# Papéis Avulsos de Zoologia

Papéis Avulsos Zool., S. Paulo, vol. 23(6): 53-62

15. VIII. 1970

# THE SUBFAMILIES OF THE FAMILY DOLICHOPODIDAE IN NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICA (DIPTERA)

HAROLD ROBINSON

In any family having the size and diversity of the Dolichopo-didae the relationships within the family can be of particular interest and importance. Such relationships should be reflected in the organization of the subfamilies. Unfortunately, in the Dolichopodidae the subfamilies have been based primarily on certain obvious extreme forms without enough attention to many intermediate types. Also, most of the smaller forms have been placed rather casually in one or two loosely defined subfamilies in spite of a great diversity of characters. Studies regarding mouth parts (Cregan, 1941), and genitalia (Buchmann, 1961) along with isolated works on larvae and pupae (Dyte, 1967) have occasionally appeared but no formal effort has been made to incorporate the knowledge

into a revised subfamily organization.

The following review and revision of the subfamilies of the Dolichopodidae is based on various characters including male and female genitalia, mouth parts, antennal structure, wing venation, chaetotaxy, leg structure, and larval form. While none of these characters are entirely reliable, they are all useful within limits. As an example, the setae borne on the dorsal surface of the first antennal segment are characteristic of the Dolichopodinae where there is no suggestion of variation. In the Hydrophorinae, however, some genera have such setae and others lack them. In the genera Argyra and Symbolia of the Diaphorinae and Stolidosoma of the Stolidosominae, presence or absence of such setae is important only at the species level. As another example, in the genus Stolidosoma, the occurrence of acrostichal setae is particularly variable though the character distinguishes valid genera elsewhere in the family. The occurrence of preapical setae on the femora seems of great importance in distinguishing subfamilies, but the character is variable within the genus *Rhaphium* and is very erratic in the genus Harmstonia. As a final example, the characters I would use to distinguish the Stolidosominae might seem weak on the basis of their value in other groups, but I am convinced the Stolidosominae as thus delimited is a natural group.

The characters described and illustrated by Cregan (1941) in her study of the mouth structure seem particularly worthy of comment. There is no question that most of the groups tentatively established in the study are highly unnatural. Certainly, the mouth being a highly functional structure would be subject to many

Department of Botany, Smithsonian Intitution, Washington, D.C.

adaptations that would obscure relationships. Still, close examination of certain characters in light of known relationships is very revealing. The pseudotracheae seem potentially useful, with closely related genera usually showing similar structure. The Sciapodinae and Medeterinae are entirely or almost entirely unsclerotized. The Hydrophorinae show an inclination toward massive sclerotization. Limits must be placed on the interpretations in such cases as the barred pattern in *Gymnopternus* which is a genus closely related to others having geminate sclerotization. Still, I find it impossible to ignore the nonsclerotized condition of *Xanthochlorus* which contrasts strongly with the geminately sclerotized pattern in all genera to which *Xanthochlorus* has been considered related.

The subfamilies that I would recognize at present are as follows:

- 1. **Sciapodinae.** Arista usually dorsal, if apical third segment usually asymmetric, first segment bare; vertex of head strongly excavated; epipharyngial armature with four smooth long prongs, connected; pseudotracheae unsclerotized. Thorax often broad with enlarged acrostichal bristles; fourth wing vein usually forked. Femora without preapicals. Hypopygium relatively small but not enclosed in preabdomen, female genitalia with few dornen. Larvae with four prominent projections posteriorly. Though this is perhaps the most distinctive and natural group in the family, no one character is sufficient to distinguish it. *Mesorhaga* lacks the forked fourth vein, *Psilopiella* and *Leptorhethum* lack the excavated vertex, and many species of *Sciapus* lack the broad thorax.
- 2. **Neurigoninae.** Arista dorsal or subapical, first segment bare; head usually strongly excavated behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature with two slightly denticulated long prongs; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow with small usually doubly seriate acrostichals and a strongly flattened posterior slope; fourth wing vein not forked. Femora without preapicals. Hypopygium relatively large, not projecting far forward; female genitalia with no dornen. Larvae rounded posteriorly, without obvious lobes. I would place here, tentatively, a number of neotropical genera described as having a flattened posterior slope on the mesoscutum and a narrow pollinose face.
- 3. Medeterinae. Arista apical, antennal segments all short and symmetric, first segment bare; head usually strongly excavated behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature with two smooth long prongs; hypopharynx often with spur below; pseudotracheae not sclerotized. Thorax narrow with small usually doubly seriate acrostichals and a strongly flattened posterior slope; fourth wing vein not forked. Femora lacking preapicals. Hypopygium usually large and projecting far forward; female genitalia with no dornen or one pair apically. Larvae rounded posteriorly or with very blunt lobes. Pupae with flat ventral profile of head and thorax. This and the preceding subfamily seem very closely related, especially in the presence of a strongly flattened posterior slope of the thorax, the lack of dornen on the female genitalia, and the blunt tip of the larva. Antennae, pseudotracheae, and hypopygial and facial structure are characters useful in distinguishing the two subfamilies.

- 4. Systeninae, subfam. n. Arista subapical to apical on an enlarged sometimes prolonged third antennal segment, first segment bare, head usually excavated behind the vertex; mouth parts not examined. Thorax narrow with biseriate acrostichals and a flattened posterior slope; fourth wing vein not forked. Femora without preapicals. Hypopygium large, projecting far forward; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae with a pair of distinct prolegs; four prominent lobes posteriorly, uppermost smaller. I have been inclined to relate the genus Systenus to the Medeterinae, but the enlarged third antennal segment, the dornen on the female genitalia, and the prolegs and lobes on the larvae indicate a position entirely outside of the Neurigoninae Medeterinae complex. The genus has been placed in the Rhaphiinae, but that subfamily lacks the flattened posterior slope of the thorax, has the posterior surface of the male head flattened, has numerous hairs on the upper part of the proepisternum, and has a small hypopygium.
- Xanthochlorinae. Body color usually a translucent yellow. subapical to apical, third antennal segment sometimes enlarged, first segment bare; head rounded to slightly concave behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature with two somewhat denticulate long prongs, connected; labellae often expanded, pseudotracheae not sclerotized. Thorax narrow with acrostichals biseriate to lacking and with a slightly flattened posterior slope; fourth wing vein not forked. Femora without preapicals. Hypopygium relatively small but not or only partially enclosed in the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. unknown. The genus Xanthochlorus has been placed in the Sympycninae, but from that complex it differs by the lack of preapicals on the femora and by the unsclerotized pseudotracheae. Also the Sympycninae proper do not have a flattened posterior slope on the Though there are a number of differences between Xanthothorax. chlorus and Xanthina including especially the absence versus the presence of acrostichals, the two genera agree in the characters by which I distinguish the subfamily, both even having yellow body color and unsclerotized pseudotracheae. The Xanthina sp. observed had eight or more pseudotracheae rather than six as found in most genera of the Dolichopodidae. Mouth parts have not been examined in Achalcus, but it very strongly resembles Xanthina, and I would place it here tentatively in spite of the presence of preapicals on the femora.
- 6. **Enlininae**, subfam. n. Arista apical to subapical, rarely dorsal, third segment often distinct in shape or size, first segment bare above; head slightly concave behind the vertex; pseudotracheae very small, slightly rugose but not obviously sclerotized. Thorax narrow with acrostichals biseriate or absent, posterior slope of thorax flattened, fourth wing vein not branched, straight from the base and diverging from the third vein or highly modified. Femora with or without preapicals. Hypopygium globose, large to small and partially to almost completely enclosed in the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae unknown. The third and fourth veins being divergent mark the group well with only the very distinct *Asyndetus* of the Diaphorinae being at all

similar. The two genera, *Enlinia* and *Harmstonia*, have sufficient differences that close relationship cannot be assumed, but they share very similar pseudotracheae.

- Peloropeodinae, subfam. n. Arista apical to dorsal, third antennal segment sometimes enlarged, first segment bare; head slightly depressed behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature with four seriately denticulate prongs connected; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow, having acrostichals usually bito uniseriate, and having a slightly flattened posterior slope; fourth wing vein not branched. Femora with preapicals. Hypopygium relatively large to relatively small but not enclosed in the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae unknown. The group has been submerged in the Sympycninae with which it shows some resemblance. Nevertheless, species in the group are generally shorter and thicker in build, have a slightly flattened posterior slope on the thorax, and have generally larger and more exposed hypopygia. The subfamily seems further divisable into those having globose hypopygia such as *Peloropeodes* and Neurigonella, and those with smaller cylindrical hypopygia such as Micromorphus, Chrysotimus, and Nanomyina,
- Diaphorinae. Arista dorsal, subapical, or in an apical notch, third antennal segment usually enlarged, first segment bare or with hairs above; head rounded behind the vertex or sometimes the hind surface of the male head totally flat; epipharyngial armature variously denticulate with two to four prongs; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow having usually biseriate or uniseriate acrostichals, posterior slope not flattened, proepisternum with many, one, or no hairs on the upper part; fourth wing vein not branched, sometimes ending before the wing margin and the costa ending at the third vein. Femora without preapicals, pulvilli of the male fore tarsus often enlarged. Hypopygium small and partially to mostly enclosed in the tip of the preabdomen, often bearing a group of large bristles posteriorly; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae with four or five prominent lobes posteriorly. This subfamily with the following, forms a very natural group. The hypopygium of the group seems very characteristic, having a rounded basal and ventral surface along which runs the penis-aedeagus mechanism. This arrangement seems most highly developed in this group, but hypopygia of most Sympycninae and Dolichopodinae are rather similar. In the Peloropeodinae, Enliniinae, and Medeterinae groups the penis-aedeagus mechanism is usually more distorted in shape and restricted to the middle and apical parts of the hypopygium.

Notable within the subfamily is the great variation in antennal form including shape of the second segment and pubescence of the first segment. The subfamily includes the only Dolichopodidae with eyes contiguous above the antennae or with the fourth wing vein not reaching the wing margin. I have included Nematoproctus and Keirosoma here rather than in the Rhaphinae in spite of the pubescence of the proepisternum. At least one species of Nematoproctus, N. cylindricus, was described as a Diaphorus and shows many characters of that genus including the rounded posterior surface of the male head and the shorter hypopygial appendages.

- Rhaphiinae. Arista strictly apical, third antennal segment sometimes very elongate, first segment bare; head of male flat posteriorly; epipharyngial armature with two short stout somewhat denticulate prongs; pseudotracheae essentially geminately scleroti-Thorax narrow with biseriate or uniseriate acrostichals, posterior slope not flattened, upper proepisternum with many long hairs; fourth wing vein not branched. Femora with or without preapicals. Hypopygium relatively small to somewhat enlarged, sometimes partially enclosed in the tip of the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae with four obvious lobes posteriorly. The subfamily is very closely related to the Diaphorinae with similar flattening of the posterior surface of the male head and similar pubescence of the proepisternum occurring in the genera *Nematoproctus*, *Keirosoma*, and to some extent in *Argyra* of the latter group. The Rhaphinae are distinct in the strictly apical arista (except in one species) and the occurrence of preapical bristles in some species. Cregan (1941) noted the absence of an apodeme on the epipharyngial armature in Rhaphium effilatum Wheeler, a situation not observed in members of any other subfamily. The subfamily shows greater development of sexual dimorphism than the Diaphorinae, but much less than that in the Enlininae.
- 10. **Plagioneurinae.** Arista dorsal, third antennal segment enlarged, first segment bare; head flat posteriorly in both sexes; face with a median longitudinal furrow; epipharyngial armature with four short somewhat denticulate connected prongs; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow without acrostichals, posterior slope not flattened, upper proepisternum with many long hairs; fourth wing vein not branched, strongly bent in last part, forming an acute angle with the crossvein. Femora with preapicals. Fourth and fifth abdominal sternites with submarginal bristles; hypopygium very small, enclosed in the tip of the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae unknown. The group contains a single quite distinctive species.
- 11. **Stolidosominae.** Arista dorsal, third antennal segment often enlarged, first segment bare or with hairs above; head slightly depressed behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature seriately denticulate with four rather short prongs, connected; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow, having acrostichals biseriate, uniseriate, or lacking, five pairs of dorsocentrals or six pairs with anterior pair weakest; posterior slope not flattened; fourth wing vein not branched. Femora with preapicals; tip of male hind tibia with sinus; second joint of male fore tarsus slightly to strongly ornamented. Hypopygium relatively small, partially enclosed in the tip of the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae unknown. The group seems very close to the Sympycninae but is clearly distinct from Sympycnus and its closest allies by the dorsocentrals, the sinus in the tip of the male hind tibia, and the consistently modified second joint of the male fore tarsus. The group as thusly separated seems unquestionably natural having absolutely uniform general structure of the male genitalia. The question remains whether the Stolido-

sominae are more distinct from *Sympycnus* than other elements retained in the Sympycninae.

- Sympycninae. Arista dorsal, third antennal segment usually somewhat enlarged, first segment usually bare; head slightly depressed behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature seriately denticulate with four rather short prongs connected; pseudotracheae geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow with acrostichals usually uniseriate or lacking, usually six pairs of dorsocentrals with the fifth pair displaced or lacking, sometimes only three or four pairs of dorsocentrals, posterior thoracic slope not flattened, proepisternum with or without hairs on the upper part; fourth wing vein not branched. Femora with preapicals; tip of hind tibia without a sinus. Hypopygium relatively small, partially enclosed in tip of the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae The genera Telmaturgus and Lamprochromus with only three or four pairs of dorsocentrals seem to be distinctive. The face of Telmaturgus is similar to that of Syntormon which with its second antennal segment produced thumblike along the inside of the third and its first antennal segment sometimes bearing setae provides another anomalous element in the subfamily.
- 13. **Dolichopodinae.** Arista dorsal, rarely apical, third antennal segment usually somewhat enlarged, first segment with hairs above; head of male slightly depressed behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature seriately denticulate, with four short connected prongs; pseudotracheae barred or geminately sclerotized. Thorax narrow with biseriate acrostichals, posterior slope not flattened; upper proepisternum with some hairs; fourth wing vein usually unbranched, sometimes with a stump vein of a posterior branch. Femora with preapicals. Hypopygium very large, extending forward to near the base of the abdomen; female genitalia with a crest of dornen above. Larvae with four or five obvious lobes posteriorly. The large hypopygium is a prime character of the group. The setae on the first antennal segment are consistently present in the subfamily.
- 14. **Hydrophorinae.** Arista dorsal or apical, third antennal segment often elongate or lobed; head rounded posteriorly or slightly depressed behind the vertex; epipharyngial armature with two to four short or long lobes often separated at the base, smooth or slightly to seriately denticulate; labellae sometimes highly sclerotized and mandibuliform, pseudotracheae geminately to massively sclerotized, sometimes the sixth panal unsclerotized, sensory papillae often located on or attached to bases of the pseudotracheae. Thorax rather narrow, acrostichals biseriate to lacking, four to ten pairs of often reduced dorsocentrals; slightly to strongly convex, sometimes flattened posteriorly; proepisternum bare in upper part, often heavily pubescent below; fourth wing vein not branched, last of fifth vein often shorter than the posterior crossvein. Femora with poorly differentiated preapicals often remote from the tips of the femora, anterior femora often thickened at the base and bearing distinctive setae. Abdomen sometimes flattened above; hypopygium relatively small or somewhat enlarged but usually enclosed in the tip of the preabdomen; female genitalia with a crest

of dornen above. Larvae with obvious lobes posteriorly (7 lobes

in Aphrosylus).

The massively sclerotized pseudotracheae combined with the posterior crossvein close to the wing margin seem to indicate a related group of genera. Some genera such as *Liancalus*, *Hypo-charassus*, and *Melanderia* lack the characteristic pseudotracheae, others such as Aphrosylus and Thinophilus have the posterior crossvein farther from the wing margin, but no genus that I would presently include in the subfamily lacks both characters. see no basis by which a separate subfamily. Aphrosylinae, might be maintained. The American species placed in this group do not show the backwardly curved beak on the mouth by which the European members of the Aphrosylinae have been distinguished. Also, I have concluded that the great resemblance between Campsicnemus and the Hydrophorine genus, Thinophilus, is misleading. Campsicnemus has a much narrower face, well developed preapicals on the middle femur, six dorsocentral bristles with the fifth displaced, and has neither the wing venation or pseudotracheal structure of the Hydrophorinae. I have placed *Campsicnemus* provisionally in the Sympycninae where it is usually placed. The subfamily Hydrophorinae seems easily subdivided into genera with eight or more small dorsocentrals such as Hydrophorus, Scellus, and Hypocharassus, and those with four to six usually larger dorsocentrals as in Liancalus, Oedematopus, Aphrosylus, Diostracus. Melanderia, and Thinophilus. The former group includes species showing an angular type of hypopharynx not known elsewhere in the family. The latter group includes two genera Liancalus and Oedematopus that show a larger shorter pronged united epipharyngial armature with close set seriate denticulations or striations. Such an epipharyngial armature is uncommon in the Hydrophorinae but might indicate an ancestral type within the family.

### KEY TO SUBFAMILIES

- 2. Third and fourth wing veins strongly divergent at least in female, males sometimes with veins highly distorted and not divergent; body 1.5 mm or less long; posterior slope of mesoscutum flattened ...... Enliniinae

	First antennal segment bare above or hypopygium small, less than half as long as preabdomen 4
4.	Posterior crossvein distinctly longer than distal part of fifth vein; hypopygium always short, usually enclosed in tip of preabdomen
	Posterior crossvein not longer than last of fifth vein, or hypopygium extending far forward under preabdomen 5
5.	Abdomen distinctly flattened dorsally, acrostichal setae absent Hydrophorinae (Thinophilus)
	Abdomen not flattened dorsally, or acrostichal setae present 6
6.	Face with a median vertical furrow; third and fourth abdominal sternites with large submarginal bristles; posterior crossvein very oblique, parallel to last part of fourth vein
	Face without median vertical furrow; third and fourth abdominal sternites without obvious bristles; posterior crossvein not parallel to last of fourth vein
7.	Middle and hind femora bearing distinct preapical setae on their anterodorsal surface; proepisternum without long dense pubescence on the upper part 8
	Femora without distinct preapical setae, or proepisternum bearing long dense pale pubescence before the anterior spiracle
8.	Elongate area on posterior slope of thorax somewhat flattened; hypopygium usually borne below and extending somewhat forward from tip of preabdomen
	Posterior slope of thorax not flattened; hypopygium usually forming cap on tip of preabdomen
9.	Third and fourth wing veins somewhat divergent beyond posterior crossvein, distinctly farther apart at margin than at crossvein; usually yellowish species
	Third and fourth veins parallel or convergent beyond posterior crossvein; usually greenish or brownish species
10.	Dorsocentrals usually five, rarely with equally large anterior sixth pair; hind tibia of male with a minute apical notch anterodorsally; second joint of male fore tarsus with either special hairs or otherwise modified Stolidosominae
	Dorsocentrals usually six with fifth pair often reduced or lacking, rarely only three or four pairs present; hind tibia of male without apical notch; second joint of male fore tarsus not particularly distinct Sympycninae

11.	Posterior slope of thorax not metallic green or silvery	flatte polli	ned; species usually highly nose 12
	Posterior slope of thorax if green, others entirely yel	flatten llow, k	ed; some species metallic brown, or black 13
12.	Arista strictly apical, third se num with long pale hairs	gment on u	never notched; proepister
		rnum	es borne in apical notch or with or without long pale
13.	Posterior slope of thorax or species totally lacking me setae sometimes lacking	tallic g	ightly flattened; yellowish green coloration; acrostichal Xanthochlorinae
	Posterior slope of thorax stro green; acrostichal setae p		lattened or species metallic
14.	Third antennal segment slight segments very unequal; dornen above	female	greatly enlarged, the three genitalia with a crest of Systeninae
	Third antennal segment not equal; female genitalia lacking	with	ged, three segments nearly dornen rudimentary or 15
15.	Arista strictly apical; face narrower in the male; hy tending forward under th	popyg	ly metallic greenish, not ium usually cylindrical, ex- abdomen Medeterinae
	bose, borne on or unde	male; er the	vered with whitish pollen, hypopygium usually glo- tip of the preabdomen Neurigoninae
Dol	The following list includes ichopodidae presently recognize	the s	ubfamilies and genera of North and South America.
1.	Sciapodinae Chrysosoma Guérin-Méneville	3.	Medeterinae  Medetera Fischer von Wald-
	Condylostylus Bigot Leptorhethum Aldrich Megistostylus Bigot Mesorhaga Schiner Psilopiella Van Duzee Sciapus Zeller		heim Microchrysotus Robinson Microcyrtura Robinson Thrypticus Gerstaecker
	zewpwo zewer	4.	Systeninae, new subfamily
2.	Neurigoninae		Systenus Loew
	Argentinia Parent		FEMALES CALCUS
	Coelinium Parent	5.	Xanthochlorinae
	Coeloglutus Aldrich		
	Neotonnoiria Robinson Neurigona Rondani		Achalcus Loew Xanthina Aldrich
	Notobothrus Parent		Xanthochlorus Loew

- 6. Enliniinae, new subfamily

  Enlinia Aldrich

  Harmstonia Robinson
- 7. Peloropeodinae, new subfamily

Chrysotimus Loew
Discopygiella Robinson
Micromorphus Mik
Nanomyina Robinson
Neurigonella Robinson
Peloropeodes Wheeler

8. Diaphorinae

Argyra Macquart
Asyndetus Loew
Chrysotus Meigen
Diaphorus Meigen
Ionthadophrys Van Duzee
Keirosoma Van Duzee
Nematoproctus Loew
Pseudargyra Van Duzee
Symbolia Becker

- 9. Rhaphiinae
  Rhaphium Meigen
- 10. Plagioneurinae Plagioneurus Loew
- 11. Stolidosominae

  Pseudosympycnus Robinson
  Stolidosoma Becker
  Sympycnidelphus Robinson
- 12. Sympycninae

  Calyxochaetus Bigot

  Campsicnemus Walker

Filatopus Miller
Hyptiocheta Becker
Lamprochromus Mik
Neoparentia Robinson
Parasyntormon Wheeler
Pinacocerus Van Duzee
Sympycnus Loew
Syntormon Loew
Telmaturgus Mik
Teuchophorus Loew

### 13. Dolichopodinae

Cheirocerus Parent
Dolichopus Latreille
Gonioneurum Becker
Gymnopternus Loew
Hercostomus Loew
Paraclius Loew
Pelastoneurus Loew
Proarchus Aldrich
Sarcionus Aldrich
Stenopygium Becker
Tachytrechus Haliday

# 14. Hydrophorinae

Aphrosylus Haliday
Cymatopus Kertész
Diostracus Loew
Hydrophorus Fallén
Hypocharassus Mik
Liancalus Loew
Melanderia Aldrich
Oedematopus Van Duzee
Scellus Loew
Syntomoneurum Becker
Thinophilus Wahlberg

#### REFERENCES

#### BUCHMANN, W.

1961. Die Genitalanhänge mitteleuropäischer Dolichopodiden. Zoologica 110:1-51, pls. 1-13.

#### CREGAN, MARY B.

1941. Generic relationships of the Dolichopodidae (Diptera) based on a study of the mouth parts. *Illinois Biol. Monographs* 18:1-68.

# DYTE, C. E.

1967. Some distinctions between the larvae and pupae of the Empididae and Dolichopodidae (Diptera). Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (A) 42(7-9):119-128.