

PROPOSED SUSPENSION OF THE RÈGLES 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 tanacetii* Fieber, 1858, *i.e.*, *Capsus tanacetii* (Fallén) Fieber, 1858, *nec* Fallén, 1807.

Species intended by the original author of the genus when employing the specific name in question:—*Capsus tanacetii* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1836, *nec* *Capsus tanacetii* 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 tanacetii* Fallén, 1807, and *Oncotylus fenestratus* Fieber, 1858. Kirkaldy, 1906, fixed *Oncotylus tanacetii* Fieber, 1858, as the type, indicating that this species was not *Capsus tanacetii* 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, *Rhyn. Wiesbaden* 1 : (*Jahrb. Ver. Naturk. Herz. Nassau* 10 :) 80 no. 102, in his identification of *Capsus tanacetii* 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 tanacetii* 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 tanacetii* 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*) *tanacetii* 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*) *tanacetii* Fallén.²⁰

²⁰ See footnote 12 above.