Synonyms of some European Trichoptera

Hans Malicky

Abstract—The following synonyms are proposed: 


1. Wormaldia khourmai and related species (Philopotamidae)

Wormaldia khourmai Schmidt 1959, W. bulgarica Novák 1971 and W. balcanica Kumánský 1979 are similar to each other (Malicky 2004:83). They have in common many fine and straight spinules in the phallus. Their inferior appendages are rounded at their bases of segment 1, and are continuously narrowed to the end of segment 2. The distal end of segment 10 is rounded in lateral view in W. khourmai, but the other two species have a minute dorsal tooth on this distal part. All this may be slightly variable. Most important for the separation are the spines in the phallus. The specimens of W. khourmai from the Caucasus have one large and two smaller straight spines in addition to the many tiny spinules. W. bulgarica has one large distal spine which may also be doubled, and W. balcanica has typically three large spines of equal size which are straight and relatively short and sturdy. In all three species, specimens may occur where the one or other spine may be lacking, probably lost. Possible transitions may exist in northeastern Anatolia: one male from Samsun has the typical form of segment 10 like balcanica, but has one large and two smaller spines as in khourmai. One male from Trabzon has the rounded form of the distal part of segment 10, but only one large spine in the phallus. - W. khourmai lives in eastern Turkey, in the Caucasus and Elburz Mountains. W. bulgarica lives in the Bulgarian Mountains Rila, Rhodope and Pirin, and in Greece in Thrakia, the Rhodope and in the Pindos Mountains. W. balcanica lives in the Bulgarian Strandsha Mountains, in western Turkey and in the islands of Lesbos, Chios and Rhodos.

Wormaldia albanica Olah 2010 was described from one male from Albania and has the typical single spine, but a slightly variable end of segment 10. The type locality is close to the records in the Greek Pindos Mountains:

Wormaldia balcanica Olah 2010 = Wormaldia bulgarica Novák 1971, nov. syn.

Wormaldia busa Olah 2014 has the three typical straight and sturdy spines in the phallus. The end of segment 10 falls within the variation for W. balcanica. W. busa was described from the island of Rhodes where W. balcanica was already known (Malicky 2005:74):

Wormaldia busa Olah 2014 = Wormaldia balcanica Kumánský 1979, nov. syn.

Wormaldia daga Olah 2014 has the typical distal spine in the phallus. The end of segment 10 is rounded similar to W. khourmai, but the area of khourmai is far away, and individual variation is to be expected. W. daga was described from Bulgarian mountains where bulgarica is well known.

Wormaldia daga Olah 2014 = Wormaldia bulgarica Novák 1971, nov. syn.

2. Wormaldia kimminsi Botosaneanu 1960

The figure of Wormaldia graeca by Olah (2014) corresponds well with those of W. kimminsi (Malicky 2004:83), except Segment 10 which is broader in his figure. This may be caused by a different position of the preparation under the microscope, or by individual variability. The phallus includes the typical large, slightly bent scerite which is accompanied by two bunches of fine spines. I see no reason to make a separate species from this variation.

Wormaldia graeca Olah 2014 = Wormaldia kimminsi Botosaneanu 1960, nov. syn.

3. Wormaldia asterusia Malicky 1972

According to the description and the figure, Wormaldia homora (Olah 2014) is without doubt W. asterusia, a species which lives from Crete in the south to the Bulgarian mountains (Malicky 2005:179), and is common in many sites. Its variability is well known.

Wormaldia homora Olah 2014 = Wormaldia asterusia Malicky 1972, nov. syn.

4. Tinodes petaludes Malicky 1975 (Psychomyiidae)

Olah (2014) described Tinodes karpathos from the island of Karpathos, and compared it only with Tinodes reisseri which is an endemic of the island of Crete. He did not mention that Tinodes petaludes is known from Karpathos (Malicky 2005:190) and this species corresponds exactly with his drawing (Malicky 2004:118, 119).

Tinodes karpathos Olah 2014 = Tinodes petaludes Malicky 1975, nov. syn.

5. Hydropsyche dinarica Marinković 1979 (Hydropsychidae)

Hydropsyche sarnas is described by Olah (2014) from Albania, a short distance from the region where H. dinarica was described. The drawing shows the remarkable phallus which is strikingly broad in lateral view, and has prominent lateral teeth in ventral view, which is characteristic for the widespread H. dinarica.

Hydropsyche sarnas Olah 2014 = Hydropsyche dinarica Marinković 1979, nov. syn.

6. What is Drusus destitus? (Limnephilidae)

In a recent publication, OLAH & al. 2017, p. 169-170 deals with Drusus destitus Kolenati 1848 and writes:

„Drusus destitus (Kolenati, 1848): Malicky 2007-51. „Die Situation is also: Drusus destitus (Kolenati, 1848), species incerta, nec Drusus destitus auct. Drusus adustus (McLachlan 1867) = Drusus destitus auct."
Opposite is right! Drusus destitutus has very distinct, very specific and easy to recognise characters. Brauer's determination is more reliable as accepted also by McLachlan than the location data of some old specimens. Similarly as we have documented the unreliability of old collecting data for Chaetopteryx rugulosa's locus typicus established by commercial insect dealers (OLAH et al. 2015). Dr. destitutus in Silesia? We have to accept the conclusion of McLachlan (1876), FISCHER (1967) and SCHMID (1956) that Drusus adustus is a junior synonym of Drusus destitutus!

In my paper (MALICKY 2007) to which OLÁH (I.C.) refers, I wrote:


Wir kennen inzwischen Drusus destitutus gut als einen Ostalpen-Endemiten und kennen eine Anzahl von Fundorten. Wenn Drusus destitutus aber von Elberfeld und Schlesien beschrieben worden ist, kann es nicht unsere Ostalpen-Art sein, denn die gibt es dort nicht. Was ist also Drusus adustus wirklich?


Drusus destitutus (KOLENATI 1848), species incerta
Drusus adustus (MCLACHLAN 1867) = Drusus destitutus auct.
Drusus adustus (MCLACHLAN 1867) = Drusus destitutus auct.'

I had hoped that my statement was clear and detailed enough to explain the situation so that no misunderstandings might arise. As the above example shows, I was wrong. Therefore, I repeat here once more the story and give a summary for those who do not understand German.

'Stathmoporus destitutus was described by KOLENATI in 1848 and this is confirmed by a male specimen in the Natural History Museum in Vienna, which lacks now a head and abdomen. This specimen bears several labels (see below) and comes from the then town of Elberfeld (now part of Wuppertal) in the Ruhrgebiet. In the text of the description appears also the remark 'Silesia' (in German 'Schlesien'), which is however, as far as I know, not confirmed by voucher specimens. Elberfeld is not in Silesia, as was sometimes reported. – Drusus adustus was described in 1867 by MCLACHLAN from a specimen from Stelzing (Austria, Carinthia, see above). This male is kept in the Natural History Museum in London.

The two species were synonymised because Brauer had written to McLachlan that the type of destitutus was 'specifically identical' with adustus (in which he was erroneous). McLachlan had never seen the destitutus type, and Schmid has prepared his drawings after a pencil sketch by Kimmisch, made after the adustus type, and also had never seen the destitutus type. Not to mention Fischer who had never seen either specimen and had only summarised the literature references, but is called an authority by Oláh. All the earlier figures and descriptions originated from the adustus type which came from Carinthia.

More explanations. We, the Austrian trichopterists, know Drusus adustus quite well. It is an insect which is not rare in its well-known area, i.e. in tiny springs and brooklets in the high elevations between 1100 and 2500 metres of altitude, and only exceptionally down to 800m. A good number of localities are known. It is unthinkable that this endemic, high-mountain insect might live in the lowlands of Ruhrgebiet, more than 700 kilometres away.

What, however, is the specimen from Elberfeld? Which Drusinae species may occur in the Ruhrgebiet? The voucher specimen in the Vienna Museum has no abdomen so that one cannot identify it from the copulatory structures. However, it is clearly a dark specimen, even if the 170 years old specimen is somewhat bleached. It cannot be the widespread and light (yellowish) colored Drusus annulatus. Dark Drusinae which occur in the Ruhrgebiet and its surroundings are: Drusus trifidus MCLACHLAN 1868, Ecclisopteryx dalecarlica KOLENATI 1848 and Ecclisopteryx guttulata PICTEY 1834. Which one could it be?"

Concerning this state of affairs I must confess that I had (MALICKY 2007) certainly written the truth, but not the complete truth. It was my intention to avoid a nomenclatorial disaster, and had hoped that the whole story would be dumped and thus become forgotten. However, OLÁH (I.C.) has resurrected it, so I must say one more word to clear the situation.

The specimen of destitutus from Elberfeld is in the Vienna Museum and was not only studied by Brauer and myself but also by Walter Döhler in 1931, who had seen it when the abdomen was still present, and he had put his identification label on the pin. The labels on the pin are as follows (handwritten in italics):

"Elberfeld" + "Cornelius" + "$5$" + "Kolenati" + "adustus det. Brauer" + "Destitutus det. Kolenati" + "Destitutus Kolenati" + "trifidus $\delta$ det. Döhler 3$".

To this last label, I (I.C.) had not referred above. Walter Döhler was doubtless a competent expert of caddisflies who certainly was able to distinguish the well-known Drusus trifidus from Ecclisopteryx guttulata or E. dalecarlica. Therefore, Drusus destitutus from Elberfeld is the same species as Drusus trifidus. But as trifidus was described in 1868, and destitutus already in 1848, the situation is as follows:

Drusus destitutus (KOLENATI 1848) = Drusus trifidus MCLACHLAN 1868. nov. syn.

As a result, the species which was named Drusus trifidus in many publications must now be called Drusus destitutus because this name has priority. I am well aware that nomenclatorial confusion will arise from this statement, but after Oláh’s publication, unfortunately, I have no other choice.
7. Allogamus uncatus Brauer 1857 (Limnephilidae)

Allogamus uncatus which is widespread in the mountains of eastern Central Europe has its southern limit in the Greek Rodopi mountains. The males of this species in the eastern Alps usually have a sharp hook on the inner edge of their inferior appendages, as seen from below, which is a striking character to recognize the species. This hook however appears less prominent in the southern part of the area, but the typical form of the phallic apparatus in lateral view (MALICKY 2004-272) remains unchanged. Such specimens were described as new species under the names A. tomoor OLAH 2012 from Albania and A. zugor OLAH 2014 from Makedonia:


8. Notidobia bizens Malicky & Sipahiler 1993 (Sericostomatidae)

I have directly compared the holotype of Notidobia nogradorum with the holotype of N. bizens and found no differences in all relevant characters. Both species have been described from Albania.


Personal remarks

In several publications, OLAH & al. (2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2015a, 2017) (it is unknown to me whether all the co-authors which are listed in the titles have really seen the manuscripts) has described many new species and has proposed several generic changes. These publications must of course be accepted, but it is urgently needed to check in detail every one of these descriptions and other nomenclatorial acts in a similar manner as I have done it here. Scrutinising and possibility to falsification is the basic demand of any work in the Natural Sciences. That I have done in the species of Chaetopteryx rugulosa group of which I was well familiar through my own year-long study (MALICKY 2014), which I maintain despite the objections by OLAH & al. (2015a). That I have done with his Allogamus alpensis OLAH, LODOVICI & VALLE 2014, for which I had to do months of field work, breeding larvae in the laboratory and several hundred kilometres of car-driving, and for which I had to study more than 4000 specimens from several Museum and private collections (MALICKY 2016). I am not willing to undertake more of these extraordinary investigations, only to find out possible odd mistakes (see above) from a list of roughly 100 species. As long as these nomenclatorial acts were not cleared in a serious manner through refereeing, I will myself maintain the situation which had existed before these papers have been published.
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