

ERIOPHYID MITES OF ALFRED NALEPA

Richard Albert Newkirk



ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA
College Park, Maryland
1984

Alfred Nalepa (19 December 1856–11 December 1929) published descriptions of 331 species, 42 varieties, and 28 subspecies of eriophyid mites between 1887 and 1930. The higher taxa he described include one family, two subfamilies, and 12 genera. Three species were described jointly with other authors. His 1930 work was published posthumously.

Not only was Nalepa the foremost authority on this taxon, but he was also known as the "Founder of Acarology in Austria" (Schuster 1979). The obituary written by K. Rechinger (1909) summarized Nalepa's monumental contributions to science, including his early writings on molluscs and tyroglyphids. V. G. Shevtshenko (1967) expanded upon Rechinger's remarks and wrote a charming account touching upon the personality of Nalepa. Shevtshenko succinctly stated: "Nalepa's excellent ideas are alive now, they agitate the imagination of scientists and call to new investigations."

In his enthusiasm to share his discoveries, Nalepa presented the results of collecting expeditions by naming his material "n. sp." In later publications he often referred to these names as "descr. nulla." I have taken these early presentations to be collection site notes and recorded the names as without descriptions. In the text that follows, these are noted as "checklist of undescribed mites."

Other publication events that cause concern to modern writers include the use of the phrase "N. Gen., n. sp." for the same genus more than once and the appearance of the same article in separate publications or distributed as separata under different dates. The absence of a clear indication of the date of publication of works by many writers during this period of time made assembling these records in chronological order a challenging task, second only to collecting the publications.

In his 1924 work, *Polymorphe Eriophyiden*, Nalepa recognized polymorphism but did not pursue study of this condition. He was a careful researcher and examined numerous mites living within a gall formation. He designated a primary form and "parallel forms," i.e., first and second inhabitants of some galls. The parallel forms and the primary form have specific characteristics in common but belong to separate genera. George C. Steyskal (personal communication 1982), after reviewing

This work is affectionately dedicated to Hartford H. Keifer.

Polymorphe Eriophyiden, noted that Nalepa presented a credible case for synonymy of several genera.

The reader will note elimination of some of the multinominals proposed by Nalepa. H. H. Keifer (1975a: 330) suggested that Nalepa's multinominals call attention to certain morphology that students may then reinterpret if they feel there are sufficient basic data to support revisions. Keifer added (1975a: 331) that many of Nalepa's subspecific and varietal names stand for alternate forms and are therefore synonyms.

H. K. Farkas (1966b) discussed the problems involved in indicating subspecies and varieties. He suggested that J. I. Liro and H. Roivainen simply gave specific status to a number of Nalepa's subspecies and varieties. He notes, however, that the majority of these can justifiably be regarded as distinct species, chiefly on an ecological basis, because they produce galls that are different from those of the related taxa. Farkas prefers to follow Nalepa "from practical considerations." Compelled by the same practical considerations, I find it desirable to elevate multinominals to specific rank. I have indicated who first elevated a subspecies or variety.

The taxonomist who wishes to maintain Nalepa's systematics will find full bibliographic data. Changes have been made not for curatorial purposes but rather to reflect the intent of Nalepa insofar as the rules of nomenclature permit. It is my intention to record Nalepan basonyms. In those cases in which stability would be unduly disturbed, I have urged that current practice be maintained.

Format

Nalepa's eriophyid works are presented under 113 separate titles. A paper started in one issue of a serial and completed in the next is treated as a single article. With a few exceptions, articles are presented in chronological order. Works not affecting nomenclature are noted, usually without comment. Omission of comments should in no manner be interpreted as an opinion that such works are less important.

The full title as it appeared is given. Generic and specific names in titles are italicized. Other words italicized in the original are not italicized here.

When more than one paper was presented in a serial, the name of the publication is reduced to one or two words. The

full title of the serial is cited in the Bibliography. Series (ser.), volume (v.), plate (pl.), and figure (f.) are given in Arabic numerals, even when the original numerals were Roman. Page and plate numbers refer to the basic article.

Genera are arranged alphabetically. For a genus proposed by Nalepa the type-species fixation is given. "Original designation" indicates that formula "Gen. n., sp. n." or its equivalent was used. The first use of that term governed type-species fixation.

Species group names are arranged alphabetically, including changes in rank, emendations, errors, misidentifications, nomina nuda, preoccupied names, and synonyms.

Names not accepted in this work are not italicized on the left margin; elsewhere, italics are used. Specific names that were capitalized in the original are presented in lowercase. Diacritical marks other than the umlaut have been omitted. Nalepa's use of "typicus" to indicate nominant forms is not entered in this work. Changes in rank are referred to its basonym. This is more for convenience than from a conviction that the original combination is the correct assignment.

Emendations are noted; only one is accepted in this work. Subsequent spellings are recorded as errors or emendations. Variant spellings by authors other than Nalepa have not been included.

Entries in this work indicated as misidentifications are based upon statements by Nalepa. These are noted in the text.

Nomina nuda [NOM. NUD.] designations are my responsibility; Nalepa rarely considered his proposed names nomina nuda.

Synonyms are those accepted by Nalepa, or when synonymy is not in keeping with his views, I have indicated the work accepted by me.

Host names are given as used in current botanical literature. The name used by Nalepa, if substantially different, is given in parentheses. Host names of junior synonyms of the mite are given when they differ from that of the senior synonym. Host names appearing in brackets indicate that the name has been supplied from sources other than the original description. (See additional comments on p. 75.)

Additional descriptions direct the reader to illustrations or redescriptions; all additional descriptions are to Nalepa's works.