I wish to comment on the application dealing with the family-group names BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] and BRACHYPTERINAE Zwick, 1973. I agree with the authors’s proposals to conserve the current spelling of the much older name BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson and to modify the later name to eliminate the homonymy.

In para. 2 of the application the authors cited Erichson (1843) for the establishment of the family name KATERETIDAE, with BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] as a subfamily within this family. It should be noted that Erichson (1843) did not include in his group ‘Cateretes’ a valid genus Kateretes (or its emendation Cateretes), but rather seems to have appropriated this generic name to be the group name; hence Erichson’s group name ‘Cateretes’ is not available (Article 11(d)). A family-group name based on Kateretes apparently was first made available by Ganglbauer (1899, p. 447; not p. 518 as cited in the application). Thus, the family name should be BRACHYPTERIDAE Erichson, [1845], with KATERETINAE Ganglbauer, 1899 as a subfamily or synonym. This situation, pointed out in two works on Coleoptera family-group names that are now in press (by J.F. Lawrence & A.F. Newton, and by J. Pakaluk et al.), makes action to conserve Ganglbauer’s (1899) KATERETIDAE a necessity. (Editorial note. A proposal to conserve the name KATERETIDAE Ganglbauer, 1899 by giving it precedence over BRACHYPTERINAE Erichson, [1845] is set out in Dr Audisio’s comment above).

Comments on the proposed conservation of Sphaerocera Latreille, 1804 and Borophaga Enderlein, 1924 (Insecta, Diptera)

(Case 2907; see BZN 51: 312–315)

(1) R.H.L. Disney

University Department of Zoology, Downing Street, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, U.K.
1. In their application Brown & Sabrosky provide (BZN 51: 313, paras. 4 and 5) an interesting and exhaustive review of the identity of *Musca subsultans* Linnaeus, 1767. Professor O.W. Richards was a specialist on the Sphaeroceridae, hence it is not surprising that he found it hard to believe that earlier authors could confuse a phorid specimen and a sphaerocerid (see para. 4 of the application). However, as a specialist on the Phoridae I can testify that the most frequent non-phorids sent to me for identification are sphaerocerids. Even distinguished entomologists have confused the two families when the rear veins of a sphaerocerid have been particularly pale.

2. The suggestion by Richards (1930) that the phorid specimen labelled as *Musca subsultans* in the collection of the Linnean Society of London may not be an original specimen is simply speculative. Richards identified it as *Phora flavimana* Meigen, 1830, but it is actually the species called *Borophaga okellyi* by Schmitz (1937); Schmitz did not examine this specimen. Like Richards, Brues (1903) confused this species with *P. flavimana*, which is a junior (by the first reviser action of Zetterstedt, 1848, p. 2886) subjective synonym of *P. femorata* Meigen, 1830 (p. 213). The valid specific name of the type species of *Borophaga* is hence *femorata*, and there is no need either to take any action concerning *flavimana* (cf. the title and abstract of the application) or to treat it as relevant to the Linnean Society specimen.

3. I support the proposed suppression of *Borborus* Meigen, 1803 (proposal (1)(a) on BZN 51: 313). However, I oppose the suppression of the specific name of *Musca subsultans* Linnaeus, 1767 (proposal (1)(b)); this is the valid name of the *Borophaga* species otherwise called *B. okellyi* Schmitz, 1937. Ecologists and ethologists do not read the BZN, and they have as their priority minimum changes to the names they find in relevant key works. The two most recent such works dealing with the European species of *Borophaga* are Disney (1983, 1991) and both employ the name *Borophaga subsultans*. The name *subsultans* should be put on the Official List of Specific Names, not be treated as in proposal (5) on BZN 51: 314.

Additional references


(2) Brian V. Brown

Entomology Section, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, 900 Exposition Boulevard, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.

I would like to reply to the above comment by Dr Disney on the application by Dr Sabrosky and myself.

The phorid *Borophaga okellyi* Schmitz, 1937 occurs not only in Europe but also in North America. This name has been in continuous use in North America. It is used in the major works (Borgmeier, 1963; Schmitz & Beyer, 1965). The species is
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