

Amalopsis Halid. (O.S.)  
versus Tricyphona Bergroth (not Zett.)

by

C. R. Osten Sacken.

---

More than once I have protested against the assertion that the generic name *Tricyphona* Zett. has a right of priority over *Amalopsis* Halid. (O.S.). As this erroneous assumption is still prevailing in certain quarters, I deem it necessary to return to the subject, the more so, as I have a new argument to offer, which I hope, will settle the matter. As Dr. Bergroth has, for about ten years past, taken the principal interest in the question, it is against him that my critique will, this time, be directed.

In my last publication on the subject (Berl. Ent. Z. 1887. p. 224) I have said: *Tricyphona* was established upon a character of an altogether secondary importance, an open discal cell, which does not occur in most species of the same relationship. It was Haliday who pointed out one of the leading characters of this generic group (*Amalopsis*), and the generic name proposed by him must prevail" etc. Upon this Dr. Bergroth in his article: „Ueber einige N.-Am. Tipuliden (Wien. Ent. Zeit. 1888, p. 198) contended that in Zetterstedt's second description of the genus (Dipt. Scand. X, p. 4035, 1851) „which is a page long, and appeared five years before Haliday's diagnosis, the venation is described in detail, and therefore the absence of the discal cell is mentioned, although no particular importance is attached to this character.“

Since my publication of 1887, I have come across a passage in the Dipt. Scand. which had escaped my attention before, and

which proves, beyond any contention, that my original assertion, (compare above): „*Tricyphona* was established upon a character of an altogether secondary importance, an open discal cell," was correct; that Zetterstedt had no other reason for establishing that genus, than the absence of that cell; and that, if that cell had been present, it would never have occurred to him to introduce that genus. — In the passage I am referring to (Dipt. Scand. I, Preface, p. VIII; 1842) Zetterstedt explains the general plan of his work, which was, to introduce a system avowedly artificial, in which species but little related to each other are sometimes placed in the same genus („interdum species minus propinquas in idem congesserim genus"), and, on the contrary, forms sufficiently allied are excluded from a genus („e contrario hinc inde e genere removerim formas ut videntur satis approximatas"). As an example of the latter category he quotes, among other instances. *Tricyphona*, which he removed from *Limnobia* („*Tricyphona* a *Limnobia* separavi").

The reason why Zetterstedt „separated" *Tricyphona* from the other *Limnobiae* becomes plain, when we turn to the Dispositio Synoptica, Family Tipulidae. There (Dipt. Sc. vol. I, p. 94, line 2) we find: „Subdiv. I: Areola alarum minuta adest (in *Erioptera* saepius deest)", to which corresponds, on p. 98, line 1, Subdiv. II: „Areola alarum minuta deest etc." This second subdivision contains Tipulidae without discal cell, longipalpi and brevipalpi promiscuously: *Ptychoptera*, *Dicranota*, *Tricyphona*, *Anisomera*, *Dolichopeza*. *Pachyneura*, which is among the number, is a Bibionid, which Zetterstedt took for a Tipulid.

Will Dr. Bergroth, after that, maintain his assertion that Zetterstedt „attached no particular importance to this character?" My excuse for not discovering the passage in Zetterstedt's Preface earlier is that, having spent most of my life in studying American Diptera, and never having given a particular attention to European ones, I have never made a thorough study of Zetterstedt's work, although I have consulted it whenever necessary. But that Dr. Bergroth, a Finländer, who should have known Zetterstedt by heart, has, as it seems, never taken the trouble to read his Preface, indispensable as it is for the understanding of his method, appears to me, to use the mildest expression, singular. If, before preparing my Monograph of the Tip. brevipalpi, I had read that Preface, I would never have pointed out, as a reproach to Zetterstedt (Mon. N. A. Dipt. IV, p. 21, 1869), that one of his ultimate subdivisions of the genus *Limnobia* contains fourteen species which, in my classification, are

distributed among six different Sections of Tipulidae. From his point of view Zetterstedt was right.

I have said enough to show the fallacy of Dr. Bergroth's first proposition that Zetterstedt „attached no particular importance“ to the absence of the discal cell. Now I shall attempt to prove the inanity of his other thesis; that Zetterstedt's definition of the genus *Tricyphona* contains the necessary data for its claiming priority against *Amalopsis* Hal. (O.S.).

While preparing the first edition of my work on Tip. brevipalpi (Proc. Ac. Nat. Sc. Philad. 1859, p. 245) I discovered an important character in the venation, overlooked before, which led me to introduce the Section Amalopina (at that time I called it Pediciaeformes). Besides this essential character, this Section was distinguished by several other, subsidiary characters, not existent in the majority of the Tip. brevipalpi. These were: a distinct tubercle behind the antennae; pubescent eyes, peculiarities in the venation, a peculiar structure of the male forceps etc. As appeared afterwards, this new Section was to embrace half a dozen genera, forming a very distinct natural group of Tipulidae. In attempting to select a name for this Section I came across a notice by Haliday, inserted in a very out of the way place in Walker's Ins. Brit. Diptera III, Addenda p. XV). Haliday says: The latter (*Limn. occulta* M.) is the type of the genus *Amalopsis*, distinguished from the other groups that have been separated from *Limnobia* not only by the characters of the venation, specified in the table, but also by the hairy eyes and by the frontal tubercle, which seems to foreshadow the appearance of ocelli in that region, towards which the subsidiary nerves run in the Tipulidae, although those organs are as yet undeveloped.“ Now this notice made me aware that Haliday was on the right track for the recognition of the Section Amalopina, although he had overlooked the principal character, the position of the subcostal crossvein, and had even adduced a wrong one, the absence of the discal cell. (His reference to the table, as reproduced above, refers to p. XVI, of the same Addenda, where 5<sup>f</sup> *Limnobia* = *Amalopsis* Hal. is characterized as having no discal cell). Now as Haliday had named *Limn. occulta* M. the type of his genus *Amalopsis*, and at the same time had assigned to it, as distinctive character, the absence of a discal cell, and had overlooked the principal character, the position of the subcostal crossvein, I would have had a perfect right to set aside his wrongly defined new genus, and to introduce a new name, for the genus as well as for the

Section. I have preferred however to render justice to Haliday's perspicacity, in attributing to him the priority in foreshadowing the Section *Amalopina*.

Such is the history of the introduction of the scientific concept of the genus *Amalopsis* and of the Section *Amalopina*. Now when we turn to the long generic description of *Tricyphona* (Dipt. Sc. X, p. 4035) which, according to Bergroth, justifies its right of priority over *Amalopsis*, we do not find a single one of the characteristic features of the *Amalopina*, as defined above, mentioned in it. The truth is that Zetterstedt himself would not have recognized as *Tricyphona*, the *Amalopina* provided with a discal cell, which Bergroth seems anxious to force upon him. I strongly suspect, for instance, that the *Limnobia varinervis* Zett., Dipt. Sc. X, p. 3813, is an *Amalopsis*, although the description does not offer me sufficient data for being sure of it (comp. O.S. in the Berl. E. Z. 1887, p. 224).

Such well-matured conclusions of mine about the relation between *Tricyphona* Zett. and *Amalopsis* Hal. (O.S.) Bergroth characterizes (l. c.) as the „greatest arbitrariness“ (grösste Willkür), and adds the following flourish: „If the principle applied by O.S. to *Tricyphona* were generally adopted, thousands of names would have to give place to younger ones.“

Before dismissing the subject of *Tricyphona*, I shall, for completeness' sake, communicate some data about the first description of *Tricyphona* (Ins. Lapp. p. 851, p. 1840) which, as Dr. Bergroth said l. c. p. 198, was not accessible to him when he wrote his article of 1888. This description contains nothing of importance, except that, in describing the venation, Zetterstedt gave more prominence to the three forks, than he did in the Dipt. Scand.: „Nervi 7 longitudinales marginem interiorem attingunt, quorum 4 superiores (a marginis interioris basi numerati) furcas duas formant. Supra has, tertia furca observatur elongata. Areola nulla. . . . Faunae nostrae communis *Limnobiae* valde affinis, sed nervorum singulari directione, areolaqua nulla, dignota. Nomen *Triciphonae* (sic!) a τρεῖς, three, and κίρκον, furcifer, ob nervorum in alis directionem, tres furcas propinquas formantem, mutuavi.“ This passage proves again that the three forks, dependent on the absence of the discal cell, and expressed in the etymology of the name, were the principal characters which induced Zetterstedt to introduce his new genus. The statement, in the Ins. Lapp., „tibiae vix vel brevissime calcaratae“ is more near the truth than the corresponding

statement in the Dipt. Scand.: „pedes inermes . . . ne quidem calcaribus in apice tibiæ muniti.“ The tibiæ of *T. immaculata* are provided with short spurs. — The heading of the genus appears as: 165. *Tryciphona* Zett., which is a misprint, corrected in the Dipt. Sc. X, p. 4036, footnote, *Tricyphona*.

Heidelberg, Nov. 20. 1897.