

Notas Nomenclaturales / *Nomenclatural Notes*

Three unavailable aphid species names by Bertels, 1973*

J. M. Nieto Nafría and M. P. Mier Durante

Departamento de Biología Animal
Universidad de León
24071 Leon (España).
e-mail: dbajnn@unileon.es / dbammd@unileon.es

The check-list and catalogues of a specific animal group are of undeniable use in zoosystematic and ecological studies, but they are not without errors, especially when referring to a large group with a complicated taxonomy. These errors are of great importance since check-lists and catalogues are works of reference.

The magnificent “*Catalogue*” by Remaudière & Remaudière (1997) contains 3 available species by Bertels (1973): *A. achinifoliae* (amongst the synonyms of *A. schinifoliae* Blanchard, 1939), *A. neosaliceti* (amongst the synonyms of *A. farinosa* Gmelin, 1790) and *A. pseudopomi* (amongst those of *A. spiraecola* Patch, 1914).

In the previous and also outstanding “*Survey*” by Eastop & Hille Ris Lambers (1976) these species were evaluated differently: *achinifoliae* Bertels appears as a synonym of *schinifoliae* Blanchard (page 80) and as «lapsus pro schinifoliae E.E. Blanchard, 1939» (page 41); whereas *pseudopomi* Bertels and *neosaliceti* Bertels appear as species of Blanchard erroneously attributed to Bertels.

One or perhaps both of the catalogues must contain an error. To clarify the matter we carefully

reviewed the paper on aphids in the Brazilian state of Rio Grande do Sul by Bertels (1973).

Bertels did not make formal descriptions of any of the three species in his article, but he described several species of agronomic interest. For nomenclatural purposes the descriptions are implicit in the key for *Aphis* species. To be more precise, at the end of the 1st proposal of disjunctive 8 Bertels wrote: «*Aphis pseudopomi* n. sp.»; at the end of the 2nd proposal of disjunctive 10 he wrote «*Aphis achinifoliae* n. sp.»; and at the end of the 1st proposal of disjunctive 11 he wrote «*Aphis neosaliceti* n. sp.».

We could therefore consider that all three species names are available species, as do Remaudière & Remaudière and, to a certain extent, Eastop & Hille Ris Lambers and that the rest of what the latter two authors wrote is incorrect.

However, the key by Bertels (1973) for *Aphis* species in Rio Grande do Sul is a literal translation of that by Blanchard (1939) for *Aphis* species in Argentina. So literal that the untranslatable parts are copied: (1) the unusual way of abbreviating the name Linnaeus as «Linn.», (2) the wrongly-placed commas between the name of a species and that of the author, and (3) the indications “n. sp” in the three new species that Blanchard described in detail in his article in 1939. It is obvious that Bertels did not intend to describe new species, which perhaps, he had not even seen (*A. farinosa* has yet to be recorded in Brazil).

Eastop & Hille Ris Lambers acted correctly with regard to *pseudopomi* and *neosaliceti*. However, why did they not do the same in the case of *achinifoliae*? Obviously because they did not realise that a simple typing error had been made,

* This article was realized with a research grant of the Regional Government of *Castilla y León* (Spain): “Áfidos del margen andino de Catamarca, Salta y Jujuy (Argentina)”, LE034A05

since: (1) the difference between *achinifoliae* and *schinifoliae* is one letter “a” and “s”; (2) *achinifoliae* has no etymological meaning, whereas *schinifoliae* does; (3) as can be seen in its typography, the article by Bertels is a copy of a type written text, and the letters “a” and “s” are next to each other on the typewriter keyboard.

In conclusion: under no circumstances can the nominal species *Aphis achinifoliae* Bertels, *Aphis pseudopomi* Bertels and *Aphis neosaliceti* Bertels be considered available species, but rather erroneous attributions to Bertels (1973) of three species by Blanchard (1939), *Aphis schinifoliae*, *Aphis pseudopomi* and *Aphis neosaliceti*, respectively, the first of which could be called a “lapsus machinae”.

References

- BERTELS, A., 1973. Revisão de afídeos no Rio Grande do Sul. *Boletim Técnico Instituto de Pesquisas Agropecuárias do Sul*, 84: 1-64.
- BLANCHARD, E. E., 1939. Estudio sistemático de los afídeos argentinos. *Physis*, 17: 857-1003.
- EASTOP, V. F. & HILLE RIS LAMBERS, D., 1976. *Survey of the World's aphids*. Junk. The Hague. 573 pp.
- REMAUDIÈRE, G. & REMAUDIÈRE, M., 1997. *Catalogue des Aphididae du Monde / Catalogue of the World's Aphididae. Homoptera Aphidoidea*. INRA Editions. Versailles. 478 pp.

Recibido, 2-V-2006
Aceptado, 6-VII-2006
Publicado, 29-XII-2006