ent., pls. 409, 432 -----, 1833, Brit. Ent., pls. 444, 452 -, 1835, Brit. Ent., pls. 553, 557 -----, 1837, Brit. Ent., pls. 637, 661 -----, 1838, Brit. Ent., pl. 677 -----, 1839, Brit. Ent., pls. 749, 753 Cuvier, G., 1803, Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris 1: 480-496 -, G. L. C. F. D., 1798, Tabl. élém. Paris ------, 1829, Règne anim. (ed. 2) 2, Paris Czerny, L., 1930, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, fam. 42(a), Stuttgart De Geer, C., 1776, Mém. Ins. 6, Stockholm Dejean, P. F. H. A., 1835, Cat. Col., ed. 2, 5, Paris [Denis, M. & Schiffermüller, I.], 1775, Ank. syst. Verz. Schmett. Wiener Gegend Desmarest, A. G., 1820, Ency. méth. (Mamm.) 1 Deyrolle, H., 1864, Ann. Soc. ent. Belge 8:1-312 Duméril, A. M. C., 1806, Zool. anal., Paris Eaton, A. E., 1895, Ent. mon. Mag., 29: 120-130 -, 1904, *ibid*. 40 : 55–59 Edwards, F. W., 1920, Mesure Arc mérid. Amér. Sud 10: 143-162, Paris -, Henry, 1881, Papilio 1:80-81 Enderlein, G., 1935, Sitzungsber. Ges. naturf. Freunde Berlin, Jahrg. 1935: 246-
  - Erxleben, J. C. P., 1777, Syst. Anim.

250

- Fabricius, J. C., 1775, Syst. Ent., Flensburg & Leipzig
- -----, 1779, Reise Norwegen, Hamburg
- -----, 1781, Spec. Ins. 2, Hamburg
- -----, 1781, Mantissa Ins. 1, 2, Copenhagen
- -----, 1794, Ent. Syst. 4, Copenhagen
- -----, 1798, Suppl. Ent. Syst., Copenhagen
- -----, 1803, Syst. Rhyng., Brunswick
- -----, 1805, Syst. Antliat., Brunswick
- -----, 1807, Mag. Insektenk. (Illiger) 6 : 279-289

- Fairmaire, L., 1846, Ann. Soc. ent. France, (2) 4: 265-320
- Fallén, C. F., [1811], K. svenska Vetensk.-Akad. nya Handl. 31(4): 253-287
- \_\_\_\_, 1816, Dipt. Svec. (Syrph. 2), Lund
- \_\_\_\_, 1817, ibid. (Syrph. 3), Lund
- Fauvel, A., 1902, Rev. Ent. France 21: 40-43
- Felt, E. P., 1913, Bull. U.S. State Mus., 165, Rept. State Entomologist-Appendix
- Forbes, E., & Goodsir, J., (1840), Rep. brit. Assoc. 1839 (Notices), 79-82
- Forskål, P., 1775, Descr. Anim. [op. post. ed. Niebuhr], Copenhagen
- Funkhouser, W. D., 1927, General Catalogue Hemiptera, Fasc. 1 (Membracidae), Northampton, Mass.
- Gegenbaur, C., 1856, Z. wiss. Zool. 8 (no. 2): 202-273
- Geoffroy, E. L., 1762, Hist. abrég. Ins. 2, Paris
- Geyer, C., 1832, in Hübner, Zutr. z. Samml. exot. Schmett. 4, Augsburg
- Giebel, C. G. A., 1875, Thes. orn. 2, fasc. 2, Leipzig
- Gistl, J., & Bromme, [1847], Handb. Nat. 1850, Stuttgart
- \_\_\_\_, J. von N. F. X., 1848, Nat. Thierr., Stuttgart
- Gmelin, J. F., [1790], Syst. Nat. (ed. 13) 1, (5), Leipzig
- Goetghebuer, H., & Lenz, F., 1933, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 13(a), Stuttgart
- Goffe, E. R., 1932, Trans. ent. Soc. S. Engl. 8: 58-64
- \_\_\_\_, 1933, ibid. 8:77-83
- Gray, G., 1832, in Griffith's Cuvier, Anim. Kingd. (Ins.) 15, London
- \_\_\_\_, J. E., 1852 [op. post. of W.E. Leach], Syn. Moll. g. Brit., London
- -----, 1866, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 1866 : 211-216
- \_\_\_\_, 1867, ibid. 1867 : 233-240
- Grote, A. R., 1865, Proc. ent. Soc. Philad. 5: 227-255
- Gyllenhal, L., 1810, Ins. Svec. 1 Coleopt. 1(2)
- Haan, W. de, [1833], in Siebold, Fauna Japon. (Crust.), Leiden
- Haekel, E., 1880, Monogr. Medusen, Denkschr. med.-naturw. Ges. Jena 1
- Harris, M., 1776, Exp. Eng. Ins., London
- Harris, T. W., 1841, Rep. Ins. Mass. inj. Veg. [ed. 1], Boston
- Heinemann, H. von, [1870], Schmett. Deutschl. u. Schweiz 2 (Klein-Schmett. 2) Heft 1 (1877), Brunswick
- Hemming, F., 1933, Entomologist 66: 196-200
- Hendel, F., 1908, Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien 58: 43-69
- \_\_\_\_, 1927, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 49, Stuttgart
- Hermann, J., 1804, Obs. Zool., Paris
- Herrich-Schaeffer, G. A. W., [1844], Schmett. Europ. 1, Regensberg
- Hine, J. S., 1919, Ann. ent. Soc. Amer. 12: 103-154
- Horváth, G., 1909, Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Hung. 7:631-632
- Hübner, J., [1819], Verz. bekannt. Schmett. 1818 : 17-176, Augsburg
- International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 1910, Opinion 28, Smithson. Publ. 1989: 66-67
- \_\_\_\_, 1944, Opinion 152, Ops. Decls. Int. Comm. zool. Nomencl. 2:181-196
- -----, 1950, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 4: 158-159, 346, 557-558

- Jacquet, E., [1889], Ann. Soc. ent. France 6 : CXLIII-CXLV
- Johannsen, O. A., 1909, Gen. Ins. 93 (Dipt. Mycet.)
- Kaup, J. J., 1828, Isis (Oken) 21 : 1144-1150
- Kertész, C., 1902, Cat. Dipt. 1, Budapest (Mus. Nat. Hung.) -----, 1910, ibid. 7
- Keyserling, E. von, 1882, in Koch (Keyserling), Arachn. Austr. 1, Nuremberg
- Kirby, W. F., 1892, Cat. Lep. Het. 1, London & Berlin
- Kloet, G. S., & Hincks, W. D., 1945, Check List brit. Ins., Stockport, England
- Knocker, H. H., 1869, Proc. zool. Soc. Lond. 1868 : 615-622
- Kobayashi, T., 1933, Jap. J. Geol. Geogr. 11: 55-155
- Koch, C. L., 1846, Die Arachn. 13(2), Nuremberg
- —, 1850, Ueber Arachn. 5, Nuremberg
- Kröber, O., 1925, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 27, Stuttgart
- Labbé, A., 1935, Bull. Soc. zool. France 60: 312-317
- Lacépède, B. G. E. de la V., 1802, Hist. nat. Paris in Buffon, Hist. nat. (1794– 1804 ed.)
- Lamarck, J. B. P. de, 1799, Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris 1:63-91
- -----, 1818, Hist. nat. Anim. s. Vert. 5, Paris
- Landrock, K., 1926, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 18, Stuttgart
- Latreille, P. A., 1796, Précis Caract. Ins., Paris
- -----, [1802-1803], Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins. 3, Paris (in Sonnini's Buffon)
- -----, 1804, Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat. 24, Paris
- -----, [1804-1805], Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins. 14, Paris (in Sonnini's Buffon)
- ------, 1809, Gen. Crust. Ins. 4, Paris
- -----, 1810, Consid. gén. Anim. Crust. Arachn. Ins., Paris
- -----, 1818, Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat. (nouv. ed.) 23:29
- ------, 1829, in Cuvier, Règne Anim. (ed. 2) 1, Paris
- [Leach, W. E.], [1815], Edinb. Ency. 9(1), Edinburgh
- Leconte, J. L., 1859, Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad. 1859: 310-317
- -----, 1861, Smithson. Misc. Coll. 3(3)
- Lengersdorf, F., 1928, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 7, Stuttgart
- Lesson, R. P., 1843, in Roret's Suite à Buffon, Hist. nat. Zooph., Acalèphes, Paris
- Lindner, E., 1930, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 1a, 1b, Stuttgart
- Link, H. F., 1795, Beytr. Nat. 1(2), Rostock & Leipzig
- Linnaeus, C., 1746, Fauna svecica [ed. 1], Stockholm
- -----, 1758, Syst. Nat., ed. X (1). Stockholm
- -----, 1761, Fauna svecica (ed. 2), Stockholm
- -----, 1767, Syst. Nat. ed. XII (q) 2, Stockholm
- Lioy, Da P., 1864, Atti Ist Veneto (3) 9(2) : 879-910, 989-1027, 1087-1126, 1311-1352
- Loew, H., 1846, Linn. Entom. (Ent. Verein Stettin) 11 : 319-530
- -----, 1860, Dipt.-Fauna Südafr., Berlin [ex Abh. naturw. Ver. Sachs. Thür. in Halle, 2]
- -----, 1862, Smithson. Misc. Coll. 6 (Art. 1)

\_\_\_\_, 1862, in Peters, W. C. H., Reise Mossambique, pt. 5, Diptera, Berlin

- Macquart, P. J. M., 1823, Rec. Trav. Soc. amat. Sci. Lille 1 : 137-165
- \_\_\_\_, 1835, Hist. nat. Ins. 2, Paris

Mannerheim, C. G., 1831, Mém. prés. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Petersb. 1(5): 415-502

Mannheims, B., 1952, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 15, Stuttgart

- Mayer, A. G., 1910, Medusae of the World 3, Scyphomedusae (Carnegie Inst. Wash. Publ. 109)
- Meigen, J. W., 1800, Nouvelle Class. Mouches à deux Ailes, Paris (fascimile ed. Bull. zool. Nomencl. 1:119-160)
- \_\_\_\_, 1803, Mag. f. Insektenk. (Illiger) 2:259-281
- \_\_\_\_, 1804, Klass. Beschr. europ. zweifl. Ins., Brunswick
- \_\_\_\_, 1818-1838, Syst. Beschr. bek. europ. zweifl. Ins., Aachen and Hamm. 1, 1818; 2, 1820; 3, 1822; 4, 1824; 5, 1826; 6, 1830; 7, 1838
- Menge, A., 1854, in Berendt, Bernst. Reste 1(2), Berlin
- Metcalf, Z. P., 1952, J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 42: 226-231
- Meyrick, E., 1883, N.Z.J.Sci. 1:526-531
- Milne Edwards, H., 1836, in Lamarck, Hist. nat. Anim. s. Vert. (ed. 2), 2, Paris and London
- Moerch, O. A. L., 1865, J. Conchyl. 13 [(3) 5]: 376-396
- Montfort, D. de, 1810, Conch. syst. 1, Paris
- Müller, O. F., 1776, Zool. dan. Prodr., Copenhagen
- \_\_\_\_, 1781, Zool. dan. (Danm. Norges Dyrs Hist.), Copenhagen
- Nozeman, C. & Vosmaer, P., 1758, [Moehring's] Geslach. Vogel 2
- Newman, E., (1834), Ent. Mag. 2: 379-431
- \_\_\_\_, 1835, Grammar Ent., London

Oken, L., 1815, Lehrb. Nat. 3(1) and 5, Leipzig and Jena

- \_\_\_\_, 1816, *ibid*. 3(2)
- [----], 1829, Isis (Oken) 22 : 1111
- Olivier, M., 1811, Ency. méth., Hist. nat. Ins. 8

Oppel, M., 1812, Denkschr. k. Akad. Wiss. München 1811-1812 : 159-166

- Pallas, P. S., 1766, Misc. zool., The Hague
- Panzer, G. W. F., 1794, F. Ins. Germ., Heft 24, Nuremberg ......, 1809, *ibid.* Hefte 103, 108
- Passerini, C., 1849, Cont. Atti Accad. Econ.-Agr. Georgofili Firenze 27:70-79
- Peron, F., & Lesueur, C. A., 1810, Ann. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris 14: 325-366
- Quatrefages de Bréau, J. L. A. de, [1866], *Hist. nat. Annel.* 2 (1865), Paris (Roret's Suite à Buffon)
- Ragonot, E.-L., [1891], Ann. Soc. ent. France (6) 10:435-546
- Rang, M., 1827, Ann. Sci. nat. 12: 320-329
- Rathke, H., 1843, Nova Acta Acad. Leop. Carol. 20(1): 1-264
- Reichenbach, H. G. L., 1828, Zool. Thierr. 9, Dresden
- \_\_\_\_, [1863], Central-Atlas zool. Gärten Lief. 20, 21, Dresden and Leipzig
- Reitter, E., 1906, in Heyden, Reitter & Weise, Cat. Col. Eur. Caucas. Armen. (ed. 2), Paskau
- Robineau-Desvoidy, A. J. B., 1830, Mém. prés. Acad. roy. Sci. Inst. France 2 (Essai Myod.)
  - \_\_\_\_, 1847, Ann. Soc. ent. France 1847 : 283

- -, 1863, Hist. nat. Dipt. Env. Paris, 2 vols., Paris [Röding, P. F.], 1798, Museum Boltenianum 2, Hamburg Rondani, C., 1844, N. Ann. Soc. nat. Bologna (2) 2:443-459 -----, 1856, Dipt. Ital. 1, Parma Rossi, F. W., 1848, Syst. Verz. zweifl. Ins., Vienna Sabrosky. C. W., 1951, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 6:131-141 ------, 1954, ibid. 9 : 225-240 Sack, P., 1939, in Lindner, Die Fliegen, Fam. 37, Stuttgart St. Fargeau, A. L. M., & Serville, J. G. A., 1825, Ency. méth., Ins. 10(1): 1-344 \_\_\_\_, & \_\_\_\_, 1828, ibid. 10(2) : 345-832 Samouelle, G., 1819, Ent. useful Comp., London Savigny, M. J. C. L. de, 1822, Hist. nat. Egypte 1(3), Syst. Annel. (Paris, Commission d'Egypte) Say, T., 1824, in Keating, Exped. Peter River 2, Philadelphia Schiner, I. R., 1860, Wien. ent. Monatsber. 4: 208-216 -----, [1868], Reise Novara, Zool. 2, Dipt., Vienna Schioedte, J. C., (1842), Naturh. Tidsskr. 4: 279-312 Schweigger, A. F., 1820, Handb. Nat., Leipzig Scopoli, G. A., 1763, Ent. Carn., Vienna \_\_\_\_, 1777, Introd. Hist. nat., Prague Seeley, H. G., 1864, Geologist 7:44-50 Smart, J., 1944, Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (11) 11: 261-272 Staeger, C., 1839, Naturh. Tidsskr. 2:549-600 Stål, C., [1855], Öfvers. k. Vetensk.-Akad. Förhandl. 12:89-100 -----, 1861, Stettin ent. Z. 22 : 129-153 \_\_\_\_, 1862, ibid. 23 : 81–118 -----, 1863, Ann. Soc. ent. France (4) 3: 25-58 -----, 1866, Hem. Afr. 4, Stockholm -, 1867, Öfvers. k. Vetensk.-Akad. Förhandl. 24: 491-560 Stephens, J. F., 1829, Nom. brit. Ins., London Stoll, C., [1782], in Cramer, Uitl. Kapellen 4(32), Amsterdam Stone, A., 1941, Ann. ent. Soc. Amer. 34: 404-418 Strand, E., 1910, Soc. ent. Frankfurt Jahrg. 25:19 Strobl, G., 1880, XIV Progr. Ober. Gymnas. Benedict. zu Seitenstetten (Dipt. Funde Seitenstetten) Swainson, W., 1832, Zool. illustr. (2) 2, London Thienemann, A., 1916, Archiv. f. Hydrobiol. Suppl.-Bd. 2:483-554 Thorell, T., 1870, N. Acta Soc. Uppsala (3) 7(2) : no. 1 Trouessart, E. L., 1879, Rev. Mag. Zool. (3) 7:218-285 Turton, W., 1825, Zool. Journ. 2(7): 361-367 Valenciennes, A., 1837, in Cuvier & Valenciennes, Hist. nat. Poissons 12, Paris Vieillot, L. J. P., 1816, Analyse Ornith., Paris Villers, C. J. de, 1789, C. Linnaei Ent. Fn. Svec. descr. aucta 3, Leiden Wachtl, F. A., 1894, Wien. ent. Z. 13: 140-144 Walbaum, J. J., (1788)-1793, P. Artedi Renov. Ichth. (3), ed. 2, Greifswahl Walckenaer, C. A., & Gervais, F. L. P., 1847, Aptères 4 (Roret's Suite à Buffon) Walker, Francis, 1866, List. Spec. Lep. Ins. Coll. B.M. 35: 1839
- 63

Westwood, J. O., 1840, Introd. mod. Class. Ins. 2 Synopsis Gen., London Winnertz, J., 1863, Verh. zool.-bot. Ges. Wien 13 (Abh.): 637-964
Wiedemann, C. R. W., 1819, Zool. Mag. 1(3): 1-40
Williston, S. W., 1886, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus. 31
Zeller, P. G., 1850, Stettin ent. Ztg. 11: 308-313
Zetterstedt, J. W., 1837, Isis (Oken) 30: 837
\_\_\_\_\_, 1838, Ins. Lapp. Descr. (1) Leipzig
\_\_\_\_\_, 1840, ibid. (1)
\_\_\_\_\_, 1843, ibid. 2

- \_\_\_\_, 1850, ibid. 9
- \_\_\_\_, 1851, ibid. 10

Zimmermann, C., 1869, in Leconte, Trans. ent. Soc. Amer. 2:243-259

#### COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME *IDOTEA* FABRICIUS, 1798, AND MATTERS CONNECTED THEREWITH. Z.N.(S.) 412

(See Volume 17, pages 178-184.)

By Henning Lemche (Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark) It is always much easier for the few specialists in a certain group to remember changes of

anmes and to realize what recently dug-out names stand for. The difficulties in changes of generic names for reasons of priority are much more strongly felt by the general zoologists who use such names only now and then but, on the other hand, meet a much larger number of them. The name *Mesidotea*, now proposed to be suppressed for reasons of priority, is such a name which is well known by quite a large number of zoologists working in ecology and zoogeography, whereas *Saduria* is almost completely unknown.

Hence, I propose to accept the proposals of Dr. Heegaard and Dr. Holthuis as set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 17: 182-184 with the following changes:

- (1)(e) add "to suppress the generic name Saduria Adams, 1852, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy";
- (2)(e) replace by "*Mesidotea* Richardson, 1905 (gender : feminine) type-species, by designation by Heegaard and Holthuis, 1960, *Oniscus entomon* Linnaeus, 1758";
- (3)(f) replace by "entomon Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen Oniscus entomon (type-species of Mesidotea Richardson, 1905)";
- (4)(i) replace by "Saduria Adams, 1852, as suppressed under the plenary powers in (1)(e) above".



Melville, R. V. 1960. "Report on Mr. C.W. Sabrosky's proposal for the suppression under the plenary powers of the pamphlet entitled "Nouvelle classification des mouche a deux ailes" by J. W. Meigen, 1800 Z. N. (S). 191." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 18, 9–64.

View This Item Online: <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44460</u> Permalink: <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/34422</u>

Holding Institution Natural History Museum Library, London

**Sponsored by** Natural History Museum Library, London

**Copyright & Reuse** 

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder. Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature License: <u>http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/</u> Rights: <u>https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions</u>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org.

This file was generated 26 March 2024 at 12:45 UTC