

The genus **Phyllolabis** O. S. (Dipt., Tipul.);  
a remarkable case of disconnected areas  
in geographical distribution,

by

C. R. Osten Sacken.

It was in July 1853, that the Norwegian entomologist H. Siebke, who died about 1876<sup>1)</sup> as Director of the Zootomical Museum in Christiania, discovered in the Norwegian alpine regions a Tipulid, which he described as *Limnobia macroura* (sic!) in the *Nyt. Mag.* etc. 1863, p. 179 (the description is also found in his posthumous work: *Enumer. ins. norw. Diptera*, p. 226, 1877). Other abundant specimens were found by him in 1861 in another Norwegian locality. Later, Mr. Bergroth received several specimens from Lapland, and to him belongs the merit of identifying this species with the genus *Phyllolabis* O. S., two species of which were discovered by me in several localities in California, in March and April 1876. (Bergroth, *Wien. Ent. Zeit.* 1889, p. 116; O. Sacken, *Western Diptera*, 1877, p. 202). In August 1882, Prof. Strobl discovered the same *P. macroura* in the Alps of Upper Styria (*Wien. Ent. Zeit.* 1892, p. 182), and later in other localities of the same region (Strobl, *Die Dipt. v. Steyermark*, 3. Theil, p. 118, Grätz 1895; originally published in the *Mittheil. d. Naturw. Ver. f. Steyerm.* 1894).

A passage in Bergroth's above-quoted notice about *P. macroura* made me doubt the correctness of his incorporation of it in my Californian genus. Recently, and at my request, Prof. Strobl very obligingly sent me two specimens (♂♀) of the species, which convinced me that Bergroth was right, and that he had thus discovered a very remarkable case of a disconnected area of generic distribution. It was very fortunate for me in this connection, that, on my return to Europe in 1877, I had brought with me a pair (♂♀)

<sup>1)</sup> I do not know the exact date.

of specimens of the Californian *P. claviger*, waifs of my North American collections, the bulk of which remained in the United States. These specimens enabled me to compare the two species in their generic characters, and to publish the result.

The most obvious difference between the species consists in the course of the second vein and its surroundings. In comparing the generic description in the Western Diptera, p. 202—203, with the specimens of *macrura* before me, I find everything to agree, except the following characters:

*Claviger* (l. c. p. 202, lines 12—13 from bottom) „first submarginal cell about half as long as the second“.

*Macrura* has the first subm. c. a little shorter than the second.

*Claviger* (l. c. line 12) „its slightly arcuated petiole occupying the length of the other half“ (of the first subm. c.).

*Macrura* has the same petiole short, not occupying the length of the other half of the first subm. c.

The praefurca in *macrura* has a more distinct curvature at the base and is comparatively shorter than that of *claviger*; but it is longer (in *macrura*) than the petiole of the first subm. cell (a little longer in the ♂, twice as long in the ♀ specimen). The praefurca of *claviger* is, in both sexes, about as long as the petiole of the first subm. cell.

To make the difference clearer, I shall describe it in other words: „In *macrura* the fork of the second vein is considerably longer than one half of the length of the whole vein; the proximal end of this fork is at a considerable distance proximad of the tip of the first vein, and almost opposite the tip of the auxiliary vein. In *claviger* the fork of the 2<sup>d</sup> v. is about one third the length of the whole vein; the proximal end of the fork is but very little proximad of the tip of the first vein.“

In respect of this difference between the two species, Bergroth very happily suggested, that the omission of the words: „first subm. c. about half as long as the second, its petiole occupying the length of the other half“ in my generic description, would make that portion of the description applicable to both species.

In my generic description (West. Dipt. p. 203, line 24 from top) the word at, would be better replaced by near, because, as I perceive now, the great crossvein in both species is not quite constant in its position with regard to the bifurcation of the posterior branch of the fourth vein.

The wing of *macrura*, especially in the ♀, is distinctly broader than that of *claviger*.

376 *Osten Sacken: The genus Phyllolabis O. S. (Dipt., Tip.).*

The forceps of the male is, in the main, of the same structure in both species; but some differences are evident: On the underside of the forceps of *macrura* there is a conspicuous crest of stiff, yellowish hairs („ein langer, dichter, goldglänzender Borstenkamm“, as Bergroth describes it) which does not exist in *claviger*.<sup>1)</sup> What I described as a yellowish-white foliaceous, folded appendage on the underside of the forceps of *claviger*, is visible in *macrura* too, but it is more decidedly yellow.

What I have given is more than sufficient for proving, beyond any possible doubt, the generic identity of the Californian and of the European species of *Phyllolabis*. It is much to be desired now, when fresh specimens can be easily procured, to have a more detailed description of this remarkable genus made, with accompanying figures. A dissection and a comparative description of the male forcepses would afford a particular interest.

If traces of any ancient connection between the two, at present very distant, areas of distribution of *Phyllolabis* still exist, they should be looked for in Siberia and in the Alpine regions of the North West of North America.

I have every reason to suppose (although, after the lapse of twenty years, I do not distinctly remember) that some of the statements of my description of the genus *Phyllolabis* in the „Western Diptera“ were taken down on the spot, from living, or quite fresh specimens, because that was my usual custom. This should be borne in mind, in case some slight discrepancies be noticed between dried specimens and my data, when compared with them.

---

### A d d e n d u m

to the article: On the terms Calyptrata etc.

On p. 332, line 6 from bottom, after the word Diptera add: Westwood, Introd. II, p. 500, is likewise of the opinion that the *squamae* (he calls them alulets) „are mere appendages of, or in fact, not distinct organs from the upper wings“. The halteres he takes for the real analogues of the hind wings (contrary to the opinion of Latreille, Fam. Natur. 1825, p. 480, footnote, and of Audouin).

---

<sup>1)</sup> The presence of this yellow crest was the principal cause of my doubts about the right identification of my genus by Bergroth.

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Berliner Entomologische Zeitschrift](#)

Jahr/Year: 1895

Band/Volume: [41](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Sacken C. R. Osten

Artikel/Article: [The genus \*Phyllolabis\* O. S. \(Dipt., Tipul.\); a remarkable case of disconnected areas in geographical distribution. 374-376](#)