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Abstract
Type specimens of seven nominal species of sawfly described by Edward Newman and one by Charles Healy were studied. This material is housed in the Oxford University Museum of Natural History, United Kingdom. The following new synonymies are proposed (valid names in parentheses): Hartigia Schiodte, 1839 (Phylloecus Newman, 1838), Cephus helleri Taschenberg, 1871 (Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838) and Euura gallae Newman, 1837 (Euura mucronata (Hartig, 1837)). The type species of Euura Newman, 1837 and Euura subgenus Gemmura E. L. Smith, 1968 belong to the same taxonomic species, Euura mucronata (Hartig, 1837), so that these genus group names become new synonyms. Lectotypes are designated for Phyllotoma tormentillae Healy, 1868, Fenusa ianthe Newman, 1837, Fenusa parviceps Newman, 1837, Selandria pallida Newman, 1837 and Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838. 26 new combinations are proposed for species formerly placed in Hartigia and here transferred to Phylloecus, and 4 original combinations are re-instated as valid.
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Introduction

Edward Newman (1801–1876) described 24 species-group and six genus-group sawfly taxa as new to science. In many cases, the type material of these nominal taxa has apparently never been re-examined. During ongoing studies on West Palaearctic nematine sawflies (see STI Nematinae Group 2013), it became clear that clarification of the identity of Euura gallae Newman, 1837 is necessary. This being the type species of Euura Newman, 1837, the correct interpretation of the species name is required to ensure future nomenclatural stability. Through the kind assistance of the staff of the Oxford University Museum of Natural History (OUMNH), potential type specimens of several species described by Newman were located and sent to us for examination. Although only a few of these taxa belong to the Nematinae, it seems appropriate to deal here with the entire material, as well as the type series of a species described by Charles Healy (1826–1876). Newman undertook the identification of the Tenthredinidae, mostly leaf-mining species, on which Healy published several papers describing their biology.

In his introduction, Newman (1837) stated that the material referred to in that article was “in the possession of the Entomological Club”. The statement applies also to the sawflies discussed by Newman (1838), which despite its different title, is effectively a continuation of the same work. The Hymenoptera in the collection of the Entomological Club were donated in to the OUMNH in 1927 (Smith AZ 1986; J. Hogan personal communication).

Material and methods

All specimens mentioned in this paper are deposited in the Hope Collections, Oxford University Museum of Natural History, Oxford, United Kingdom. They are all mounted in a similar way (Figs 1, 7): pinned along the dorso-ventral axis through the thorax with a short, headless pin which is carried on a small cardboard stage supported by a longer pin with a head. When the specimens were received for examination, nearly all had only a single label, with an identical printed, lower part (Figs 6, 12). At the top of this label appears the handwritten name under which the specimens stood in the collection of the Entomological Club. Although these labels are not original, they are interpreted here as representing determinations made by Newman. None of the specimens bears any data on collection locality or date on the labels or cardboard stage.

Taxa are listed in alphabetical order, under their current valid names. Complete lists of all the synonyms of species mentioned below and references to their original descriptions may be found in Taeger et al. (2010). Below are cited only the names and descriptions of taxa described by Newman or Healy, and of taxa considered here to be conspecific with the former, when the latter names are in general current use as valid.
Results and discussion

Euura mucronata (Hartig, 1837) (Tenthredinidae)

http://species-id.net/wiki/Euura_mucronata

= Euura gallae Newman, January 1837: 260; sex not stated; type locality: Scotland. syn. n.
= Nematus (Cryptocampus) mucronatus Hartig, March 1837: 223; ♂♀; type locality: not stated.

Type material examined. Euura gallae. Holotype ♀, figs 1–6: “[handwritten] Euura gallae Newm. [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”, “[red] Holotype (teste A. Liston, 2013) Euura gallae Newman, 1837”, “Euura mucronata (Hartig, 1837) det. Liston 2013”, “DEI-GISHym 19993”. Condition: apical three flagellomeres of both antennae and right rear tarsus missing.

Discussion. Newman’s very short original description of Euura gallae, based on a single specimen [holotype], is impossible to identify as belonging to one of the currently recognised species. The description reads: “Euura gallae. Nigra : antennis nigris, apice ferrugineis: pedibus pallidis. Black: mouth yellow; antennæ rust-coloured at the tip; the legs entirely pale. The insect is the size of Nematus pallipes: the only specimen I have observed was taken by Mr. Walker, in Scotland.”

Five specimens bearing the name Euura gallae, all females, were found in the Hope Collections. Four of these belong to the Euura atra species group. They have nearly completely dark mouthparts, except for the labrum, and the femora are conspicuously black basally. They therefore do not agree with the description of the holotype. The fifth specimen (Figs 1–6) has more extensively pale mouthparts and antennae, the malar area is conspicuously pale, and the legs are almost completely pale. This specimen is identified as the holotype of E. gallae.

Newman’s description of E. gallae pre-dates Hartig’s of N. mucronatus by a couple of months. Article 23.9 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is here applied, to reverse the precedence of the species names, because the name E. gallae (nomen oblitum) has not been used as valid after 1899, and E. mucronata (Nematus mucronatus: nomen protectum) has been used as a valid species name in [very many] more than 25 works published by more than 10 authors in the last 50 years. A list of these references is available from us on request.

The type species of Euura Newman, 1837 by subsequent designation of Rohwer (1911: 80) is Euura gallae Newman, 1837. Dalla Torre (1894: 276) listed E. gallae as a valid species of Cryptocampus Hartig, 1837, but with a footnote “= ? C. saliceti (Fall.).” At this time, C. saliceti (Fallén, 1808) was in use as the name of the species called Euura mucronata (Hartig, 1837) by most recent authors. Konow (1905b) placed E. gallae as a synonyn of Cryptocampus medullarius (Hartig, 1837). The latter is a junior subjective synonym of the species currently known as E. amerinae (Linnaeus, 1758). Rohwer (1911: 94) and all subsequent authors followed Konow’s opinion, in that gallae was regarded as a synonym of E. amerinae, or one of the subjective junior synonyms of that
taxon. It is unlikely that any specialist, apart from Newman himself, has examined the holotype of *E. gallae*. Clearly, the identity of *E. gallae* has until now been widely misinterpreted. As a result of the new identification, the genus group name *Gemmura* E. L. Smith, 1968 (type species *Nematus mucronatus* Hartig, 1837), proposed as a subgenus of *Euura*, becomes a junior objective synonym of *Euura* Newman, sensu stricto. If in future it should be considered that recognition of subgenera within *Euura* is necessary, then a new name for the stem-galling groups would be needed. However, in our opinion there is at present neither sufficient phylogenetic support, nor a practical justification (because the genus includes too few species) for such an act. Distinction of species

**Figures 1–6.** *Euura gallae* Newman, 1837; holotype 1 dorsal 2 head, dorsal 3 head, lateral 4 abdomen, dorsoapical 5 abdomen, lateral 6 labels.
groups, if considered necessary, should be achieved by employing “informal” group names whose use is not regulated by the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Such names might, for example, be the “mucronata group” for the bud-gallers and the “atra group” for the stem-gallers.

**Fenella nigrita** Westwood, 1839 (Tenthredinidae)
http://species-id.net/wiki/Fenella_nigrita

= *Fenella nigrita* Westwood, 1839: 54; sex not stated; type locality: not stated.
= *Phyllotoma tormentillae* Healy, 1868: 140–141; larvae; adults reared [sex not stated] but not described; type locality: Highgate, Hornsey, Hampstead, Norwood and Croydon [parts of London].

**Type material examined.** *Phyllotoma tormentillae*. Lectotype (hereby designated) ♀ [adult]: “[handwritten] Phyllotoma tormentillae, N. [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst.’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”; “[red] Lectotype Phyllotoma tormentillae Healy, 1868 des. A. Liston 2013”; “Fenella nigrita Westwood, 1839 det. A. Liston 2013”, “DEI-GISHym 19994”. Condition: fair. Paralectotypes: 11 ♀ with same original labels, [blue] paralectotype labels, and “Fenella nigrita Westwood, 1839 det. A. Liston 2013”. One paralectotype has a large handwritten label reading “Phyllotoma Tormentilliæ N A complete life history of this species by Mr Healy appears in the Entomologist Vol iv p140”.

**Discussion.** It is considered that the lectotype of *Phyllotoma tormentillae* [adult] was reared from the larvae described by Healy. The synonymy of *P. tormentillae* with *F. nigrita* as given by Kirby (1882) and in various subsequent works is confirmed.

**Harpiphorus lepidus** (Klug, 1818) (Tenthredinidae)
http://species-id.net/wiki/Harpiphorus_lepidus

= *Tenthredo (Emphytus) lepida* Klug, 1818: 277–278; ♀♂; type locality: Germany.
= *Fenusa ianthe* Newman, 1837: 261; sex not stated; type locality: “[..]woods of the metropolitan district[..]” (= around London).
= *Asticta ianthe*: Newman (1838: 484), comb. n.

**Type material examined.** *Fenusa ianthe*. Lectotype (hereby designated) ♀:”[handwritten] Phyllotoma”; “[handwritten] P. ianthe, Newm [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst.’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”; “[red] Lectotype Fenusa ianthe Newman, 1837 des. A. Liston 2013”; “Harpiphorus lepidus (Klug, 1818) det. A. Liston 2013”, “DEI-GISHym 19995”. Condition: fair, but apical tarsomeres of all legs missing.

**Discussion.** Although the sex of the type specimen[s] is not explicitly mentioned by Newman, the described colour pattern is found only in the female of this species.
The comment “This insect appears generally distributed[.]” leads one to suppose that the description is based on more than one specimen. However, Westwood (1839: 53) wrote “This description is drawn from Mr. Newman’s typical specimen, which he has been so kind as to lend me; and of which the fore wings are unlike, the transverse nerve separating the first two submarginal cells being obliterated in one of them[.]”. The specimen here designated as lectotype possesses this abnormality (vein Rs+M is missing in the left forewing), and therefore is probably the same specimen as examined by Westwood. The synonymy of *F. ianthe* with *H. lepidus*, already adopted by Kirby (1882), is confirmed.

**Heterarthrus nemoratus** (Fallén, 1808) (Tenthredinidae)

http://species-id.net/wiki/Heterarthrus_nemoratus

- *Hyloptera nemorata* Fallén, 1808: 47; ♀; type locality: Sweden [according to title of work].
- *Fenusa parviceps* Newman, 1837: 261–262; sex not stated; type locality not stated.
- *Druida parviceps* (Newman, 1837); Newman 1838: 484.

**Type material examined.** *Fenusa parviceps*. Lectotype (hereby designated) ♀:”[handwritten] Druida parviceps, Newm [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”; “[red] Lectotype Fenusa parviceps Newman, 1837 des. A. Liston 2013”; “Heterarthrus nemoratus (Fallén, 1808) det. A. Liston 2013”, “DEI-GISHym 19996”. Condition: fair. Paralectotypes: 2♀ and 1 cocoon-disc with same original labels, [blue] paralectotype labels, and “Heterarthrus nemoratus (Fallén, 1808) det. A. Liston 2013”.

**Discussion.** The synonymy of *F. parviceps* with *H. nemoratus* as proposed by Cameron (1876) and adopted in numerous subsequent works, is confirmed.

**Hoplocampa alpina** (Zetterstedt, 1838) (Tenthredinidae)

http://species-id.net/wiki/Hoplocampa_alpina

- *Tenthredo alpina* Zetterstedt, 1838: 339; ♀♂; type locality: “Raschstind in insula Schiervoe Nordlandiae; Gamstenstind ad Alteidet” [in northern Norway: see clarification by Greve (1986)].
- *Selandria pallida* Newman, 1837: 262; sex not stated; type locality: not stated.

**Type material examined.** *Selandria pallida*. Lectotype (hereby designated) ♀:”[handwritten] Hoplocampa pallida, Steph. [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”; “[red] Lectotype Selandria pallida Newman, 1837 des. A. Liston 2013”; “Hoplocampa alpina (Zetterstedt, 1838) det. A. Liston 2013”, “DEI-GISHym 19997”. Condition: fair. Paralectotype: 1♂ with same original label, [blue] paralectotype label, and “Hoplocampa alpina (Zetterstedt, 1838) det. A. Liston 2013”.
Discussion. Within Hoplocampa, Selandria pallida Newman is a junior secondary homonym of Tenthredo pallida Serville, 1823 (= Hoplocampa flava (Linnaeus, 1760): Lacourt 2000). The synonymy of S. pallida with H. alpina, which has long been recognised (e.g. Kirby 1882), is confirmed.

Phylloecus Newman, 1838 (Cephidae)
http://species-id.net/wiki/Phylloecus

≡ Phylloecus Newman, 1838: 485–486.
≡ Phylloecus: Rohwer 1911; type species designated as Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838; placed as synonym of Janus Stephens, 1829.
≡ Hartigia Schiodte, 1839: 331–332, 347, 370. Boie 1855; type species designated as Astatus satyrus Panzer, 1801 [= Phylloecus niger (Harris, [1779])]. syn. n.

Discussion. P. faunus was stated by Abe and Smith (1991) to have been designated by monotypy as the type species of Phylloecus Newman, 1838. This is not so, because Newman (1838, p. 486) ends his discussion on his new genus with the words “[..] but it seemed to me that the division containing Faunus, &c. is equally distinct, and therefore I would submit the propriety of raising these also, to the rank of a genus, under the name Phylloecus”. His foregoing text makes it clear that at least Cephus satyrus (Panzer, 1801) (a junior synonym of Hartigia nigra (M. Harris, [1779]) was thus considered also to belong to Phylloecus. Rohwer (1911) interpreted this correctly and accordingly designated P. faunus as type species. However, Rohwer (1911, p. 94 [index], under the names cynosbati and faunus) makes it clear that he regarded P. faunus as conspecific with Janus cynosbati (Linnaeus, 1758) (= J. femoratus (Curtis, 1830): see Blank et al. (2009) on nomenclature). From Newman’s description and subsequent discussion it is evident that his concept of Phylloecus corresponds closely with that of what in recent years has been called Hartigia, and this correct interpretation was followed by various authors during the 19th Century. The lectotype of Phylloecus faunus belongs to the species recently known as Hartigia belleri (Taschenberg, 1871) (see below, under P. faunus). Benson (1951) and Pagliano and Scaramozzino (1990) treated Hartigia and Phylloecus as synonymous, but did not use the latter as the valid name. On the other hand, the misinterpretation of Phylloecus as Janus also has a long history, which can be traced back at least to Kirby (1882), and in recent years this wrong synonymy has become universally accepted. The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999) unfortunately provides no opportunity of maintaining the name Hartigia in precedence over Phylloecus, because the use of Phylloecus as a valid name after 1899, by for example Marchand (1902) and Richter von Binnenthal (1903), precludes the application of Article 23.9. (reversal of precedence). Neither are the species of Phylloecus of such economic, scientific or cultural importance that an application to the Commission to conserve the name Hartigia seems likely to achieve
success, although some species are of rather minor significance to growers of soft fruit and ornamental roses in North America (Smith DR 1986), and *Phylloecus faunus* has been considered for use in the biological control of *Rubus* in Australia (e.g. Bruzzese 1982; as *Hartigia albomaculatus*). As a result of the new synonymy, the following species names are either newly transferred to *Phylloecus* (comb. n.) or the original name combinations are re-instated as valid (comb. rev.). New combinations are followed in parentheses by the original combination of the species group name. Only the nominal species which were considered to be valid by Taeger et al. (2010) are listed:

*Phylloecus agilis* (F. Smith, 1874), comb. n. (*Cephus agilis*)
*Phylloecus albotegularis* (Wei & Nie, 1996), comb. n. (*Hartigia albotegularis*)
*Phylloecus algiricus* André, 1881 comb. rev.
*Phylloecus bicinctus* Provancher, 1875 comb. rev.
*Phylloecus cheni* (Wei & Nie, 1999), comb. n. (*Hartigia cheni*)
*Phylloecus coreanus* (Takeuchi, 1938), comb. n. (*Hartigia coreana*)
*Phylloecus cowichanus* (Ries, 1937), comb. n. (*Hartigia cowichana*)
*Phylloecus elevatus* (Maa, 1944), comb. n. (*Hartigia elevata*)
*Phylloecus epigonus* (Zhelochovtsev, 1961), comb. n. (*Hartigia epigona*)
*Phylloecus etorofensis* (Takeuchi, 1955), comb. n. (*Hartigia etorofensis*)
*Phylloecus fasciatus* (Cresson, 1880), comb. n. (*Cephus fasciatus*)
*Phylloecus faunus* Newman, 1838 comb. rev.
*Phylloecus kamijoi* (Shinohara, 1999), comb. n. (*Hartigia kamijoi*)
*Phylloecus linearis* (Schrank, 1781), comb. n. (*Tenthredo linearis*)
*Phylloecus mexicanus* (Guerin, [1844]), comb. n. (*Cephus mexicanus*)
*Phylloecus minutus* (Wei & Nie, 1997), comb. n. (*Hartigia minutut*)
*Phylloecus niger* (M. Harris, [1779]), comb. n. (*Sirex niger*)
*Phylloecus nigratus* (Dovnar-Zapolskij, 1931), comb. n. (*Pachycephus nigratus*)
*Phylloecus nigritus* (Forsius, 1918), comb. n. (*Macrocephus nigritus*)
*Phylloecus nigrotibialis* (Wei & Nie, 1977), comb. n. (*Hartigia nigrotibialis*)
*Phylloecus ppyrrha* (Zhelochovtsev, 1968), comb. n. (*Hartigia ppyrrha*) [Zhelochovtsev gives no etymology for this species name. It is here considered to be a noun, the name of a figure in Greek mythology]
*Phylloecus riesi* (D. R. Smith, 1986), comb. n. (*Hartigia riesi*)
*Phylloecus sibiricola* Jaklovlev, 1891 comb. rev.
*Phylloecus simulator* (Kokujev, 1910), comb. n. (*Macrocephus simulator*)
*Phylloecus stackelbergi* (Gussakovskij, 1945), comb. n. (*Hissarocephus stackelbergi*)
*Phylloecus stigmaticalis* (Wei & Nie, 1996), comb. n. (*Hartigia stigmaticalis*)
*Phylloecus trimaculatus* (Say, 1824), comb. n. (*Cephus trimaculatus*)
*Phylloecus viator* (F. Smith, 1874), comb. n. (*Cephus viator*)
*Phylloecus xanthostoma* (Eversmann, 1847), comb. n. (*Cephus xanthostoma*)
*Phylloecus zhengi* (Wei & Nie, 1996), comb. n. (*Hartigia zhengi*)
Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838, spec. rev. (Cephidae)
http://species-id.net/wiki/Phylloecus_faunus

= Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838: 485–486; ♀♂; type locality: “in the vicinity of London”. Note: faunus is a noun; the name of a Roman deity.

= Cephus helleri Taschenberg, 1871: 305–306; ♀; type locality: Insula Lesina [Island of Hvar, Croatia]. syn. n.

Type material examined. Phylloecus faunus. Lectotype (hereby designated) ♀, Figs 7–12. “[handwritten] Phylloecus faunus, Newm. [printed] Det. in Coll. Ent. Club, Inst’d 1826. Pres’d 1927 by Club to Hope Coll.”; “[handwritten] Faunus Newm.”; “[red] Lectotype Phylloecus faunus Newman, 1838 des. A. Liston 2013”; “Hartigia faunus (Newman, 1838) det. A. Liston 2013”. Condition: missing most of right antennal flagellum, most tarsi except right middle and rear; abdomen after tergum 5 glued to specimen.

Discussion. [see also under Phylloecus, above]. Newman refers to a syntype series of three specimens of P. faunus: “Two specimens of this insect have been taken by Mr. Ingall, and one by Mr. Stephens”. The single specimen examined agrees well with the brief description. Most taxonomic works and catalogues (e.g. Konow 1905a; Taeger et al. 2010) have until now placed P. faunus as a synonym of Janus cynosbati (Linnaeus, 1758), although it should have been apparent from several characters described or discussed by Newman (1838), that these are not conspecific. The mistaken synonymy was possibly first published by Kirby (1882).

Although the name faunus has not to the best of our knowledge been used as valid after 1899, neither has the name helleri been sufficiently used (in 21 publications by 27 authors including co-authors) as valid in the last fifty years to satisfy the conditions of Article 23.9 (reversal of precedence) of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999). A list of these references is available from us on request. The lectotype of P. faunus agrees in all important points with the characterisation of Hartigia helleri by Jansen (1998). Quinlan (1970) identified a second female specimen in the Natural History Museum, London, which should be regarded as a paratype of P. faunus, as H. albomaculatus [sic!], noted that it bore a label “faunas” [presumably in reality faunus] and mentioned that no reliable information is available on where it was caught. One might doubt the reliability of Newman’s statement that the types of Phylloecus faunus were collected around London, because under its synonyms Hartigia albomaculata and H. helleri no evidence for the presence of this species in the British Isles has been published, and because neither of the two type specimens still in existence bears any explicit label data referring to the collection locality. However, an occurrence in the London area, at least historically, seems not unlikely. Chevin (1993) presented several records from northern France, under the name H. albomaculata, and later (Chevin and Chevin 2007) recorded H. helleri from the Département de la Manche, not far from the Channel coast. It is concluded that Phylloecus faunus should
Figures 7–12. *Phylloecus faunus* Newman, 1838; lectotype. 7 dorsal abdomen, dorsoapical 9 head, frontal 10 head, dorsal 11 abdomen, lateroapical 12 labels.
Sawfly taxa (Hymenoptera, Symphyta) described by Edward Newman and Charles Healy

be used as the valid name of the species referred to in recent years first as Hartigia albomaculata (or H. albomaculatus, misspelling) and latterly as H. helleri, and that after weighing up the evidence, the type locality of P. faunus can be accepted as being in the area of London.

Specimens without type status

Amongst the specimens borrowed for examination were also the following Tenthredinidae, apparently identified by Newman. None of these specimens is considered to be a type.

1♂ Euura atra (Jurine, 1807), det. A. Liston, with handwritten superscript on the printed label “Euura cynips, Newm.” and the following additional labels: “[printed] 1 Cynips Newm.”, “[handwritten / blue paper] Euura roboris Newman”. Remarks: The colouration of this specimen (completely black antennae, femora basally black) does not fit Newman’s (1837: 260) very short original description of the male of Euura cynips. The specimen therefore cannot be considered to belong to the type series of E. cynips. Newman (1869: 319) wrote that “Euura cynips produces the familiar gall to be found almost everywhere on the leaves of the crack willow (Salix fragilis): this gall is of an oblong form, and protrudes equally from both surfaces of the leaf; it is usually of a red tint on the upper surface [...]”. This statement clearly refers to the gall of Pontania proxima (Serville, 1823), but having been published more than thirty years after the description of E. cynips, it cannot be used as an argument for interpreting the name as a synonym of P. proxima. Based on the inadequate original description, Liston et al. (2006) treated E. cynips as a synonym of E. testaceipes (Brischke, 1883) and as a nomen oblitum. This treatment should be maintained.

1♀ Heterarthrus ochropoda (Klug, 1818), det. A. Liston, with handwritten superscript on the printed label “Druida populi”. Remarks: No publication has been located in which the name “Druida populi” is used.

2♀ Pontania proxima (Serville, 1823), det. A. Liston, with handwritten superscript on the printed label “Euura roboris, Newm.” Remarks: No publication has been located in which the name “Euura roboris” is used. Newman (1869) did make a name Euura quercus available (Taeger et al. 2010), by publishing a seven-word description of a gall on oak that he supposed to have been caused by a sawfly. Whether this has anything to do with “E. roboris”, a name possibly indicating a relationship with Quercus robur, cannot at present be answered.
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