OPINION 1255

LESPESIA ROBINEAU-DESVOIDY, 1863 (DIPTERA, TACHINIDAE): DESIGNATION OF TYPE SPECIES

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers Achaetoneura anisotae Webber, 1930, is hereby designated as the type species of Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863.

(2) The generic name Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, Achaetoneura anisotae Webber, 1930, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2197.

(3) The specific name anisotae Webber, 1930, as published in the binomen Achaetoneura anisotae (specific name of type species of Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2864.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)2234

An application for the designation of a type species for Lespesia Robineau-Desvoidy, 1863, was first received from Dr C. W. Sabrosky (Systematic Entomology Lab USDA, c/o U.S. National Museum, Washington D.C. 20560, U.S.A.) on 11 October 1977. A revised draft was sent to the printer on 16 February 1978 and published on 31 May 1979 in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 35, pp. 243–247. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the Bulletin as well as to the statutory serials, to eight general serials and eight entomological serials. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 November 1982 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1982)29 for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 35, p. 246. At the close of the voting period on 22 February 1983 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Brinck, Mroczkowski, Uéno, Willink, Corliss, Halvorsen, Schuster, Kraus, Alvarado, Trjapitzin, Hahn, Cocks, Starobogatov, Bayer, Heppell, Cogger, Ride

Negative Vote — Savage.

Dupuis and Sabrosky abstained. Welch returned a late affirmative vote. Bernardi was on leave of absence. Binder and Lehtinen returned no votes.
The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Savage: ‘My reluctance to accept this proposal stems from the uncertainties regarding the distinction between datanarum, anisotae and a possible third species reared from Datana (Bull. zool. Nom. vol. 35, p. 245). Thus the type species of Lespesia “may or may not be “anisotae, which form “may or may not prove to be equal to datanarum”, yet if anisotae is selected as the type a possible misidentification occurs.’

Dupuis: ‘Je suis en faveur de la conservation de Lespesia.

‘Je suis cependant hostile à la solution proposée, qui consiste à sacrifier un type authentique existant à des synonymies douteuses, en passant outre aux incertitudes sur la spécificité parasitaire des espèces.

‘Le matériel-type de Robineau existe toujours; il s’agit d’un mâle “in sehr gutem Zustand und . . . vom Autor eigenhändig bezettelt” (Mesnil. 1950, p. 108) et “les caractères génériques on été décrits d’après ce mâle” (Robineau, 1863, p. 569).


‘Les spécificités parasitaires — qui, souvent, chez les Tachinaires, ont une réelle signification taxinomique — ne sont pas suffisamment établies, ni chez anisotae, ni chez datanarum, ni, bien entendu, chez ciliata R.D. A propos de cette dernière espèce, Sabrosky a beaucoup trop résumé les dires de Robineau et ceux de Mesnil.

‘Robineau (p. 569) (sans contradiction, car il est de règle chez les Tachinaires parasites de Lépidoptères que la larve se développe dans la chenille et écloses de la chrysalide) a écrit: “la larve de la seule espèce connue a vécu dans une chenille indéterminée” et “le mâle de cette espèce que je possède, est écolos chez moi d’une chrysalide de Bombyx que je n’ai pu déterminer”. A cette époque et sous cette forme, le nom de genre Bombyx peut désigner toute espèce possible de la famille.

‘Mesnil a tenté d’expliquer la provenance de l’hôte indéterminé de Robineau par l’engouement, réel en France à l’époque, pour l’introduction de Bombycides sériconètes exotiques. Ayant examiné un autre exemple de “diese selbe Lespesia” provenant d’une chrysalide de Philosamia cyenthia, il a pensé que cette espèce pourrait être l’hôte du mâle de Robineau. Ce scénario n’est pas certain car si “irgend jemand” avait, à Robineau, “einige Puppen von Philosamia cyenthia geschenkt”, Robineau eut connu la détermination de cette espèce alors très populaire.

‘Pour éviter tout risque de confusion, il conviendrait de maintenir comme type du genre l’espèce de Robineau, avec le spécimen-type et le nom utilisés par lui. Pour cela, il suffit, en vertu des pleins pouvoirs, de considérer le nom de ciliata R.D. comme un nom original, en déclarant nulle la synonymie avec la combinaison “mascera ciliata Macq.—Collect. du Museum” (R.D. p. 569). Cette combinaison était, pour
Robineau, un nom manuscrit, dont il n'avait “trouvé nulle part la description” (p. 571) (effectivement, elle n'a jamais été publiée et l'on ne connaît de Macquart que Erycia cilata et Senometopia ciliata).

‘L'intérêt d'une telle solution a été entretenu par Sabrosky: je la propose formellement ici. La Commission peut utiliser ses pleins pouvoirs pour ouvrir un nouveau vote à ce sujet.

‘Dans tous les cas, en tant que connaisseur des difficultés de la taxinomie des Tachinaires lorsque les données biologiques sont insuffisantes, je vote contre anisotae ou datanarum.'

Dr Sabrosky replied to this comment as follows: Dr Dupuis has laid great stress on the ‘synonymies douteuses’ and ‘incertaines’, the ‘incertitudes’ of host specificity, and the ‘données biologiques insuffisantes’. It is unfortunate that, before the voting on my application, I did not call attention to my discussion of the species and my revised key to Lespesia (Sabrosky, 1980). It is thus unfortunate that Dupuis did not see this, because the confusion he sees from the doubtful synonymies, etc., does not now exist.

In the past, certainly, the male specimen of ‘ciliata’ upon which the generic description was clearly based had a checkered career. It was at first unrecognised (Mesnil, 1939) and then successively identified as hesperus Brauer & Bergenstamm (now frenchii) (by Mesnil, 1950), samiae Webber (by Beneway, 1963, based on Byers’ examination of the then undissected male), datanarum Townsend (by Herting, 1974, from Arnaud’s examination of the male genitalia, never before dissected), and finally anisotae Webber (by Sabrosky, 1979, 1980, after determination of the uniqueness in the genus Lespesia of the male genitalia of anisotae). I do not wonder that this sequence of identifications appeared to Dupuis to be confusing, but this was a series of misidentifications that I was able finally to clarify, a series that gradually progressed toward a solution.

In actual fact, the application as at first submitted to the Secretary proposed datanarum as the type species, following Beneway, 1963, who synonymised anisotae under datanarum because of his erroneous association of males and females. Incidentally, Beneway’s figure of the male genitalia of ciliata proved to fit the male of samiae! Later, when I had sorted out the confusion and recognised the uniqueness of the male genitalia of anisotae (‘ciliata’), I asked to have the still unpublished application changed to request anisotae as type species, and this was done. What I should also have done, two years later, was to have submitted a note on my published revision.

Now the doubtful and uncertain synonymies do not exist. Discrimination of the species in this large and difficult genus of TACHINIDAE has long been difficult, especially of females (and the lectotype of datanarum is a female), but the successive revisions of Webber, 1930, Beneway, 1963, and Sabrosky, 1980, have clarified the problems, each contributing significant steps on which the others have
The male genitalia of *anisotae* proved to be unique in the genus and easily recognised, and the male of 'ciliata Macq. of R.D.' is clearly *anisotae*, as recognised from dissection of the male genitalia by Arnaud, and is neither *frenchii, samiae*, nor *datanarum* as previously mis-identified. At the time of the application I could not distinguish the females of *anisotae* and *datanarum*, which might have been conspecific, but later I solved that problem and properly associated males with females of *datanarum* and showed the distinctness of those species.

Host specificity: Contrary to Dupuis' opinion that 'les données biologiques sont insuffisantes', the biologies are better known than he realises, and certainly well enough known that in my opinion they are irrelevant in this case. Few tachinids are exclusively parasitic on one host, even though they may be host specific to a high degree. Even such a one-species parasite as *Blepharipa pratensis* (Meigen) (scutellata R.D.), a common parasite of the gypsy moth, *Lymantria dispar* (Linnaeus), is known from at least two other hosts in Europe and from at least five native lepidopterous hosts in the United States, all rare and probably accidental hosts.

Some species of *Lespesia* are polyphagous, others are quite host specific although occasionally a stray host of another species will be attacked. In particular a species such as *anisotae*, which usually parasitises the saturniid *Anisota*, may attack other saturniids. I would not consider it at all strange that it should attack *Philosamia cynthiae* in France, especially in the absence of its native American host. The fact remains that *Lespesia* is a New World genus, not native to France and apparently not established there. Any host record in France would have been an accidental occurrence.

I have long admired Robineau-Desvoidy as a dipterist far ahead of his time, and I have defended him in print (Sabrosky, 1974), but in the case of *Lespesia* it is unfortunate that he did not recognise the history of Macquart's *ciliata* in the works of Macquart, 1834, 1835, 1849, and 1850, all certainly available to him. I see no credit or justice in assigning the name ciliata to him. Robineau-Desvoidy cannot of course be blamed for Macquart's misidentification of his own species!

Referring to the combination *Masicera ciliata* Macquart, Dupuis states that 'effectively, it has never been published and one knows from Macquart only *Erycia ciliata* and *Senometopia ciliata*.' But Dupuis has overlooked Macquart, 1850, who cited ciliata in synonymy under *Masicera scutellata* and thus did refer his ciliata to *Masicera*. Furthermore, Rondani, 1856, in proposing his new genus *Blepharipa* designated as type species 'Masicera ciliata Macq.'

I consider then that there is no 'risque de confusion' as Dupuis believes, and I would prefer to see *anisotae* declared the type, which is the species that was before Robineau-Desvoidy when he proposed the name *Lespesia*. If anything, use of the name ciliata, which has appeared in combination with *Erycia, Senometopia, Masicera, and Lespesia* and
which has in the past been considered synonymous with four different species of \textit{Lespesia}, is by far the more confusing.
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