

OPINION 896

PHASIA LATREILLE, 1804, (INSECTA, DIPTERA): ADDITION TO THE OFFICIAL LIST

RULING.—(1) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Phasia* Latreille, 1804 (gender : feminine), type-species, by subsequent monotypy, *Conops subcoleoptrata* Linnaeus, 1767 (Name No. 1877);
- (b) *Ectophasia* Townsend, 1912 (gender: feminine), type-species, by original designation, *Syrphus crassipennis* Fabricius, 1794 (Name No. 1878).

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *subcoleoptrata* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the binomen *Conops subcoleoptrata* (type-species of *Phasia* Latreille, 1804) (Name No. 2342);
- (b) *crassipennis* Fabricius, 1794, as published in the binomen *Syrphus crassipennis* (type-species of *Ectophasia* Townsend, 1912) (Name No. 2343).

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1706)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Dr. B. Herting in April 1965. This application was sent to the printer on 20 May 1965 and was published on 2 November 1965 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **22** : 243–245. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **21** : 184) and to seven entomological serials.

The application was supported by Dr. L. P. Mesnil. Objections to the proposal were received from Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 9–11) and Dr. C. Dupuis (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 134–144). Further discussion by these two authors was published in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **23** : 196–197 and *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 68–69. This resulted in Herting revising his proposal (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 70–72).

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 1 September 1967 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote on Voting Paper (67)38 either for or against Herting's revised proposals as set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **24** : 71–72. That Voting Paper also carried the following note: "If a majority of Commissioners vote against these proposals, then Dupuis' proposals (*Bull.* **23** : 142), as corrected by Sabrosky (*Bull.* **24** : 68 and 69, para. 9) will be considered to be adopted."

At the close of the prescribed voting period on 1 December 1967 the state of the voting was as, follows:

Affirmative votes—seven (7), received in the following order: do Amaral, Mayr, Jaczewski, Bonnet, Alvarado, Boschma, Uchida.

Negative votes—fourteen (14); China, Lemche, Holthuis, Munroe, Simpson, Vokes, Obruchev, Sabrosky, Brinck, Binder, Ride, Mertens, Forest, Kraus.

Voting paper not returned—one (1): Hubbs.

On Leave of Absence—one (1): Evans.

Commissioner Tortonese returned a late negative vote. The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their Voting Papers:

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (16.ix.67): "Herting's latest communication continues to rest his case on certain assumptions that are unprovable and subject to speculation, but that may mislead because of his positive wording. For example, in his second paragraph, he states that 'there is also no reason to believe that the Bosc material was different from the one in Fabricius' collection.' On the contrary, I believe there is ample reason for believing that they were different: the species in Fabricius' collection (*rubra* Girschner according to Herting) is not known to occur in Sweden, whereas the Bosc material came from Sweden, the homeland of *subcoleoptrata*. Herting's fourth paragraph raises an interesting point, but again with the unprovable assumption that 'Latreille's opinion is based on the description of *subcoleoptrata* by Linné and not on comparison of material.' However, Latreille could not have derived the antennal generic characters used for his *Phasia* from the Linnean description of *Conops subcoleoptrata* nor from the descriptions of Fabricius, as a comparison of the descriptions will show; he must have used actual material. In reality, it seems highly probable that Latreille had the true *subcoleoptrata* Linnaeus (provenance Sweden) before him without realizing it, in the form of *Thereva subcoleoptrata* from Sweden in the Bosc Collection.

"The 'clear' facts concerning *Phasia* (Herting, paragraph 8) are in part based on assumptions (see above, also comments by Sabrosky and Dupuis) and hence cannot be accepted as 'clear.' Further, because designation or fixation of the type-species takes precedence over restriction, one cannot say that Robineau-Desvoidy (1830) 'restricted' the use of *Phasia* to the *crassipennis*-complex. The type-species of *Phasia* had already been fixed by Latreille as *subcoleoptrata*, and this is clear, whether one accepts it by subsequent monotypy (1805) or by designation (1810). Accordingly, Robineau-Desvoidy did not restrict *Phasia*: rather, in the presence of a valid type designation, he misapplied the name. To top the matter, he misidentified *subcoleoptrata* as well, judging from his statement that it is found throughout France."

Prof. E. Mayr (20.ix.67). "Since the nomenclatorial argument is inconclusive (though somewhat favouring Sabrosky) it is best to adopt the proposal of Herting which preserves traditional usage."

Prof. P. Brinck (23.x.67). "In spite of the numerous data provided by various specialists, there are still details which are unclear in this case, particularly so as there are no comments to Herting's revised proposal. Therefore I cannot vote for this proposal. On the other hand, if generally voted against, we are told that Dr. Dupuis' proposal, reconsidered in the light of Dr. Sabrosky's paragraph 9, will be adopted. Judging from Sabrosky's paragraph 3 this would mean a logical development since 'the type-species of *Phasia* is *subcoleoptrata* Linnaeus.' If this be accepted it would be wise to state what this Swedish

subcoleoptrata of Linnaeus really is, by, in one way or the other, stating what is the type specimen. As far as I can understand there is also inconsistency as regards the family group names. It is usual that such problems are also dealt with."

After the close of the Voting period, Dr. Herting submitted a further comment on this case, purporting to show that Latreille in 1809 (*Genera Crustacearum et Insectorum* 4:345) had made deliberate use of Fabricius's misidentification of *Conops subcoleoptrata* Linné, thereby establishing a new nominal species *Thereva subcoleoptrata* Fabricius, 1794, in the terms of Article 70b. According to this argument, Article 70a (misidentified type-species) would no longer apply. This action of Latreille's in 1809, however, does not affect the result of what he did in 1805 which was, under the Rules, to designate *Conops subcoleoptrata* Linné, 1758, as type-species of *Phasia* Latreille, 1804. Dr. Herting's comment is published here out of courtesy to him, but it has no effect on the decision reached by the Commission using its ordinary powers.

Where is the type material of those insects which Fabricius described from the
Bosc Collections?

Benno Herting

(European Station, Commonwealth Institute of Biological Control, Delémont,
Switzerland)

Fabricius described many insect species with a reference to "Mus. Dom. Bosc". This has led several authors (e.g. Sabrosky and Dupuis in the controversy over the use of the genus name *Phasia*) to the conclusion that the material of these species in Fabricius' collection should not be considered as typical. The types must have been "in the Bosc collection at Paris".

The life and scientific work of Bosc was reviewed by Cuvier 1829 (Eloge historique de M. Bosc, *Mém. Mus. Hist. nat. Paris* 18:69-92). Cuvier says about Bosc's relations to Fabricius on p. 74: "... il n'apprit qu'en 1782, lorsque Broussonet revint d'Angleterre, l'existence des ouvrages de Fabricius. Le *Systema entomologicum*, ce livre qui a fait une si grande révolution dans l'histoire des insectes, était imprimé depuis sept ans, et personne encore à Paris n'en avait entendu parler. Bientôt M. Bosc fit la connaissance de Fabricius lui-même, et cet excellent homme a été jusqu'à sa mort son ami dévoué. Il a décrit dans sa collection les plus intéressants de ses insectes, et il le cite à chaque page de ses écrits. M. Bosc lui abandonnait, en effet toutes ses collections; et ce qu'il a fait pour Fabricius, il l'a fait pour une multitude d'autres; personne n'a été plus communicatif."

When Bosc returned from the United States in 1800 (p. 82): "... il se vit en état d'apporter des matériaux à tous les naturalistes de l'Europe. En effet, toujours également généreux, s'il avait des insectes nouveaux, c'était pour son ami Fabricius ou pour Olivier; des poissons, il les donnait à Lacépède; des oiseaux, à Daudin; des reptiles, à M. Latreille. Quiconque travaillait sur quelque branche que ce fût de l'histoire naturelle, était sûr d'obtenir de M. Bosc tout ce qu'il possédait."

In his later years Bosc worked mainly as a botanist. He had collected many kinds of animals, but he did not keep the material for himself. When Fabricius

cites "Mus. Dom. Bosc", he refers to material that he obtained from Bosc. The types, if preserved, should therefore be located in the collection of Fabricius.

What Meigen (1824, p. 186) saw in Fabricius' collection under the name *Thereva subcoleoptrata*, was therefore very likely the Bosc material to which Fabricius refers in his description, and we have to accept Meigen's statement as valid information on the type-species of *Phasia* Latreille (for details see volume 22, pages 243-245, paragraphs 4-6, and volume 23, page 196, paragraph 7). Latreille who designated this type-species considered it as different from *Conops subcoleoptrata* Linné. He says in his *Genera Crustacearum et Insectorum*, volume 4 (1809), page 345: "*Conops subcoleoptratus* Linnaei congener, sed a *T. subcoleoptrata* Fabricii diversus videtur, ut indicant haec Linnaei verba . . ." His opinion was based on descriptions only, but he was right. He thus made a deliberate use of a misidentification, which is valid under the Rules (Art. 70b of the Code) and does not require an action by the Commission.

My proposal for designation of a type-species for *Phasia* Latreille under the plenary powers was based on Art. 70a of the Code (misidentified type-species) which, however, does not apply to the present case. The *Thereva subcoleoptrata* in Fabricius' collection is now to be considered as typical, which removes the doubt about the identity of the type-species of *Phasia*. I therefore withdraw my request for action by the Commission because the use of its plenary powers has become unnecessary.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on the Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

crassipennis, *Syrphus*, Fabricius, 1794, *Ent. Syst.* 4 : 284

Ectophasia Townsend, 1912, *Proc. ent. Soc. Wash.* 14 : 45

Phasia Latreille, 1804, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* 15 : 122

subcoleoptrata, *Conops*, Linnaeus, 1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) 1 : 1006.

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (67)38 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper as the original proposal for the use of the plenary powers has not been adopted, but that the alternative proposal has been adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 896.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

W. E. CHINA
Assistant Secretary

London

8 May 1969



International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1970. "Opinion 896. Phasia Latreille, 1804 (Insecta, Diptera): addition to the official list." *The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 26, 196–199.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44468>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/9895>

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>.