

Commission be designating if it accedes to Griffiths's request? For such nondescript flies as ANTHOMYIIDAE the ancient illustrations of Harris are hardly up to the needs of modern taxonomy, and Pont & Michelsen themselves seem not to have been overly convinced that *lancifer* should be treated as a senior synonym of *conica*, writing 'We think that this [*lancifer*] is most probably *Hydrophoria conica* ...'. In such woolly circumstances it is unhelpful (in fact most unwise) of Griffiths to ignore the type specimen situation. There is clearly need here, while the type species muddle is sorted, for a neotype to be designated for *lancifer* Harris: only this will ensure proper understanding of the species concerned and make for the needed future stability. The Commission's approval of the designation of *lancifer* Harris as type species of *Hydrophoria* should be contingent upon revision of the case so that it deals with this important point. A neotype specimen should be designated and such designation (part-and-parcel of the application) approved by Commission action. A suitably selected neotype would uphold the synonymy of *conica* with *lancifer* that has begun to be accepted over the past few years. (A type specimen probably exists for *conica* Wiedemann, and evidence could helpfully be presented simultaneously that this is conspecific with the *lancifer* neotype: the specific names should then both go on the appropriate list). I recommend that the Commission rejects the application as formulated, but acts as Griffiths suggests once the type specimen question has been properly presented.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Sicus* Scopoli, 1763 and *Myopa* Fabricius, 1775 by the designation of *Conops buccata* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species of *Myopa* (Insecta, Diptera), and on the proposed rejection of *Coenomyia* Latreille, 1796

(Case 2881; see BZN 51: 31–34)

(1) Curtis W. Sabrosky

205 Medford Leas, Medford, New Jersey 08055, U.S.A.

I support and applaud the application to resolve the difficulty concerning *Sicus* Scopoli, 1763 and *Myopa* Fabricius, 1775. This is a useful clarification of confusion in the family CONOPIDAE.

The type species of *Sicus* is widely accepted as *Conops ferruginea* Linnaeus, 1761 but an objective examination could lead to another conclusion. *Sicus* was based on two nominal species, *S. ferrugineus* and *S. buccatus*. There is no problem with the authorship of the second species, under which was cited reference to *C. buccata* Linnaeus, 1758; the latter has long been accepted as the type species of *Myopa* Fabricius, 1775. However, there is no citation under *S. ferrugineus*, and to all appearances this is a new species *S. ferrugineus* Scopoli, 1763, rather than a simple oversight of a citation. Nevertheless, almost all authors have regularly interpreted this *ferrugineus* as *Conops ferruginea* Linnaeus, 1761 and have cited the Linnaean nominal species as the type species of *Sicus* (see, for example, Coquillett, 1910, and the three modern regional catalogs of Camras, 1965, Smith, 1975, p. 384 and Majer, 1988, p. 32, where there is no mention of *ferrugineus* Scopoli; para. 1 of the application). Bezzi (1907, p. 271) listed Scopoli's species, although as a synonym of

ferrugineus Linnaeus. The descriptions of *ferrugineus* in Scopoli and Linnaeus are slightly but not impossibly different. If the Scopoli species were considered to be *S. ferrugineus* Scopoli, this could be designated as the type species of *Sicus* and then recognized as a junior synonym (and a junior secondary homonym) of *C. ferrugineus* Linnaeus.

The name *Coenomyia* Latreille, 1796 has no place in the *Sicus-Myopa* problem in the CONOPIDAE. It is part of the confusion arising from the usage of the name *Sicus* in three different families of Diptera (para. 6 of the application). *Coenomyia* is an important name in its own right and should not be rejected (cf. paras. 4 and 6 of the application). The '*Sicus ferrugineus* F.' referred to by Latreille (1802), which is the type species of *Coenomyia* by subsequent monotypy, was *Musca ferruginea* Scopoli, 1763 (cf. James, 1965, p. 296; Webb, 1983, pp. 653–664; Majer, 1988, p. 32; Thompson & Pont, 1993, p. 75). *Coenomyia ferruginea* (Scopoli) has a widespread Holarctic distribution. It was long placed in its own family COENOMYIIDAE, but has been combined recently with the XYLOPHAGIDAE.

A type designation for *Sicus* Fabricius, 1798 (said in para. 6 of the application to be unknown) was made by myself (Sabrosky, 1961; BZN 18: 228) in a report on Meigen's (1800) work. The type is *Musca ferruginea* Scopoli, 1763, rendering *Sicus* Fabricius a junior objective synonym of *Coenomyia* Latreille, as well as being a junior homonym of *Sicus* Scopoli.

Additional references

- Bezzi, M. 1907. Conopidae. In Becker, T. et al. (Eds.), *Katalog der paläarktischen Dipteren*, vol. 3. 828 pp.
- James, M.T. 1965. Family Xylophagidae. Pp. 296–298 in Stone, A. et al. (Eds.), *A catalog of the Diptera of America north of Mexico*. Agricultural Handbook No. 276. iv, 1696 pp. United States Department of Agriculture, Washington.
- Majer, J. 1988. Family Coenomyiidae. Pp. 31–34 in Soós, A. & Papp, L. (Eds.), *Catalogue of Palaearctic Diptera*, vol. 5. 446 pp. Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Smith, K.G.V. 1975. Family Conopidae. Pp. 375–386 in Delfinado, M.D. & Hardy, D.E. (Eds.), *A catalog of the Diptera of the Oriental Region*, vol. 2. 459 pp. University Press of Hawaii, Honolulu.
- Thompson, F.C. & Pont, A.C. 1993. *Systematic database of Musca names*. 219, 2 pp. Koeltz Scientific Books, Koenigstein.
- Webb, D.W. 1983. The genus *Coenomyia* (Diptera: Coenomyiidae) in the Nearctic Region and notes on generic placement. *Proceedings of the Entomological Society of Washington*, 85: 653–664.

(2) Terry A. Wheeler

Department of Environmental Biology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada
N1G 2W1

I support the application by Camras for the conservation of *Myopa* Fabricius, 1775 and *Sicus* Scopoli, 1763 as currently recognized. However, I disagree with the proposal to place *Coenomyia* Latreille, 1796 on the Official Index as a junior objective synonym of *Sicus* Scopoli, 1763. *Coenomyia* is currently in widespread use and is the type genus of the family COENOMYIIDAE; rejection of the generic name would cause unnecessary confusion in the nomenclature of the Diptera. The proposal is based on the erroneous assumption that *Coenomyia* and *Sicus* Scopoli have the same type species.



Sabrosky, Curtis W. 1994. "Comments On The Proposed Conservation Of *Sicus Scopoli*, 1763 And *Myopa Fabricius*, 1775 By The Designation Of *Conops Buccata* Linnaeus, 1758 As The Type Species Of *Myopa* (Insecta, Diptera), And On The Proposed Rejection Of *Coenomyia* Latreille, 1796." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 51, 259–260. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.7210>.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44552>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.part.7210>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/7210>

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: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

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>.