PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE REGLES FOR ONCOTYLUS FIEBER, 1858 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA), A GENUS BASED UPON AN ERRONEOUSLY DETERMINED SPECIES

By W. E. CHINA, M.A.

(Assistant Keeper in the Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History).)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)144.)

Oncotylus Fieber, 1858

Original reference: -Fieber, 1858, Wien. ent. Monatschr. 2:318.

Author by whom the type in question was designated and reference:—Kirkaldy, 1906, Trans. Amer. ent. Soc. 32:126.

Name of species so designated as type:—Capsus tanaceti Fieber, 1858, i.e., Capsus tanaceti (Fallén) Fieber, 1858, nec Fallén, 1807.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question:—Capsus tanaceti Herrich-Schaeffer, 1836, nec Capsus tanaceti Fallén, 1807, i.e., the species the valid name of which is Oncotylus punctipes Reuter, 1873, Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Ak. Handl. 3 (1): 42.

Discussion of case :- Fieber based his genus Oncotylus on Capsus decolor Fallén, 1807, Capsus tanaceti Fallén, 1807, and Oncotylus fenestratus Fieber, 1858. Kirkaldy, 1906, fixed Oncotylus tanaceti Fieber, 1858, as the type, indicating that this species was not Capsus tanaceti Fallén, 1807, the species actually referred to by Fieber, but Oncotylus punctipes Reuter, 1879, as had been shown by Reuter, 1873, Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl. 3 (1): 42 and 1879, Act. Soc. Sci. Fenn. 13 (2): 279. Fieber apparently followed Herrich-Schaeffer 1836, Wanz. Ins. 3: 85 and Kirschbaum, 1855, Khyn. Wiesbaden 1: (Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau 10:) 80 no. 102, in his identification of Capsus tanaceti Fallén, 1807, but, as shown by Reuter, the species which they wrongly identified as such was a distinct species later described by Reuter as Oncotylus punctipes, which therefore becomes the type of Oncotylus Fieber. If it were necessary under the Code to assume that Fieber's determination of Capsus tanaceti Fallén was correct, then Oncotylus Fieber, 1858, would replace Megalocoleus Reuter, 1890, which is a new name for Macrocoleus Fieber, 1858, nec Desvignes, 1849 (Hymenoptera) and Oncotylus auct. would become Anoterops Fieber, 1858. Such action would not only cause confusion in the nomenclature of these genera, but would also run directly counter to Fieber's intention, which was to separate his genera Oncotylus and Macrocoleus (i.e., Megalocoleus Reuter n.n.) described within a few pages of one another in the same work. It would also be open to the strongest objection in that it would involve the designation as type of Oncotylus of a species disagreeing with the generic description. It is for this reason that I have accepted Oncotylus punctipes Reuter instead of Capsus tanaceti Fallén as type of Oncotylus.

Action by the International Commission desired:—A declaration that the type of Oncotylus Fieber, 1858, is Oncotylus punctipes Reuter, 1873, Bihang K. Svensk. Vet.-Akad. Handl. 3 (1): 42 and not Capsus (Phytocoris) tanaceti Fallén, 1807, Hem. Suec. Cimic.: 83, the species included in the genus by Fieber, since Fallén's species agrees neither with Fieber's generic description nor with the description of the type species given by Fieber, which was clearly misidentified as Capsus (Phytocoris) tanaceti Fallén.²⁰

²⁰ See footnote 12 above.