

OPINION 1827

Hydrophoria* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (Insecta, Diptera): *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] designated as the type species, and a neotype designated for *M. lancifer

Keywords. Nomenclature; taxonomy; Diptera; *Hydrophoria*; *Hydrophoria lancifer*.

Ruling

- (1) Under the plenary powers:
 - (a) all previous fixations of type specimens for the nominal species *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] are hereby set aside and the male specimen labelled 'England, Surrey: Bookham Common, Broadway North, 25.x.1969, A.C. & B. Pont' in the Department of Entomology, The Natural History Museum, London, is designated as the neotype;
 - (b) all previous fixations of type species for the nominal genus *Hydrophoria* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 are hereby set aside and *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] is designated as the type species.
- (2) The name *Hydrophoria* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 (gender: feminine), type species by designation under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780], is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.
- (3) The name *lancifer* Harris, [1780], as published in the binomen *Musca lancifer* and as defined by the neotype designated in (1)(a) above (specific name of the type species of *Hydrophoria* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830), is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

History of Case 2858

An application for the designation of *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] as the type species of *Hydrophoria* Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 was received from Dr Graham C.D. Griffiths (*University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*) on 21 July 1992. After correspondence the case was published in BZN 51: 28–30 (March 1994). Notice of the case was sent to appropriate journals.

Comments in support from Dr Curtis W. Sabrosky (*Medford, New Jersey, U.S.A.*) and from Dr Roger W. Crosskey (*The Natural History Museum, London, U.K.*) were published in BZN 51: 258–259 (September 1994). Dr Crosskey supported the designation of *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] as the type species of *Hydrophoria* but noted that it was highly desirable to define the meaning of the name *lancifer* by a neotype. A specimen in the Natural History Museum, London, was proposed as the neotype by Mr D.M. Ackland (*clo The University Museum, Oxford, U.K.*) and the author of the application (BZN 52: 74; March 1995).

Musca lancifer was described and illustrated on p. 126, pl. 36, fig. 59 by Harris, [1780]. It was noted on the voting paper that the title page of Harris's *An exposition of English insects* is dated 1776 and a number of papers and catalogues have cited the work with this date. However, Pont & Michelsen (1982), following others, suggested that the work was published in five parts, each with 10 plates and corresponding text.

and (p. 26) set out the date for each part. Part 4, comprising pages 100–138 and plates 31–40, was given as ‘?1780’.

Decision of the Commission

On 1 September 1995 the members of the Commission were invited to vote on the proposals published in BZN 51: 29–30 and 52: 74. At the close of the voting period on 1 December 1995 the votes were as follows:

Affirmative votes — 23: Bayer, Bock, Bouchet, Cocks, Corliss, Hahn, Halvorsen, Heppell, Holthuis, Kabata, Kraus, Lehtinen, Macpherson, Mahnert, Martins de Souza, Minelli, Nielsen, Nye, Savage, Schuster, Starobogatov, Štys, Trjapitzin

Negative votes — 2: Cogger and Dupuis.

No votes were received from Ride and Uéno.

Cogger commented: ‘While the purpose of the application is to maintain the long-standing sense of *Anthomyia conica* Wiedemann, 1817 as the type species of *Hydrophoria*, it is proposed to designate as type a senior subjective synonym (*Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780]). Should this synonymy be rejected by later workers on taxonomic grounds then the intention of the application would be overturned. This problem could be avoided either by using the plenary powers to designate *A. conica* as the type species of *Hydrophoria* or, if there is some special advantage (of which I am unaware) in having *Musca lancifer* as the type, then it would be better to designate the type specimen of *A. conica* in Vienna (noted by Ackland & Griffiths in BZN 52: 74) as the neotype of *M. lancifer*, rather than the specimen in London proposed by Ackland & Griffiths, so that *A. conica* becomes a junior objective synonym of *M. lancifer*. Dupuis commented: ‘The concept of *Hydrophoria*, established since the time of Macquart (1835), Duponchel (1845) and Rondani (1866), as typified by *Anthomyia conica* Wiedemann, 1817, lasted 147 years. The synonymy of *Musca lancifer* Harris, [1780] with *A. conica* is a mere 13 years old (Pont & Michelson, 1982) and only ‘most probable’, hence the desirability of a neotype claimed by Crosskey (BZN 51: 258–259). I think this neotype unnecessary. In my view *A. conica* should be chosen as the type species and *M. lancifer* should be placed on the Official Index’.

Original references

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

Hydrophoria Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, *Mémoires présentés par divers savants à l'Académie Royale des Sciences de l'Institut de France*, (2)2: 503.

lancifer, *Musca*, Harris, [1780], *An exposition of English insects*, part 4, p. 126.