remaining species as genotype (*cf.* Opinion 6). This viewpoint has been adopted by Duda and Hennig.

In considering the matter, it may be pointed out that although Fallén (1810) stated that he was including *three* species in *Madiza*, these were not named nor were they identified in any way. When Fallén later (1820) expanded his preliminary account of the genus and gave descriptions of the species, he listed *five*, not three, under *Madiza*, with no indication of which three corresponded to those mentioned in 1810. However, since Meigen early removed the fourth and fifth species to *Agromyza* (the fifth is now in *Desmometopa*), it might be argued that these were later and less certain additions to *Madiza*, and that the first three species of 1820 were really the three mentioned by Fallén (1810), though internal evidence for it is lacking. It appears that Hendel so reasoned, and we may follow his conclusion. At any rate, the last two species of Fallén have not entered into the problem of the genotype for *Madiza* and hence need not concern us here.

Three species—*laevigata, oscinina, glabra*—remain for consideration. The second species was designated by Macquart (1835) as genotype of *Siphonella*. The first definite designation of genotype for *Madiza* was that by Rondani (1856), who selected the same species used by Macquart, *M. oscinina* Fallén. Whatever Rondani's reasons for so doing, whether intentional or otherwise, under our present International Code of Zoological Nomenclature his designation is a valid one because it was properly made, the species selected was originally included, and the species was not a *species inquirendae*. The fact that the species selected by Rondani had already been named as genotype of *Siphonella* did not exclude it from consideration in the selection of a type for *Madiza* (*cf.* Opinion 62). Any author subsequent to Fallén was free to select as type for *Madiza* any of its originally included species, regardless of whether any intervening author had cited them in another genus. Naturally this nomenclatorial point sometimes results in isogenotypic synonyms, but such situations result primarily from the original failure to designate a genotype.

Hendel's point of type by elimination must still be considered, since he argued that Macquart had *removed* two species to *Siphonella* and left a single species (*glabra*), which then automatically functioned as type. If such were the case, we should indeed have to agree that Macquart had established *Madiza* by inference as a monotypic genus, for Opinion 6 states that '. . . the type of the original genus was fixed when, through a division of its species, it

was definitely made into a monotypic genus.'

It appears, however, that Hendel was in error in considering that Macquart 'removed' *two* of the three species. This would have meant that Macquart included *laevigata* and *oscinina* in his new *Siphonella*, but we find that not one of Macquart's species is the same as *laevigata*! The latter is now known to belong to the genus *Haplegis* Loew (1866) in another subfamily, as synonym of *Haplegis tarsata* (Fallén). Therefore, when Macquart erected the genus *Siphonella* for *Madiza oscinina* Fallén, *et al.*, there still remained *two* species, *laevigata* and *glabra*, in *Madiza* Fallén, and thus the type of the latter was *not* indicated by elimination. If all five species were considered eligible, of course, type by elimination would be even more remote.

Article 30, k, of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature merely *recommends* that authors now give preference in selecting genotypes to those species not already designated in other genera; Rondani's action is, therefore, not to be rejected as long as he complied with the Rules for designating genotypes, and selected an originally included species. The case is a duplicate of those discussed in Opinion 62, especially the example cited (type of *Thalasseus* = *Sterna cantiaca*).

For these reasons the writer has adopted the use of the generic name *Madiza* Fallén (= *Siphonella* Macq.) in the family Chloropidae.

Michigan State College,
E. Lansing, Mich., U.S.A.
January 30th, 1942.

NOTE ON MR. SABROSKY'S ARTICLE ON *MADIZA* (DIPT.).

BY J. E. COLLIN, F.R.E.S., ETC.

Mr. Sabrosky's argument in favour of accepting Rondani's designation of *Madiza oscinina* Fln. as type of Fallén's genus *Madiza* (1810) cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. It is based on the assumption that *oscinina* (one of the five named and described species included in *Madiza* by Fallén in 1820) was one of the original three un-named species upon which Fallén founded the genus in 1810. Apart from the fact that the available evidence is against this assumption, the question of selecting a genotype for such a genus is governed by Opinion 46, for an analysis of which see pp. 99-100 of the current volume of this Magazine.

When *Madiza* was founded in 1810 the diagnosis included 'Antennae . . . articulo ultimo rotundato' and 'Corpus ovatum, depressiusculum, glabrum,' but in 1820 references to the rotundity

of the third antennal joint and the flatness and bareness of the body were omitted. In *Madiza glabra* the third antennal joint is round, and the whole body flattened and bare, while in *oscinina* the third antennal joint is not round, the body by no means flattened, and much more punctate and pilose. The inference that the generic diagnosis of 1810 was altered in 1820 in order to include the newly discovered species *oscinina* is obvious. In addition we are informed by Fallén that the name of the genus was an allusion to the 'glabritie corporis' of the original species.

The point of contention is between *M. oscinina* and *M. glabra* as genotype of *Madiza*. Opinion 46 rules that a genotype in cases such as *Madiza* must be in agreement with the original generic publication, a provision very necessary to ensure, as far as possible, that the selected species was one originally included. *M. oscinina* does not agree with the original generic publication while *M. glabra* does. The selection of the former by Rondani as genotype of *Madiza* must therefore be considered invalid, and Hendel's selection of *M. glabra* be accepted.

Raylands,
Newmarket.
May 22nd, 1942.

CATOPIDIUS DEPRESSUS MURRAY IN BRITAIN (COL., SILPHIDAE).

BY K. G. BLAIR, D.Sc., F.R.E.S.

Mr. F. T. Grant recently submitted to me for determination an unusual looking Cholevine that he was unable to name. Reference to Jeannel, 1936, *Monog. Catopidae*, established its identity as *Catopidius depressus* Murray, a species occurring in Spain and W. and S.W. France, of which Jeannel remarks that it is strange that it should not be represented in the British Isles. About the size and colour of *Catops fusca* Panz., it is at once distinguished by its shape; the thorax, being broadest at the base and fitting closely to the base of the elytra, gives it an evenly ovate outline not found in any of our British species; the antennae are slender, with only joints 8-10 transverse (Jeannel, *loc. cit.*: 406-9, figs. 973-978). It lives in the burrows of rabbits and badgers, though Mr. Grant's specimen was taken on an office window in Gravesend, 20.iii.1935. Mr. Grant has generously presented the specimen to the National Collection.

British Museum (Nat. Hist.),
London, S.W.7.
June 12th, 1942.

THE BRITISH SPECIES OF THE GENUS *CHAMAEMYIA* (DIPT., CHAMAEMYIIDAE).

BY R. L. COE.

The small grey or yellowish-grey pruinose flies of the genus *Chamaemyia* may be found from late spring until autumn in grassy places, often near streams, one of the species, *flavipalpis* Haliday, being confined apparently to maritime districts. They may be distinguished from *Parochthiphila* Czerny by possessing three instead of four pairs of thoracic dorso-central bristles, and both genera from *Leucopis* Meigen, the third British genus of the family, by having well-developed orbital bristles.

Verrall (1901) listed six British species of *Chamaemyia* (as *Ochthiphila*), namely *polystigma* Meigen, *juncorum* Fallén, *aridella* Fallén, *geniculata* Zetterstedt, *flavipalpis* Haliday and *spectabilis* Loew (the last-named now placed in *Parochthiphila*). Collin (1911) added *elegans* Panzer (as *fasciata* Loew) to the list, thus bringing the number of British species of *Chamaemyia* (present sense) to six. The same species are recognised on the Continent and in North America. An additional Continental species, *C. flavicornis* Strobl, is probably only a form of *elegans* (*q.v.*).

In distinguishing the species, authors have laid emphasis on the extent of the yellow colouring of the antennae and palpi, as well as the number of pairs of black abdominal spots. Owing to considerable intra-specific variation, however, these characters are limited in specific value, and by their use the species have not all been clearly differentiated. Melander (1913) and Séguy (1934) placed *elegans*, *flavipalpis* (as *maritima* Zetterstedt) and *polystigma* in their respective specific keys in the section 'antennae wholly or in part yellow' and *geniculata*, *juncorum* and *aridella* in the section 'antennae entirely black, palpi dusky.' Czerny (1936) similarly arranges his key, but sinks *aridella* as a synonym of *juncorum* and adds *flavicornis* (see above) in the first section.

Malloch (1940) considers that instead of there being several species of the genus in North America only one occurs, i.e. *polystigma*, and that *juncorum* and *geniculata* are merely forms of that species. He states:—

'Our conception of *polystigma* is a form with partly yellow antennae and the apices of the femora and all of the tibiae and tarsi fulvous-yellow. The abdomen is entirely grey-dusted and has at least three pairs of black spots on the dorsum, one to each tergite, and at the lateral curve on each side of these tergites another black spot. This is the typical form met with in the more southern states of the Union. As we go farther north the general grey colour becomes darker, especially on the abdomen, and the legs become more extensively infuscated, while the