

Some synonyms in Aphididae (Homoptera)

by

D. HILLE RIS LAMBERS

Bladluisonderzoek T.N.O., Bennekom, Netherlands

1. On *Todolachnus abietis* Matsumura, 1917.

Somewhat unusual complications seem to be associated with the above genus and species. Some Central European workers use the generic names *Buchneria* Börner, 1952, type-species *Aphis pectinatae* Nördlinger, 1880, a species name substituted by BRAUN (1938) for *Lachnus pichtae* Mordvilko, 1895. These same workers use the name *Todolachnus abieticola* (Cholodkovsky, 1899), a combination introduced by BÖRNER (1952). Western European and American authors place all these species in *Cinara* Curtis, 1835.

Through the kindness of Prof. Dr. M. INOUE, Kuriyama, Japan, I received identified specimens of *abietis* Mats. which agree very well with the description by MATSUMURA. From these specimens there can be no doubt that *pectinatae* Nördl. and *abietis* Mats. are extremely nearly related, and that they both fall into what BÖRNER described as *Buchneria*. Consequently those workers, who accepted *Buchneria* Börner, 1952 as a valid taxon, will have to use the name *Todolachnus* Matsumura, 1917 instead. *Todolachnus* as used by BÖRNER (1952) and followers, nec MATSUMURA, 1917, can be replaced by *Dinolachnus* Börner, 1940, type-species *Lachniella* "v. *cecconii*" del Guercio, 1909 (= *Lachnus abieticola* Cholodkovsky, 1899).

Those workers who, like myself, do not accept *Todolachnus* Mats., 1917 as a valid full genus, but place *abietis* Mats. in *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, will have to use another species name for *abietis* Mats. *Aphis abietis* Walker, 1848 which also belongs in *Cinara* Curtis offers no problem, for according to DONCASTER (1961) it is a synonym of *Cinara* (described as *Aphis*) *pilicornis* (Hartig, 1841), or, with greater certainty, of *Cinara* (described as *Lachnus*) *pinicola* (Kaltenbach, 1843). However, there is a *Lachnus abietis* Fitch, 1851 described from *Abies nigra* from New York State, which also is a *Cinara* species. *Abies nigra* is, according to information received from Mr. G. BOELEMA of the Dept. for Plant Systematics, Wageningen, a synonym of four different *Picea* spp., but not of an *Abies*. Of these four *Picea* spp. I believe that *P. mariana* Mill. is the most likely modern name for FITCH's *Abies nigra*. *Lachnus abietis* Fitch has also been synonymized with *Cinara pinicola* (Kltb.), but that synonymy I doubt. I have seen no records of *C. pinicola* from *Picea mariana*, and the description by FITCH of *Lachnus abietis* cannot relate to *pinicola* Kltb.

In North America according to HOTTES (1961) and BRADLEY (1961) *Cinara mariana* Bradley, 1956; *Cinara rara* Bradley; *C. coloradensis* (Gillette, 1917); *C. fornacula* (Hottes, 1930); *C. hottesi* (Gillette & Palmer, 1924); *C. palmerae* (Gillette, 1917); *C. braggii* (Gillette, 1917) and some as yet unnamed species occur on *Picea mariana*. One (or more) of these may be *Cinara abietis* (Fitch, 1851). It is very improbable that *abietis* Fitch should be a synonym of another *Cinara* from *Picea mariana*.

Therefore *Cinara* (described as *Lachnus*) *abietis* (Fitch, 1851) preoccupies *Cinara* (described as *Todolachnus*) *abietis* (Matsumura, 1917). And as the latter apparently has not been described under other names it should be renamed.

For *Todolachnus abietis* Matsumura, 1917 (transferred to *Cinara* Curtis), nec *Lachnus abietis* Fitch., 1851 (transferred to *Cinara* Curtis), I propose as new name *Cinara matsumurana* nov. nov.

2. On *Dactynotus ochropus* Hille Ris Lambers, 1939.

This species was described from a few specimens from *Chrysanthemum leucanthemum* collected by the Museo di Storia Naturale, Trento, in North East Italy. However, the real host of this species is not *Chrysanthemum leucanthemum*, but it appears to be *Lactuca perennis*, on which plant I found large colonies in Switzerland, near Sion. It is now possible to ascertain that KOCH (1855) described the same species from *Lactuca perennis* as *Siphonophora lactucae* F., which becomes a synonym of *Dactynotus ochropus* H.R.L., 1939, as KOCH credited the species to FABRICIUS. *Aphis lactucae* F. is a synonym of *Hyperomyzus lactucae* (L., 1758).

3. On *Aphis insularis* Hille Ris Lambers, 1959.

When I described this species I pointed out that it might be identical with *Cerosipha longirostris* Börner, 1950, which belongs in the genus *Aphis* L. However, *Aphis longirostris* (Börner, 1950) is preoccupied by *Aphis longirostris* Fabricius, 1776, now known as *Stomaphis longirostris* (F.).

I have since discovered that also the name *Aphis insularis* cannot be used for the *Aphis* infesting halophilous *Plantago* ssp., for it is preoccupied by *Aphis insularis* Blanchard, 1923, a species belonging either in the *A. fabae* group or in the *A. jacobaeae* group, described from Argentine.

For *Aphis insularis* Hille Ris Lambers, 1959 nec Blanchard, 1923 I propose the name *Aphis longirostrata* nom. nov. This species was also found near Antibes in Southern France.

4. On *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky, 1929.

From NEVSKY's original description it is not quite clear which of two species of *Aphis* infesting *Althaea* in Western Asia is involved, *Aphis umbrella* Börner, or a very similar species, but with an extremely long last rostral segment. However, from a recent redescription of *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky by DAVLETSHINA (1964) it appears that NEVSKY had the species with the long last rostral segment. TUATAY & REMAUDIÈRE (1964) record this species from Turkey under the name *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky. BÖRNER (1958) lists the species from Germany, but does not mention characters. Dr. R. VAN DEN BOSCH collected *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky from *Althaea* sp. in Iran and Libanon.

The name *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky, 1929 cannot be maintained, as it is preoccupied by *Aphis althaea* Harris, 1776, a very different insect. I therefore propose the name *Aphis davletshinae* nom. nov. for *Aphis althaeae* Nevsky, 1929, nec Harris, 1776.

5. On *Eonaphis* and *Paulianaphis* Essig, 1957.

It was known to those near him that the late Prof. E. O. ESSIG in the last years of his life suffered from increasing loss of memory. Almost certainly as a result of this there is some confusion both in the descriptions and in the type series of *Eonaphis pauliani* Essig, 1957, and of *Paulianaphis madagascariensis* Essig, 1957.

Examination of type slides showed that those labelled "*Eonaphis paulini* Essig" actually contain the species with only four dorsal processi that was described as *Paulianaphis madagascariensis* in ESSIG (1957). Type slides labelled "*Paulian madagascariensis* Essig" on the other hand contain the species described as *Eonaphis pauliani* Essig, with spinal and marginal rows of long processi. Apparently an error in labelling was made, and the species-name labels were interchanged.

From the 1957 paper one would assume that also the collecting data on the the slides were interchanged, for a slide with the label "*Paulian madagascariensis* Essig" has on the left hand label: "*Euphorbia splendens* / Esimbazaza / Madagascar/11-6-1952/A.P. coll.", and therefore correspond roughly with the text which gives as host "*Euphorbia stenopetala*", and as locality: "Tranoroa". However, when I asked Dr. R. PAULIAN for some material of *Eonaphis pauliani* Essig I received a number of specimens labelled *Euphorbia splendens*, Tsimbazaza, and these specimens all have the numerous processi figured and described for *Eonaphis pauliani* Essig. QUEDNAU (1964) described *Eonaphis euphorbia* n. sp. from Madagascar from *Euphorbia didieroides*, and also this is undoubtedly the same as *Eonaphis pauliani* Essig.

We may therefore assume that the host plant and locality records on the type slides are not interchanged, but that they have been interchanged in the 1957 paper, in which both genera and species are described.

Following the above suggestions the generic and species names on the type slides of the above mentioned species in the ESSIG collection of Aphididae have on February 10, 1966 been changed in such a manner that they correspond to the names under which the species in the slides have been described in 1957.

References

- BÖRNER, C., 1952, Europae centralis Aphides. *Mitt. Thüring. Bot. Gesellsch. Beiheft* 3: 1—488.
- BRADLEY, G. A., 1961, A study of the systematics and biology of aphids of the genus *Cinara* Curtis in Canada. Canada Dept. Forestry, Forest Entomology and Pathology Branch. 96 p., with appendix of 14 p.
- BRAUN, R., 1938, Die Honigtaufraße und die honigtauliefernden Kienläuse. (Cinarini C.B.). *Z. ang. Ent.* 24: 461—510.
- DAVLETSHINA, A. G., 1964, Aphids of the genus *Aphis* L. of the Usbekistan fauna (in Russian). *Ac. Sc. Usbek S.S.R. Tashkent*. 135 p.
- DONCASTER, J. P., 1961, Francis Walker's aphids. British Museum, London. 165 p.
- ESSIG, E. O., 1957, Deux nouveaux aphides de Madagascar (Homoptera). *Naturaliste Malgache* 9: 287—289.
- HARRIS, M., 1776, Exposition of English Insects. London, p. 66—67.
- HOTTES, F. C., 1961, A review and key of North American *Cinara* (Homoptera, Aphididae) occurring on Picea. *Great Basin Naturalist* 21: 35—50.
- NEVSKY, V. P., 1929, Aphids of Central Asia (in Russian). Tashkent. 424 p.
- QUEDNAU, F. W., 1964, Further notes on the aphid fauna of South Africa (Homoptera, Aphidoidea). *S. Afr. J. Agric. Sci.* 7: 659—672.
- TUATAY, N. & G. REMAUDIÈRE, 1964, Première contribution au catalogue des Aphididae (Hom.) de la Turquie. *Rev. Path. vég. Ent. Agr. Fr.* 43: 243—278.