Postscript

This is the largest, most comprehensive and detailed study of family-group names ever published. Family-group name catalogs are rare, mostly covering small taxa (families usually, such as Newton 1992) or if covering large taxa (classes) are superficial (Bock 1994, but see Olson 1995). None of these approach Sabrosky's *Magnum Opus*, but the reader still needs to beware of a few caveats.

1. This is a catalog of family-group names. For more than 60 years, Sabrosky has been searching for and accumulating data on family-group names. His catalog contains every such name he found, including even obvious typographic errors. No one will ever again accumulate so many names, we will just argument his catalog, which is now maintained as an integral part of the BioSystematic Database of World Diptera (go to the Diptera site at http://www.sel.barc.usda.gov; also on Diptera Data Dissemination Disk). Hence, the details about family-group names, such as where they were found and whether they are available names or not, should be accepted as authoritative.

2. While the nomenclature of family-group names is authoritative, the zoology is not. At the family rank, the taxa recognized as valid by Sabrosky represent an odd mixture of the new and old, not a current consensus of specialists. Consider the following:

   a. Lygistorrhinidae and other major clades of Mycetophilidae in the old sense are not recognized because Sabrosky declares he follows the conservative classification of *Manual of Nearctic Diptera* and the *Insects of Australia*. However, no work has addressed and rejected the arguments of Matile (1990) and all recent classification of the Nematocerous Diptera recognize the previous subfamilies of Mycetophilidae (old sense) at the family rank (See Neotropical, Australian/Oceania and Palearctic Diptera catalogs).

   b. Nannodastiidae is recognized while neither the *Manual of Nearctic Diptera* nor *Insects of Australia* recognized the group at family rank.

   Hence, the classification used by Sabrosky neither conforms to his cited conservative standards nor current research findings. An authoritative consensus about the families of Diptera can be found in the BioSystematic Database of World Diptera (on the Diptera Data Dissemination Disk) or at the Diptera WWW site (http://www.sel.barc.usda.gov).

3. Much of the secondary data (details about genus-group and species-group names) was derived from the literature, such as the various regional Diptera catalogs. Some of these data, however, were thoroughly reviewed by specialists. Hence, while quality of much of the secondary data are no better than their sources, those concerning families such as Chloropidae (Sabrosky), Sarcophagidae (Pape), Simuliidae (Crosskey) and Tephritidae (Norrbom et alia) should be accepted as authoritative. Data in the various regional Diptera catalogs are of the highest quality, probably the overall quality is better than 90% accurate, but problems do remain for a few names, especially the older ones. To illustrate the kinds of problems that may still exist, the following examples are given.

   a. Sabrosky declares that "Loew's *Poeciloptera* has long been considered preoccupied by *Poeciloptera* Latreille 1829, considered an emendation of *Poekilloptera* Latreille 1797 ... [but *Poeciloptera* Latreille] does not preoccupy ..." Long means since Korneyev (1987), and Sabrosky's perception that the name was not preoccupied is based on an error in Neave (1940: 839). The emendation *Poeciloptera* dates from Latreille 1804, not 1829, which isn't an emendation as indicated by Sabrosky.

b. Sabrosky gives the type species of *Simulium* Latreille as *Rhagio colombaschensis* Fabricius 1787. Unfortunately, examination of Fabricius (1787) reveals that name *Rhagio colombaschensis*, is either an emendation or misspelling of *Oestrus columbacensis* Scopoli (1780) or a new name for *Bibio sanguinarius* Pallas (1771: 475). Pallas later considered his *sanguinarius* to be a junior synonym of *Culex reptans* Linnaeus (1758) as Fabricius later did for his "*colombaschensis*", but these names are undoubtedly synonyms of *Culex lanio* Linnaeus (1771). Then there is the name *Culex columbaczense* Schönbauer (1795: 96). What is clear is that all these names apply to the same species, a previously common pest in Bannat (see Crosskey 1990: 17), and the valid name for the type of *Simulium* is not "*Rhagio colombaschensis* Fabricius."

Both of these are examples of instances where the details presented in Sabrosky represent what is currently considered correct, but are known not to be. These problems will only be resolved when more research is done on genus-group and species-group names. Both Evenhuis and myself are now committed to continue the example of Sabrosky and revise in detail the genus-group names of Diptera. And with the cooperation of other Diptera specialists, the species-group names will be also revised. The results with be continually made available online at the Diptera WWW site (http://www.sel.barc.usda.gov) or on the annual Diptera Data Dissemination Disk.

4. No bibliography was built originally, family-group names were merely recorded in notebooks with author, year and page reference and sometimes abbreviations for the source. Hence, the bibliography was built as part of the process of preparing the catalog for publication thereby serving as another independent check of data sources. There should be no problems in finding the sources of names treated here. But while no more precise dating of publications has ever been done, we caution readers that our dating is not absolute!

F. CHRISTIAN THOMPSON
Washington, D. C.
16 October 1996