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Editorial

Systema Dipterorum, the database that maintains the names of all Diptera worldwide (Evenhuis & Pape 2021), enters only published information into its records. However, there are many instances when a novel nomenclatural act is need for proper treatment of names (e.g., multiple original spellings requiring First Reviser action, preoccupied names, genus-group names lacking a type species designation, genus-group names lacking included species, etc.).

Often, this is taken care of in subsequent articles, revisionary studies, etc. This makes sense for nomenclatural acts that are taxonomically significant and may require study of a number of taxa involved before an act can be proposed. However, other nomenclatural actions we feel can be proposed outside of the taxonomic realm and proposed separately or with very succinct justification*.

As such, we offer here a new series, Systema Dipterorum Nomenclatural Notes, as a medium for specialists to publish short notes that help fix names and nominal taxa by First Reviser actions, new replacement names, designating types, proposing new junior synonyms, etc. Any worker wishing to submit articles should contact the editors for further information. All submitted manuscripts undergo peer-review. All nomenclatural acts made in this series are registered with ZooBank.

–Neal L. Evenhuis (NealE@ bishopmuseum.org)
Thomas Pape (TPape@ snm.ku.dk),
Editors
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*We understand that this has been done by some non-specialists in the case of new replacement names for homonymous genus-group names and, although such action is not disallowed by the ICZN Code (1999), we do not condone this and prefer that these actions be done by qualified workers who understand the taxonomy and/or nomenclature of the group in question.
A new replacement name for *Scrobicula* Matile, 1970
(Diptera: Keroplatidae)

**NEAL L. EVENHUIS**

*Bishop Museum, 1525 Bernice Street, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96817-2704, USA; email: neale@bishop-museum.org*


**INTRODUCTION**

Matile (1970: 782) proposed the nominal subgenus *Scrobicula* of the keroplatid genus *Heteropterna* Skuse, 1888 with the type species *Heteropterna balachowskyi* Matile, 1970, by original designation. The name *Scrobicula* is preoccupied by *Scrobicula* Posner, 1952 for an ostracod. The keroplatid subgenus *Scrobicula* is in current use and there are no available junior synonyms of it, so a new name is needed to replace it.

Earlier, Doweld (2016) noted the need for a replacement name and proposed the name *Matilea*. However, the publication in which Doweld’s new replacement name appeared was electronic-only and does not comply with the ICZN Code for electronic-published works because it was not registered in ZooBank prior to publication, and evidence of registration was not included within the work itself. The publication was registered in ZooBank in January 2017 (two months after the article was published), and the registration does not indicate an intended archive. Printed copies are available on-demand only.

In order to alleviate the situation and give credit to Doweld for the new replacement name, the name *Matilea* is proposed here again as a new replacement name for *Scrobicula* Matile, 1970 with Doweld as author.

**Genus Heteropterna Skuse, 1888**

**Subgenus Matilea Doweld, *nom. nov.***


Unavailable name; published in an electronic format that is not compliant with the ICZN Code.
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Nomenclatural and Taxonomic Notes on Dolichopodidae
Genus-Group Names (Insecta: Diptera)

NEAL L. EVENHUIS
Bishop Museum, 1525 Bernice Street, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96817-2704, USA; email: neale@bishop-museum.org

DANIEL J. BICKEL
Australian Museum, 6 College Street, Sydney, NSW 2010, Australia; email: can.bickel@austmus.gov.au

Abstract. Ceratopos Vaillant is proposed as a junior synonym of Syntornon Loew, 1857, syn. nov.; Hydrochus longicornis Fallén, 1823 (Dolichopodidae) is designated as type species of Hydrochus Fallén, 1823, making it a junior synonym of Rhaphium Meigen, 1803, syn. nov. Leptopus wiedemanni Fallén, 1823 is designated as type species of Leptopus Fallén, 1823, keeping it as a junior synonym of Sciapus Zeller, 1842. The dolichopodid genus Thinophilus is found to date from Wahlberg (1844). The genus Wangia Hong, 2002 (Dolichopodidae) is preoccupied and Fushuniregis Evenhuis nom. nov. is proposed to replace it.

INTRODUCTION
In maintaining and updating the Systema Dipterorum (Evenhuis & Pape 2021) by the first author, a number of dolichopodid genera were noted to need nomenclatural attention. Coincidentally with the idea of doing this list, manuscript notes on Palaearctic Dolichopodidae made by the late C.E. “Peter” Dyte became available. Since his notes are 25 years old, many problems he noted have already been rectified elsewhere in subsequent publications. We here deal with some of the remaining, crediting Dyte where we follow his suggestions, as well as some more recent situations that have come to our attention.

[Cachonopus] Vaillant, 1953

Cachonopus Vaillant, 1953: 277.

Dyte (MS notes) noticed that the nominal genus Cachonopus Vaillant, 1953 was proposed with two included species but without a type designation, and he intended to propose one. However, because Cachonopus was proposed after 1930 without a type designation it is an unavailable name (Code Art. 67.4.1). Evenhuis et al. (2008) dealt with this name in their list of genera proposed after 1930 without type designations. Their remarks are repeated here.
Vaillant (1953) proposed *Cachonopus* based on two newly described species (*C. aereus* Vaillant and *C. limosorum* Vaillant) without designating a type. Negrobov (1991) listed both species (incorrectly giving “Conchopus” as the original genus for *limosorum*) but failed to list the genus-group name. Yang et al. (2006) apparently did not examine the original description and simply repeated Negrobov’s errors in their world catalog. *Cachonopus aereus* is currently treated in the genus *Chrysotimus* Loew, 1857; *C. limosorum* is currently treated in the genus *Micromorphus* Mik, 1878. Negrobov et al. (2007) realized that *Cachonopus* did not have a type species and designated *C. limosorum*, placed the genus in synonymy with *Micromorphus*, and ironically claimed that it was Yang et al. (2006) who had made a “misprint” in treating *limosorum* as originally in “Conchopus”! However, because Negrobov et al. (2007) treated *Cachonopus* as a junior synonym and failed to denote the genus *Cachonopus* as “new” [required by ICZN (1999) Article 16.1], *Cachonopus* remains a nomen nudum.

*Ceratopos Vaillant* [C.E. Dyte’s notes]


The following are Dyte’s words from his MS notes (clarifications are in square brackets [ ]), which we follow but give Dyte credit.

“Vaillant (1952) erected *Ceratopos* for a single species, *C. seguyi* Vaillant, from Algeria, which is described from material of both sexes in the same paper. He stated that the genus was related to *Syntormon* Loew but differed in having the eyes contiguous on the face in the male, a lamella at the apex of the male arista, and the hind crossvein meeting vein 5 at an angle of less than 60 degrees compared to over 80 degrees in *Syntormon*. None of these characters justify a distinct genus. A narrow face occurs in the males of for example *S. bicolorellum*, and several species from the Afrotropical region, e.g., *S. longipes* Parent, are described as having the male eyes contiguous on the face. A lamella, or rather two lamellae, occur on the male arista of *S. boninense* Bickel and an inclined hind crossvein is present in *S. luteicorne* Par[ent]. Indeed, it is quite possible that Vaillant’s species *C. seguyi* is identical with *S. luteicorne*. This last species is known only in the female sex, as recent reports of males have been shown to arise from misidentified specimens of *Syntormon bicolorellum* (Zett[erstedt]) (Speight, et al. 1995).

*Ceratopos* Vaillant, 1952 is therefore considered to be a junior subjective synonym of *Syntormon* Loew, 1857, *syn. nov*.

*Hydrochus* Fallén

*Hydrochus* Fallén, 1823a: 5. Type species: *Hydrochus longicornis* Fallén, 1823, by present designation.

*Hydrochus* was proposed by Fallén (1823: 5) based on four originally included species: *Hydrochus laticornis* Fallén, 1823, *H. longicornis* Fallén, 1823, *H. nasutus* Fallén, 1823, and *H. tarsatus* Fallén, 1823; but without a type designation. To settle the typification of the genus (currently unplaced), we here designate *Hydrochus longicornis* Fallén, 1823 as type species. Currently, *Hydrochus longicornis* is treated in the genus *Rhaphium* Meigen,
1803 [teste Grichanov, 2017], which makes Hydrochus Fallén, 1823 a junior synonym of Rhaphium Meigen, 1803, syn. nov. The name is preoccupied by Leach, 1817 (in Coleoptera). The current fixation of a type species here avoids a new replacement name being unnecessarily proposed by any future worker.

Lasiargyra Mik

*Lasiargyra* Mik, 1878: 5. Type species: *Musca diaphana* Fabricius, 1775, by subsequent designation (Coquillett, 1910: 557).

As Dyte (MS notes) noted, this name was incorrectly listed the Palearctic Catalog (Negrobov, 1991) as unavailable; and Dyte intended to select what he he thought was the first included species as type species. Yang et al. (2006) omitted the name from their world catalog and Sinclair et al. (2008), no doubt following Negrobov (1991), incorrectly listed it as unavailable. *Lasiargyra* was proposed by Mik (1878) with characters to differentiate it but without included species. Kowarz (1882) was the first to include two species (*Musca diaphana* Fabricius, 1775 and *Argyra loewii* Kowarz, 1879). Coquillett (1910: 557) chose *Musca diaphana* Fabricius, 1775 as the type species. Germann et al. (2011) did a molecular analysis of *Argyra* species and were equivocal as to the placement of *A. diaphana* (Fabricius, 1775), showing that it is most likely to be to be placed outside of *Argyra* s. str. They suggested a broader species sample to better ascertain its status. Until then, we keep *Lasiargyra* Mik, 1878 as a junior synonym of *Argyra* Macquart, 1834.

Leptopus Fallén


*Leptopus* was proposed by Fallén (1823: 23) for two originally included species: *Leptopus wiedemanni* Fallén, 1823 and *L. longulus* Fallén, 1823; without a type designation. As *Leptopus* is preoccupied by *Leptopus* Latreille, 1809, it would need a substitute name if found to represent a separate genus. However, both included species have been treated for many years within *Sciapus* Zeller, 1842, so a type species has been ignored. To settle the typification of the genus and keep the synonymy with *Sciapus*, we propose *Leptopus wiedemanni* Fallén, 1823 as type species. *Leptopus wiedemanni* is currently treated as a valid species in *Sciapus* Zeller, 1842 [teste Grichanov (2017: 465)].

Leptopus Haliday


Dyte listed this genus among his notes because it was omitted from the Palearctic catalogue (Negrobov 1991) and he thought a type species was needed for it, but that was in error. Coquillett (1910) had designated a type species for it.

Haliday (1832: 358) proposed *Leptopus* as a subgenus of *Medetera* Fisher von Waldheim and included two species: *Dolichopus tenellus* Wiedemann, 1817 and
Medeterus ornatus Haliday, 1832. Leptopus Haliday, 1832 is preoccupied by Leptopus Latreille, 1809 and Leptopus Fallén, 1823; thus, if found to represent a separate genus, would need a new replacement name. No type designation was designated in the original work, and Coquillett (1910: 560) subsequently designated Medeterus ornatus Haliday, 1832. The latter is currently treated as a valid species in Xanthochlorus Loew, 1857 [teste Grichanov (2017: 469)], which keeps Leptopus Haliday, 1832 as a junior synonym of Xanthochlorus Loew, 1857 [teste Grichanov (2017: 32)] and precludes the need for a new replacement name.

**Thinophilus Wahlberg**

*Thinophilus* Wahlberg, 1844: 37. Type species: *Rhaphium flavipalpe* Zetterstedt, 1843, by monotypy.

*Thinophilus*: Wahlberg in Schiødte, 1844: 44 (subsequent usage).

Two publications in 1844 are involved in the proposal of the new genus *Thinophilus*. One in the Swedish journal *Öfversigt af Kongliga Vetenskaps Akademiens Forhandlingar* (Wahlberg 1844) and the other in Schiødte (1844). Bibliographic research was conducted here to determine which of the two has priority.

Swedish dipterist Pehr Fredrik Wahlberg (1800–1877) made observations on a distinctive dolichopodid fly and proposed the name *Thinophilus* for it. He presented his notes to Schiødte’s Danish natural history society at the meeting of 28 May 1843 and the following year submitted his notes at the 20 March 1844 meeting of the Swedish Science Academy.

Schiødte was secretary of his society and editor of its journal and in 1844 he published the minutes of the 1843 meetings that included Wahlberg’s observations and descriptions of *Thinophilus*. Schiødte (1844) has been found in this study to date at least from 21 August 1844 and probably much earlier.

The Swedish journal was issued in 9–10 parts per year. Its dates of issuance were researched and it was found that each issue came out roughly two months after the date of the meeting (which was printed on the first page of each issue). The issue in which *Thinophilus* appeared was thus most probably issued in May 1844, which is before the issuance of Schiødte (1844) and thus takes priority over it.

Although moot, since Wahlberg (1844) takes priority, we also researched the authorship on the Schiødte work in case it would have had priority over the Swedish journal. As Schiødte was clearly recording the presented notes of Wahlberg, the authorship of the genus-group name in Schiødte (1844) is Wahlberg. The fact the descriptive characters in Schiødte’s article are in Swedish (Wahlberg’s language) and not Danish (Schiødte’s language) provides further support that Wahlberg is the author of *Thinophilus* in Schiødte’s (1844) article.

---

1. Dated from a local (Danish) school program that recorded donations to their library. The date of the school program (21 August) is the date of the first day of the program when it was handed out to guests and participants.
Wangia Hong


SUMMARY OF NOMENCLATURAL DECISIONS PRESENTED HERE


Fushuniregis Evenhuis, nom. nov. (new replacement name for Wangia Hong, 2002). Type species: Septocellula trichopoda Hong, 1981, automatic.


Hydrochus Fallén, 1823a: 5. Type species: Hydrochus longicornis Fallén, 1823, by present designation, syn. nov.


Sciapus Zeller, 1842: 831. Type species: Dolichopus platypterus Fabricius, 1805, automatic.

Leptopus Fallén, 1823b: 23. Type species: Leptopus wiedemanni Fallén, 1823, by present designation.

Syntormon Loew, 1857: 35. Type species: Rhaphium metathesis Loew, 1850, by subsequent designation (Coquillett, 1910: 611).

Ceratopos Vaillant, 1952: 36. Type species: Ceratopos seguyi Vaillant, 1953, by monotypy, syn. nov.

Thinophilus Wahlberg, 1844: 37. Type species: Rhaphium flavipalpe Zetterstedt, 1843, by monotypy.

Thinophilus: Wahlberg in Schiødte, 1844: 44 (subsequent usage).

Xanthochlorus Loew, 1857: 42. Type species: Medeterus ornatus Haliday, 1932, by subsequent designation (Coquillett, 1910: 620).

Leptopus Haliday, 1832: 358 (as subgenus of Medetera Fischer von Waldheim). Type species: Medeterus ornatus Haliday, 1832, by subsequent designation (Coquillett 1910: 560).
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First Reviser actions for multiple original spellings of species-group names in Tabanidae, Mydidae, Dolichopodidae, Syrphidae, and Phoridae (Diptera)

NEAL L. EVENHUIS
J. Linsley Gressitt Center for Entomological Research, Bernice Pauahi Bishop Museum, 1525 Bernice Street, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96817, USA; email: neale@bishopmuseum.org

Abstract. First Reviser actions determining correct original spellings are given for multiple original spellings of species-group names in Tabanidae (4), Mydidae (1), Dolichopodidae (3), Syrphidae (1), and Phoridae (1).

A number of multiple original spellings were discovered, for which an extensive search of the literature did not reveal any First Reviser actions under Article 24.2.3 or 24.2.4 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999), and the relevant actions are therefore provided here. First Reviser actions via Article 24.2.4 are easily left unnoticed, and I take this opportunity to explain two such actions below.

TABANIDAE

Agelanius philippii Rondani

Rondani (1863) described a nominal species of tabanid from Chile as Agelanius philippii (p. 80). However, the name was also spelled as philippii in the same paper (p. 93). Acting as First Reviser, I select philippii as the correct original spelling as a single terminal “i” would be grammatically incorrect.

Remarks: The species appears to be named in honour of the German-Chilean paleontologist and zoologist Rodolfo Amando Philippi (1808–1904).

Tabanus gonghaiensis Xu

Xu (1979) described a nominal species of tabanid from China as Tabanus gonghaiensis (p. 45). However, the name was also spelled as goinghaiensis (p. 46, fig. 10) in the same paper. Acting as First Reviser, I select gonghaiensis as the correct original spelling.

Remarks: The species is named for its type locality Gonghai, which is in the Chinese province of Heilongjiang.

Tabanus paraflavimarginatus Xu & Sun

Xu & Sun (2008) described a nominal species of tabanid from Hainan, China as Tabanus paraflavimarginatus (p. 98). However, the name of the species is also spelled in the abstract of the same paper as “paramarginatus” (p. 96). Acting as First Reviser, I select paraflavimarginatus as the correct original spelling.

Remarks. It is clear from the work that paraflavimarginatus was the intended spelling of the species and it is in current use (Zhang & Yang 2018).
Veprius presbiter Rondani

Rondani (1863) described a nominal species of tabanid from Chile as *Veprius presbiter* (p. 84). However, the name is also spelled “presliter” in the index of the same paper (p. 98). Acting as First Reviser, I select *presbiter* as the correct original spelling.

**Remarks:** The name is most likely derived from the Greek presbyteros [πρεσβύτερος, the comparative form of πρέσβυς (presbys), “old man”], meaning elder or senior and used as an honorific title for Christian clergy.

MYDIDAE

*Mydas cubanus* Curran

Curran (1951) described a nominal species of mydid from Cuba as *Mydas cubana* (p. 3). However, the name is also spelled as “cubensis” in the key to species in the same paper (p. 2). Acting as First Reviser, I select *cubana* as the correct original spelling. The nominal species is currently treated as *Baliomydas cubana* (Curran, 1951) [*teste* Perez-Gelabert 2006: 35].

**Remarks:** Both original spellings would be fully acceptable but I am here following prevailing usage.

DOLICHOPODIDAE

*Chrysotus thornpenis* Liu, Wang & Yang

Liu, Wang & Yang (2015) described a nominal species of dolichopodid from Shanxi, China as *Chrysotus thornpenis* (pp. 86, 87, 91). However, the species is also spelled as “thornpennis” (p. 89) in the description heading of the same paper. Acting as First Reviser, I select *thornpenis* as the correct original spelling.

**Remarks:** According to the etymology “phallus with spines”, “thornpennis” was the intended spelling. A name spelled “thornpennis” would mean “wing with spines”.

*Condylostylus leigongshangus* Wei & Yang

Wei & Yang (2007) described a nominal species of dolichopodid from Guizhou, China as *Condylostylus leigongshangus* (p. 563). However, the species is also spelled as *legiongshanus* (p. 564) in the same paper. Acting as First Reviser, I select *leigongshangus* as the correct original spelling.

**Remarks:** The species is named for its type locality Leigongshan, which is in the Chinese province of Guizhou and the subject of the published survey.

*Paraclius amphiateratus* Capellari & Amorim

Capellari & Amorim (2009) described a nominal species of dolichopodid from Pernambuco, Brazil as *Paraclius amphiateratus* (p. 52). However, the name is also spelled as “amphiateratus” (p. 60) in the same paper. Acting as First Reviser under Article 24.2.4 (by being an author of multiple original spellings and, in a subsequent work, using only one of the original spellings), Capellari (2013: 296) deemed *amphiateratus* to be the correct original spelling.
SYRPHIDAE

Callicera spinolae Rondani

Rondani (1844) described a nominal species of syrphid from Italy as Callicera spinolae (p. 63, 65, 66). However, the species is also spelled as “spinoloe” (pp. 64, 65) in the same paper. Via Article 24.2.4, Rondani (1857: 209), was found here to act as First Reviser and deemed spinolae as the correct original spelling.

Remarks: The spelling spinolae is most likely an honorific for Massimiliano Spinola (1780–1857) and is the spelling in current use (e.g., Sforzi & Sommaggio 2021).

PHORIDAE

Dohrniphora calvata Solórzano-Kraemer & Brown

Solórzano-Kraemer & Brown (2018) described a nominal species of fossil phorid from Dominican amber as Dohrniphora calvata (p. 15). However, in the same paper in the figure legend, the species is spelled as “calvitii” (p. 15). Acting as First Reviser, I select calvata as the correct original spelling.

Remarks: It is clear from the etymology that calvata was the intended spelling for this species.
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Abstract. A study of the genus-group names proposed by Hermann Loew has shown that five of them are currently without designated type species: Allophyla Loew, 1862 (Heleomyzidae), Dasyllis Loew, 1851 (Asilidae), Eccoptomera Loew, 1862 (Heleomyzidae), Epicausta Loew, 1862 (Platystomatidae), and Hemilea Loew, 1861 (Tephritidae). Type species are herein designated for each genus-group name to fix their nomenclatural and taxonomic status.

Key words: Nomenclature, taxonomy, Heleomyzidae, Asilidae, Platystomatidae, Tephritidae

INTRODUCTION

As part of an ongoing series of studies on genus-group names of older authors (see e.g., Evenhuis & Pape 2019), research into the genus-group names of Hermann Loew is being conducted. During that research, it was found that five names proposed by Loew are without a type species fixation. For some, an earlier work was found that made the name available but without type fixation, and for the others the current type species was not originally included and therefore not eligible. These five nominal genus-group names are listed here, and type species designated for each.

TYPE-SPECIES DESIGNATIONS

The format of presentation of each name follows that of Evenhuis & Pape (2019) so as to give complete data on originally included species, type species, current status, family, and remarks explaining the typification of each name. Dates and pages within square brackets [ ] in a header for a genus-group name are subsequent papers by the same author treating the nominal taxon as new but not considered homonymous.

Allophyla Loew, 1862a: 127 [1862b: 227; 1862c: 7, 16, 43].

Originally Included Species: None.
First Included Species: Allophyla laevis Loew, 1862; Helomyza nigricornis Meigen, 1838 (as “Allophylae nigricorni Meig.”) (in Loew 1862b: 43).
Type Species: Allophyla laevis Loew, 1862, by present designation.
Current Status: Valid genus [reste Poole (1996: 171)].
Family: HELEOMYZIDAE.
Remarks: Previous catalogs [e.g., Gill (1965: 809); Gorodkov (1984b: 34)] listed the work in which Allophyla was first proposed as by Loew (1862c) and the type species as Heleomyza atricornis Meigen, 1830, by monotypy. Since no publication date other than the year has been found for for Loew (1862c), it must date from 31 December 1862. Research conducted in this study found an earlier work (Loew, 1862a: 127) that gives characters to make the genus-group name available there; however, no species were originally included in that work. The first subsequently included species in Allophyla are found in Loew (1862b: 227–228). A subsequent designation is needed from these first two included species. Allophyla laevis Loew, 1862 is currently treated in Suillia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830 [teste Poole (1996: 171)]; and Helomyza nigricornis Meigen, 1838 is currently treated in Tephrochlamys Loew, 1862 [teste Gorodkov (1984: 44)]. As no valid subsequent designation could be found for the species included in Loew (1862b), I here designate Allophyla laevis Loew, 1862 as type species by present designation. Coquillett (1910: 505) designated Helomyza atricornis Meigen, 1830, which was followed by Gill (1965: 809), Gorodkov (1984: 34), and Mun & Suh (2019: 401), but this is not one of the two first included species in Loew (1862b), and therefore is not eligible. Czerny (1904: 285) in remarking upon Loew’s (1862b: 228) “Nota” indicated that Loew’s “nigricorni” Meigen [Loew’s use of the name in the nominative plural] was an error for “atricorni” Meigen but gave no evidence why. The two species-group names are currently both available in Heleomyzidae, so Loew could have meant either. Because of the equivocal nature of the identity of Loew’s Heleomyza nigricornis, I feel it prudent to designate Allophyla laevis Loew, 1862. The generic concept of Allophyla apparently has two schools of thought, based zoogeographically: the New World school where it is treated as a valid genus, e.g., Gill (1965), Griffiths (1972), and Poole (1996); and an Old World school where it is treated as a junior synonym of Suillia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830, e.g., Gorodkov (1984) and Mun & Suh (2019: 401). Based on the work of Griffiths (1972), who gave apomorphic character states defining the genus [based on using Allophyla leavis] and distinguishing it from Suillia, and the fact that the type species designated herein is Nearctic, I follow the New World treatment of Allophyla Loew, 1862 as a valid genus. It may be that Helomyza atricornis Meigen, 1830 (treated as Allophyla by New World workers) is a true Suillia and Allophyla laevis is the sole member of Allophyla. More taxonomic work on the two species and their close relatives is needed to corroborate their generic placement.

Dasyllis Loew, 1851: 20.

Originally Included Species: Laphria haemorrhhoa Fabricius, 1805; Laphria croceiventris Wiedemann, 1821; Laphria nigripennis Wiedemann, 1830; Laphria bomboides Loew, 1851.

Type Species: Laphria croceiventris Wiedemann, 1821, by present designation.

Current Status: Valid genus [teste Papavero (2009: 82)].

Family: Asilidae.

Remarks: Originally proposed as a subgenus of Laphria Meigen, 1803. Previous workers [e.g., Hull (1962: 358), Martin & Papavero (1970: 45), and Papavero (2009: 82)] have given the typification for Dasyllis as Laphria haemorrhhoa Wiedemann, 1830 by original designation; however, this is incorrect because that was not one of the origi-
inally included species. Loew’s (1851: 20) statement “Typisch für die erste Gruppe der Dasyllis-Arten ist Laphr. haemorrhoa Fabr.” could be construed as Loew misidentifying the Fabrician *haemorrhoa* as Wiedemann’s *haemorrhoa*, but even then, a designation was not made for the entire genus, only his first “Gruppe”. Moreover, Loew on the next page (1851: 21) designated *Laphria bomboides* Loew, 1851 as the type for his second “Gruppe” of *Dasyllis*; so there were two type designations made by Loew (1851). As no valid type designation has yet been published for the genus as a whole, I here select *Laphria croceiventris* Wiedemann, 1830 as the type species of *Dasyllis* Loew, 1851 by present designation, which does not change the current generic concept.

**Eccoptomera Loew, 1862a: 127 [1862c: 8, 47].**

**Originally Included Species:** *Eccoptomera ornata* Loew, 1862; *Eccoptomera filata* Loew, 1862; *Eccoptomera excisa* Loew, 1862; *Eccoptomera emarginata* Loew, 1862.

**Type Species:** *Eccoptomera emarginata* Loew, 1862, by present designation.

**Current Status:** Valid genus [reste Kahanpää (2014: 322)].

**Family:** HELEOMYZIDAE.

**Remarks:** Previous catalogs [e.g., Gill (1965: 814)] have listed the work in which *Eccoptomera* was first proposed as Loew (1862c). Since no publication date other than the year has been found for Loew (1862c), it must date from 31 December 1862. Research conducted in this study found an earlier work (Loew, 1862a: 127) that gives characters to make the genus-group name available there. Coquillett (1910: 536) gave the type species as *Helomyza longiseta* Meigen, 1830, one of two species included in Loew (1862c); however, it was not one of the originally included species in Loew (1862a). As a type species designation is needed from species in that work, I select *Eccoptomera emarginata* Loew, 1862 by present designation. Because *Eccoptomera emarginata* Loew, 1862 is currently treated in *Eccoptomera* Loew, 1862 [reste Preisler et al. (2013: 192), there is no change to the current generic concept.

**Epicausta Loew, 1873: 46.**

**Originally Included Species:** *Senopterina femorata* Macquart, 1844 (as “Stenopterina femorata”); *Senopterina immaculata* Macquart, 1844.

**Type Species:** *Senopterina immaculata* Macquart, 1844, by present designation.

**Current Status:** Junior synonym of *Elassogaster* Bigot, 1860 [reste McAlpine (2001: 152)].

**Family:** PLATYSTOMATIDAE.

**Remarks:** Steyskal (1980: 566) designated *Epicausta nigra* Wulp, 1885 as the type species of *Epicausta*, which was followed by McAlpine (2001: 152), but it was not an originally included species. Although not explaining as such, Steyskal (1980: 566) no doubt thought there were no originally included species in *Epicausta* Loew, 1862 and was designating a nominal species from what he believed were the first two included species (in Wulp, 1885: ccxcv): *Epicausta nigra* Wulp, 1885 and *E. metallica* Wulp, 1885. However, Loew (1873: 46) did include two nominal species (*Senopterina femorata* Macquart, 1844 and *Senopterina immaculata* Macquart, 1844) with the statement “His [Macquart’s] *Stenopterina femorata* and *immaculata*,...
both from Bourbon, seem to belong rather to *Epicausta* than to *Stenopterina*”, which corroborates Loew’s statement at the beginning of the previous paragraph (Loew, 1873: 46) where he stated “The genus *Epicausta*, established by me for two African species...”. As no valid designation from these two included species has been made prior to this study, I select *Senopterina immaculata* Macquart, 1844 (currently treated in *Elassogaster* [teste Steyskal (1980: 566)]) as the type species by present designation, which does not change the current generic concept of *Epicausta* as a junior synonym of *Elassogaster* Bigot, 1860.

**Hemilea Loew, 1861: 265 [1863: 10, 32].**

*Originally included species:* *Trypeta sinuata* Loew, 1861; *Trypeta dimidiata* Costa, 1844; *Trypeta excellens* Loew, 1861.

*Type species:* *Trypeta dimidiata* Costa, 1844, by present designation.

*Current status:* Valid genus [teste Agarwal & Sueyoshi (2005: 410)].

*Family:* TEPHRITIDAE.

*Remarks:* Previous workers [e.g., Foote (1984: 92); Norrbom *et al.* (1999: 156); Agarwal & Sueyoshi (2005: 410)] have dated this genus-group name from Loew (1863: 32) and the type species as *Trypeta dimidiata* Costa, 1844 by monotypy. However, by proposing the genus-group name in Loew (1861: 265–266) in association with three available nominal species (*Trypeta sinuata* Loew, 1861, *Trypeta dimidiata* Costa, 1844, and *Trypeta excellens* Loew, 1861), this is enough to make available the name from this earlier publication, which has been overlooked by previous workers. Since there has been no subsequent designation of a type species from among the three nominal species included in Loew (1861) and to keep the same concept of the genus, I here select *Trypeta dimidiata* Costa, 1844, as the type species by present designation.
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