

Notes on Palaearctic Eumenidae (Hymenoptera)

by

J. VAN DER VECHT¹)

The following notes have resulted from the preparatory work for a catalogue of the palaearctic Eumenidae.

1. The name *Epiponus* Saussure, 1875. — BLÜTHGEN (1961 : 229) correctly places this name in the synonymy of *Oplomerus* Westwood, 1840. However, in his paper this name is followed by “(*Epipona* Latr., 1802)”, and this could suggest that *Epiponus* Saussure is an emendation of LATREILLE's name. Actually *Epiponus* Saussure is an emendation of “*Epipona* Shuck.” = *Epipona* Kirby and Spence, 1815, whereas *Epipona* Latreille, 1802, is the valid name of a neotropical genus of social wasps (type species: *E. tatua* (Cuvier)).

2. The identity of *Vespa albofasciata* Rossi, 1790. — According to BLÜTHGEN (1961 : 78) this is a synonym of “*Oplomerus melanocephalus* (Gmelin)” = *Odynerus melanocephalus* (Gmelin). Actually, however, Rossi's species does not belong to the Vespoidea; it has been identified as a Sphecoid wasp of the genus *Cerceris* long ago (ILLIGER, 1807). The error is evidently copied from DALLA TORRE's catalogue, where the same reference is found in vol. 8 : 450 under *Cerceris* and in vol. 9 : 77 under *Odynerus*.

3. The type species of the genus *Pterocheilus* Klug, 1805. — It is unfortunate that BLÜTHGEN (1961) in his valuable revision of the Vespoidea of Central Europe has refused to accept *Pterocheilus phaleratus* (Panzer, 1797) as the type of this genus. He believes to have “proved convincingly (in 1939 and with more evidence in 1955) for people who are able to think logically and who are willing to use that capacity” (l.c., p. 229; my translation), that BLANCHARD (1840) did not have the intention to designate a type when he wrote “Le type du genre est la Ptérochile ceinturée (*Pt. phalerata*)”. As a further argument he mentions in 1961 (l.c., p. 230) that BLANCHARD would have selected *Pt. pallasii* Klug (the first species mentioned by KLUG) as the type if he had indeed had that intention.

BLÜTHGEN thus suggests that in the case of a difference between the possible intention of an author and the contents of his published statement, the latter should be regarded as subordinate. However, there is nothing in the International Rules to support this view, and BLANCHARD's statement is distinctly a valid designation in the sense of article 69 (a, III) of the Code. Consequently there is no good reason to reject BLANCHARD's designation, which antedates those of BINGHAM (1897) and ASHMEAD (1902).

Finally, it may be remarked that even if BLANCHARD's designation were invalid, *Pt. phaleratus* must be regarded as the type since it was figured by this author in the “Disciples Edition” of CUVIER's “Règne Animal”, 1846, pl. 124, fig. 2 (“Édition accompagnée de planches gravées représentant les types de tous les genres...”).

¹) Division of Systematic Zoology, c/o Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden.

4. The status of the genus *Nannopterochilus* Blüthgen, 1961. — The creation of this genus is based on the following considerations: (a) the type species of *Pterocheilus* Klug is not *Pt. phaleratus* (Panz.), but *Pt. pallasii* Klug, designated by BINGHAM (1897) and by ASHMEAD (1902), and (b) *Pt. phaleratus* (Panz.) does not belong to the same genus as *Pt. pallasii* Klug.

As (a) is incorrect under the International Rules, the nominal genus *Nannopterochilus* Blüthgen, being isogenotypic with *Pterocheilus* Klug, is an objective junior homonym of *Pterocheilus* Klug. Whether it will now be desirable to propose a new name for *Pterocheilus* sensu BLÜTHGEN (containing *Pt. pallasii* Klug and other species to which BLÜTHGEN's diagnose, l.c., p. 23, applies) is a question which for the moment I prefer to leave unanswered.

5. The date of publication of *Hemipterochilus* Ferton. — BLÜTHGEN (1961 : 232, sub 7, 2) cites BOHART (1940) as the author of *Hemipterochilus*, thereby disagreeing with BEQUAERT (1918), according to whom this name must be ascribed to FERTON (1910). BLÜTHGEN quotes from a paper by this author in *Ann. Soc. ent. France* 78 (1909, published in 1910), and defends that the name *Hemipterochilus* is not validly proposed here, because FERTON did not intend to introduce a new taxonomic unit. Remarkably enough, he does not discuss the introduction of the name in an earlier paper by FERTON, even though he mentions BOHART's reference to this publication on the same page (l.c., p. 232).

In *Ann. Soc. ent. France* 77 (1908, published in 1909, p. 572), FERTON gives some notes on the habits of "*Hemipterochilus* (1) *terricola* Mocs. = *Odynerus terricola* Mocs." and states in a footnote "(1) M. J. Pérez a crée ce sous-genre pour les Odynérites dont l'un des sexes seulement a les palpes ciliés". The name *Hemipterochilus* was herewith made available, with the type species *terricola* Mocs., by monotypy. And since PÉREZ cannot be regarded as the person who "is alone responsible both for the name and the conditions that make it available" (art. 50 of the Code), the name must be attributed to Ferton.

6. Synonymy of *Hemipterochilus fairmairi* (Saussure). — The species described by H. DE SAUSSURE, 1852, in *Ét. Fam. Vesp.* 1 : 154, 155 (in key, *fairmairii*!), 216, ♂, from Madrid under the name *Odynerus fairmairi* (both ANDRÉ and DALLA TORRE have accepted this spelling!) has been overlooked by most authors. In GINER MARI's review of the Vespoidea of Spain (1945, *Himenópteros de España*, Madrid) it is not even mentioned. Recently BLÜTHGEN (1962, *Dt. ent. Z.*, N.F. 9 : 242) suggested that it might be a colour variety of *Hemipterochilus invasor* (Dusmet), described in 1909 from Madrid and other localities in Spain. In my opinion the two are certainly conspecific, a conclusion which I had reached in 1958 when I could compare a series of both sexes of *H. invasor* in DUSMET's collection with the original description of *H. fairmairi* (Saussure). The colour patterns are hardly different, if one takes into account that DE SAUSSURE erroneously described the penultimate (12th) antennal segment as being entirely yellow. Apparently he overlooked that the black tip of the antenna consists of two segments; it is the eleventh segment which is entirely yellow; segment 10 is brownish with yellow margins.

Another synonym of *H. fairmairi* (Saussure) is *Pterocheilus sanzi* Dusmet, described in 1903 (*Mems R. Soc. esp. Hist. nat.* 2 : 216, 218) from a single female collected at El Escorial. Through the kind cooperation of Prof. G. CEBALLOS I was enabled to study this specimen. It differs from the females of *invasor* only in the shape of the clypeus, which is unusually swollen in its lower half. I have no doubt that this is an individual abnormality due to some kind of injury (perhaps by an internal parasite?).

7. The type species of *Symmorphus* Wesmael. — BLÜTHGEN (1961 : 194) accepts ASHMEAD's designation of *Odynerus sinuatus* (F.) as the type of this genus, although in 1935 RICHARDS (*Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* 83 : 162) had pointed out that this designation is invalid because *O. sinuatus* was not originally included. The type species designated by RICHARDS is *Odynerus elegans* Wesmael, 1833. It could be argued that ASHMEAD's type designation is correct, because in his monograph of Belgian *Odynerus* (1833) WESMAEL listed *Vespa sinuata* Fabr. in the synonymy of *Odynerus bifasciatus* (L.), one of the included species. However, the supplement of 1836, in which the name *Symmorphus* is proposed, does not contain any reference to that synonymy, so that it is not possible to say with certainty whether in 1836 WESMAEL still regarded *V. sinuata* F. as conspecific with *O. bifasciatus* (L.). It may therefore be concluded that there are no good reasons to regard ASHMEAD's type designation as valid.

8. Synonymy of *Stenodynerus* Saussure and *Nannodynerus* Blüthgen. — The type species of the genus *Nannodynerus* Blüthgen 1938 (originally described as a subgenus, *Konowia* 16 (1937) : 218), is *Lionotus teutonicus* Blüthgen, 1937, by original designation. This species is in many respects so similar to *Odynerus chinensis* Saussure, 1863, that the two must be regarded as congeneric. Since the latter species was designated as the type species of *Stenodynerus* Saussure, 1863 (*Mém. Soc. phys. Hist. nat. Genève* 17 : 228), by R. BOHART, 1939 (*Pan Pacific Ent.* 15 : 100), I regard *Nannodynerus* Blüthgen as an invalid, junior, subjective synonym of *Stenodynerus* Saussure.

9. The date of publication of *Chlorodynerus* Blüthgen. — The name of this subgenus was originally published (in *Boll. Soc. ent. ital.* 81, 1951) in a somewhat unfortunate way, for it was not accompanied as such by "a statement that purports to give characters differentiating the taxon" (Article 13 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature). The only species that was included is mentioned in a key to the *Euodynerus* species of the Balkan and is described on p. 67 under the name *E. (Chlorodynerus) ypsilon* (Kostylev). On p. 75 the author states that *Odynerus chloroticus* Spinola is the type of the new subgenus *Chlorodynerus*, and on the next page he remarks that *E. ypsilon* takes an isolated position in the subgenus *Chlorodynerus*, but that it belongs here on account of the peculiar characters of the legs of the male. Since these characters are described in detail for *E. ypsilon* on p. 67, it may in my opinion be concluded that the name *Chlorodynerus* can be considered as being accompanied by a reference to the required statement concerning the characters differentiating the taxon.

For this reason I do not agree with BLÜTHGEN (1954) who in his revision of this group (*Dt. ent. Z.*, N.F. 1 : 225—265) remarked in a footnote that in his previous paper of 1951 (*Boll. Soc. ent. ital.* 81 : 66—76) this name was not validly published.

10. The identity of *Vespa variegata* Fabricius, 1793. — The type of FABRICIUS' *Vespa variegata*, described in *Entom. Syst.* 2 : 269, is a somewhat discoloured female of the species which is generally known as *Euodynerus crenatus* (Lepeletier). It is very extensively marked with yellow (? or orange-yellow); the inter-antennal spot is coalescent with the spots in the eye-emarginations, the dorsal part of the pronotum is only slightly brownish in the posterior angles, the mark on the mesepisternum extends a little over the transverse suture, the lateral areas of the scutellum (the striate parts which are separated from the disk by a deep fovea) are yellowish, and the coxae are almost entirely yellow. The sixth gastral tergite, however, is entirely black.

The type of LEPELETIER's *Odynerus crenatus* also came from North Africa (Oran, Algeria), yet this specimen is evidently less abundantly marked with yellow than *Vespa variegata* F., for the coxae are described as being "noires, tachées de jaune". If these two colour forms would prove to be geographically segregated, the darker form which inhabits Southern Europe as well as a part of Northern Africa might be called *E. variegatus crenatus* (Lepeletier).

Vespa variegata Fabricius has been misidentified by H. DE SAUSSURE (1853, *Ét. Fam. Vesp.* 1 : 229) and subsequent authors, including BLÜTHGEN (1952, *Mitt. münch. ent. Ges.* 42 : 4), who placed this species in the genus *Tropidodynerus* Blüthgen, 1939. The correct name of *Tropidodynerus variegatus* auctt. nec F. is apparently *Tropidodynerus flavus* (Lepeletier, 1841); LEPELETIER's *Odynerus flavus* was also described from Oran and has a colour pattern similar to that of *Euodynerus variegatus* (F.).

11. The correct name of "*Odynerus*" *herrichii* Saussure, 1855. — BLÜTHGEN's reference to this species (1961 : 133) is incomplete; H. DE SAUSSURE did not describe it in the subgenus *Oplopus*, but in the division *Pseudepipona* of the subgenus "*Epipona* Shuck. (*Oplopus* Wesm.)". The name *herrichii* has been considered the valid name of this species, until in 1952 BLÜTHGEN (*Nachr. Bl. bayer. Ent.* 1 : 29) proposed to use the name *variegatus* Herrich-Schaeffer, 1839. This name was a secondary junior homonym of *Vespa variegata* Fabricius since 1852, when the latter species was placed in *Odynerus* by H. DE SAUSSURE. This author misidentified the Fabrician species and regarded it as identical with *Odynerus flavus* Lepeletier, 1841. Following this error, BLÜTHGEN (1939, *Veröff. dt. Kol.- u. Uebersee Mus. Bremen* 2 : 260) placed it in his new genus *Tropidodynerus*. The objective homonymy in the genus *Odynerus* thus existed from 1852 to 1939.

The fact that *Vespa variegata* Fabricius is not a *Tropidodynerus* (see this paper, note no. 10), but a member of the genus *Euodynerus*, renders the continued use of the revived name *variegatus* for *Pseudepipona herrichii* (Saussure) highly undesirable. *Euodynerus* and *Pseudepipona* are closely related, and at least for a

number of years GIORDANI SOIKA has treated the former as a subgenus of the latter. The use of identical names in these taxa is likely to cause confusion.

BLÜTHGEN (1961 : 133) defends the continued use of the name *variegatus* instead of *herrichii* by referring to the Copenhagen Decisions and to a formal protest sent by him to the Secretary of the International Commission.

Both arguments are invalid, however, for from the articles 57 and 59c of the Code it is perfectly clear that in this case the name that was long ago rejected as a homonym cannot be restored. Such a procedure is only possible for names rejected after 1960.

Literature

- ASHMEAD, W. H., 1902, Classification of theVespoidea. — *Canad. Ent.* 34 : 203—210.
 BEQUAERT, J., 1918, A revision of the Vespidae of the Belgian Congo, etc. — *Bul. Am. Mus. nat. Hist.* 39 : 1—384.
 BLANCHARD, E., 1840, Hymenoptera, in: F. L. LAPORTE DE CASTELNAU, Histoire naturelle des Animaux Articulés 3, 672 pp. — Paris.
 BLÜTHGEN, P., 1961, Die Faltenwespen Mitteleuropas. — *Abb. dt. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, Chem. Geol. Biol.* 1961 (2): 1—252.
 BOHART, R. M., 1940, A revision of the North American species of *Pterocheilus* and notes on related genera. — *Ann. ent. Soc. Am.* 33 : 162—208.
 DALLA TORRE, K. W. VON, 1894, Catalogus Hymenopterorum 9 (Vespidae): 1—181.

De correcte naam voor de Blinde Bij (Dipt., Syrphidae). In de correcties aan het einde van het register van de afgelopen jaargang las ik, dat *Eristalis tenax* vervangen zou moeten worden door *Tubifera tenax*. De heer KABOS, die de redactie op deze verandering geattendeerd heeft, vergist zich echter. Het is deze oude kwestie over de namen van MEIGEN, die vele jaren verwarring heeft geschapen, maar waarover in 1963 door de International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature officieel een beslissing is genomen (*Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 20 : 339, 1963). De publicatie van MEIGEN uit 1800, waarin de naam *Tubifera* met als type-species *Musca tenax* voor het eerst wordt genoemd, is in 1963 officieel onderdrukt. Daarmee is automatisch *Tubifera* vervallen en kunnen we *Eristalis tenax* blijven gebruiken. Dat was ook de reden van deze beslissing: dat alle ingeburgerde namen niet plotseling door andere behoeften vervangen te worden. Ik geloof, dat iedereen daarmee zeer tevreden was.

P. J. VAN HELSDINGEN, Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden.

Ichneumonide gekweekt uit *Taleporia tubulosa* (Retz.) (Lep.). In de jaren 1961 tot en met 1964 werden uit bovengenoemde Psychide vele Ichneumoniden gekweekt, die alle tot één zeer merkwaardige soort behoorden, namelijk *Hemichneumon elongatus* Ratz. De parasiet behoort tot de Phaeogenini, die vroeger wel werden genoemd Ichneumoninae cyclopnesticidae, en staat daarin nog wat afzonderlijk wegens het bijzonder langgerekte abdomen.

De heren VAN AARTSEN en SLOB hebben grote aantallen zakjes van de gastheer-vlinder verzameld en daaruit kwamen regelmatig exemplaren van deze Ichneumonide. De heer SLOB kreeg zelfs uit één verzameling van 40 zakjes ook 40 sluipwespen. Alle dieren kwamen uit in de maanden april en mei.

Het meest merkwaardige van de *Hemichneumon* is wel, dat binnen één generatie van dezelfde vindplaatsen een opvallende variatie voorkomt in vleugelreduktie: van normaal gebouwd tot ca. 50% reductie van de vleugellengte. De reductie van de vleugeladering lijkt me een studie opzichzelf waard!

G. DEN HOED, Oude Amersfoortseweg 325, Hilversum.