BRITISH DIPTERA ASSOCIATED WITH FUNGL III. FLIES OF ALL FAMILIES REARED FROM ABOUT 150 SPECIES OF FUNGI

BY PROF. P. A. BUXTON, C.M.G., F.R.S.*

ENTRODUCTION

In the autumn of 1950 I felt the need to refresh myself by making an excursion into some unfamiliar side of British entomology. I searched for a subject which would require field work and which appeared to be neglected, and decided to investigate the Diptera associated with fungi in Britain.

It was evident that the first requirement was a general survey, wide rather than deep, of flies which might be reared from a wide range of different types of fungi. I have, therefore, made collections of a considerable number of fungi of many different families: I here record almost all Diptera that have been reared from material collected, mainly near Gerrards Cross, Bucks., or Tonbridge, Kent, from the autumn of 1950 to the end of December 1953.

The enquiry has been limited to the 'larger fungi' (cf. Ramsbottom, 1951). I have not investigated the microscopic fungi, moulds and rusts; they possess a considerable fauna of Cecidomyidae (cf. Anderson, 1936), but there is no evidence that they are fed upon or used by other Diptera. In the period under review I made 447 collections of 154 species of fungi: 196 of the collections (44 per cent.) produced Diptera. The Myxomycetes or Mycetozoa, are excluded. What little is known of them as food organisms of Diptera is given by myself (Buxton, 1954) or Perris (1839).

TABLE I.—The facts are classified on a mycological basis. The table shows for each group of fungi, the number of species from which collections were made, and the number of collections (and percent ages) in which Diptera were found; in certain cases larvae only were seen, and the species of Diptera not identified. Abbreviated from Appendix.

Group of fungi	Fungi, no. of species	Number	Collections with larvae	% with larvae
Pyrenomycetes	6	27	7	26
Discomycetes	6	17	9	
Tremellales	5	34	13	38
Thelephoraceae	11	36	9	25
Clavariaceae	7	10	2	20
Polyporaceae	25	109	50	46
Boletac eae	5	12	6	-
Agaricaceae	82	187	98	52
Gasteromycetes	4	12	2	
Imperfecti	3	3	0	
		-	*** ·*····	
Total	154	447	196	44

Most records of insects reared from fungi relate to Agaricaceae and Polyporaceae and I, therefore, made an attempt to sample other groups, collecting such fungi as Hypoxylon, Calocera, Dacrymyces and smaller Agarics, all common, but apparently never examined by entomologists. Having had a fungus identified I made an attempt to collect it repeatedly, feeling that it is more profitable to give much attention to one species of fungus, perturably to accommon, than to spread one's efforts more widely. If a fungus produced to Option one, than to spread our fortismore widely. If a fungus produced to Option only a very functed number of species, I made a point of collecting it repeatedly, feeling that negative evidence is important, but must be firmly established. On the other hand I have never been selective in picking out individual fruiting bodies containing larvae. It is not my primary purpose to make a collection of Diptera, but to discover the relation between Diptera and fungi.

^{*}Deceased December 13th, 1955.

The present paper records, without selection, almost all the Diptera reared from the fungi listed in the appendix and in Table 1. A small number of Cecidomyidae have not been examined, though some of the material was dealt with by Buxton and Barnes (1953). It has been impossible to secure identifications of the Sciarinae, all of which appear to be referable to Bradysia; this is regrettable for many species feed in fungi and inhabit or attack a singularly wide range of these plants: indeed there are certain fungi from which I have reared Sciarines (Bradysia), but no other Diptera (Table 3). It cannot be assumed that the larvae of the species reared all feed upon fungus, as many of them are predatory. In a general survey the first thing to determine is which insect is associated with which fungus or, equally important, which fungi are not used by insects of certain families. When those points have become clearer one can more easily study the numerous biological questions which arise: for instance, specificity of fly to fungus, succession of species in the fruiting body as it matures and decays, predatory habits of larvae and identification of early stages.

TABLE 2.—Showing the number of species of flies, by families, reared by myself in 1950-1953 from the fungi listed in the Appendix and in Table 1: also number of other species recorded by other authors as reared from fungi in Britain. Records of species from the Continent of Europe, and from America (even if referred to in the text) are not included: certain families are included (e.g. Psychodidae) because members have been bred from fungi, though not in Britain.

	No. of species reared by myself	Other British species reco from fungi in this pape		
Tipulidae	4 (2)	2		
Trichoceridae	3	0		
Psychodidae	o o	0		
Chironomidae	2	0		
Ceratopogonidae	2	0		
Cecidomyida e	2	0		
Mycetophilidae	36 (I)	Ĭ		
Scatopsidae	ı (ı)	0		
Anisopodidae	ı `´	0		
Empididae	o	0		
Dolichopodidae	2	ī		
Scenopinidae	o	0		
Phoridae	12	0		
Platypezidae	3	. 0		
Syrphidae	11	0		
Otitidae	0	o o		
Dryomyzidae	0	0 6		
Sapromyzidae	o	0		
Drosophilidae	7	4		
Sepsida e	ó	ŏ		
Asteidae	ı	•		
Borborida e	I	o		
Helomyzidae	6	9		
Muscidae	14 (1)	2		
Total	98 (5)	10		

An attempt has been made to review what has been published by others, but there my arrangement is not consistent. For instance, it is possible to bring together what has been recorded about Tipulidae or Drosophilidae associated with fungi as the species appear to be few and specialised: a review of that type appears under the family, before my own observations. On the other hand it is impossible to make such a general review for fungiculous Muscidae, as so little is on record. As to the Mycetophilidae, it seems better to give a brief account, limited to the species which I have reared myself.

1960.]		1 6 6	63
Dennis, or his colleague Botanic Gardens, Kew. mitted to Dr. F. van E royd, in the British Mu	e Mr. D. Reid, Material of e mden, Messrs useum (Nat. I	aple of every fungus to Dr. mycologists in the Herbar every species of Diptera has R. L. Coe, P. Freeman, Hist.), except in a few inse	ium, Royal s been sub- or H. Old- tances ack-
this paper is sound. V	Vithout their	se gentlemen, the systemate continual help, frequently	sought, it
would have been imposs of many of the Diptera l	sible for me to have been plac	o make any progress at all. ed in the British Museum (1	Specimens
TABLE 3.—Showing a selection	on of the fungi fro	m which few or no Diptera have b	cen reared. All
Fungus species	Month of collection	Diptera found	No. of collections
	· PYRENO	MYCETES	
Xylaria hypoxylon	Sept.	Mycetophilid larvae	I
,, Xylaria polymorpha	Oct. Dec. July	Nil.	3
n n	Aug.	Bradysia sp. Bradysia and Eudactylocladius icterica	ı
" "	June-Nov.	Nil.	7
	TREME	ELLALES	
Auricularia auricula-judae	Aug.	Camptodiplosis auriculariae	I
,, ,,	Aug.	· { C. auriculariae and Helomyza variegata	_
,, ,,	Aug. Oct.	c. auriculariae and maggots	1 3
"	Various	Nil.	6
Auricularia mesenterica	Feb. May	Bradysia spp.	2
Calocera cornea	Various Oct. Nov.	Nil. Trichonta vernalis	8
" "	Nov. Dec.	Yellow Mycetophilid larvae	I
,, ,,	Nov.	Nil.	3 I
Calocera viscosa	Sept.	Phronia sinuata, Bradysia and Cecidomyids	1
. 19	July-Dec.	Nil.	6
·	THELEPH	ORACEAE	
Stereum hirsutum	Dec. Oct-Dec	Mycomyia marginata	, I
Stereum purpureum	Dec.	Nil. Mycetophila luctuosa and ocellus; Lestremia	5
29 29	Feb.	Metriochemius atratulus	I I
, ,	Nov.	Mycomyia marginata	Î.
, , ,	NovDec.	Nil.	2
Stereum gausapatum	Various	Nil.	4
Corticium laeve	Nov. Dec. Jan.	Mycetophila ocellus Nil.	1 5
	CLAVA	RIACEAE	-
Clavaria vermicularis	Sept.	Trichocera hiemalis	
Clavaria inaequalis	Oct.	(one specimen) Tephrochlamys tarsalis	I
Clavaria spp. (see Appendix)	Various	(one specimen) Nil.	1 8
	POLYPO	DRACEAE .	
Polyporus betulinus	Various	Nil.	6
Polyporus adustus	May	Mycetophila trinotata,	-
		Fannia canicularis,	
		Ula sylvatica and Ditomyia fasciata	
17 27	Nov.	Mycetophila trinotata	I I
	Dec.	Cecidomyidae	1
33 39	NovDec.		

[March.

h tŀ m tl si eı d b aı bı

Lii Di Ul C_{t} M Sci Sci D_{ℓ} M

M

M

An

Dr

Dr

He

He

Te

Pho

th

be

ob

au

as

m

en

be

se

CI

co

Ba

2 I

fu

lo

me

sy.

In

т

7

Fungus species	Month of collection	Diptera foun d	No. of collections
Fomes ulmariu s	Feb. May	Ditomyia fasciata	No. of collections 2 I I I 7 I I 2 2 I 4 I 3 3 3 2 2 I I 3 3 3
» »	June	Ditomyia fasciata and	2
	T	Bradysia sp.	I
" "	June June-Oct.	Cecidomyidae	I
Polystictus versicolor	Nov.	Nil.	5
•		Ditomyia fasciata	I
" "	May	Pupa, Nematocera	I
Trametes confragosa	June-Dec. Nov.	Nil.	7
Trametes confragosa	1404.	Sciophila hirta and	
	Saut	Cecidomyidae	I
" "	Sept.	Sciophila buxtoni	I
" "	Sept. Nov.	Nil.	. 2
	AGARI	CACEAE	
Marasmius oreades	Sept. Oct.	Rhymosia domestica	•
"	Oct.	Mycetophilid larvae	
" "	AugOct.	Nil.	
Mycena flavo-alba	Dec.	Single larvae Mycetophilid	4
))))	OctNov.	Nil.	1
Omphalia fibula swartzii	Sept.	Muscid larva	4
" " "	OctDec.	Nil.	1
Galerina graminea	Oct. Nov.	Nil.	
Galerina clavata	NovDec.	Mycetophilid larvae	
" "	OctDec.	Nil.	
Psathyrella pygmaea (consimilis)	June-Aug.	Drosophila phalerata	
" " "	July	Mycetophilid larvae	_
" " "	June-Aug.	Nil.	1 .
Schizophyllum commune	Dec. Jan.	Nil.	5
Ozonium' of Coprinus	May	Helomyza variegata (several)	3
" "	June	Limosina sp.	1
" "	Various	Nil.	I
		= :== :	15

Sept.-Nov.

Aug.

Lycoperdon pyriforme

METHODS In the field, material of one fungus species (referred to as one 'collection') is placed immediately in a closed metal box or a polythene bag, so as

GASTEROMYCETES

Helomyza bicolor

fasciata

Tephrochlamys tarsalis

Platypeza modesta and

to avoid the possibility of contamination. The samples of fungus are placed in wide-mouthed glass vessels of appropriate size on a layer of slightly moist sawdust. Experience shows how much sawdust will be necessary; during decomposition some of the soft Boletus, Russula, etc., produce much water. But it is essential to moisten the sawdust at the beginning because some larvae soon require a moist environment in which to pupate. The mouth of the container is closed

with muslin and adhesive plaster, or with a rubber stopper pierced by a large hole closed with fine wire gauze. Stoppers with a diameter of one inch and 3½ inch are obtainable from Messrs. Gallenkamp. This breeding method has the advantage of simplicity and certainly produces a considerable variety of flies. But the fungi are under unnatural

conditions, the fruiting body having been cut off from the mycelium. This is likely to be of particular importance with rapidly growing organisms such as most Agarics, or the softer species of Polyporus. With those plants the failure of nourishment coming from the mycelium may quickly produce conditions unsuitable for the larvae of certain Diptera. For instance, if one puts the rapidly growing fruiting body of Polyporus squamosus in a breeding jar, very large numbers of Mycetophilid larvae will come out in 24-36

the few individuals which came to maturity were of the same species as the majority of larvae which died of starvation. The method may lead one to think that a certain insect is common, whereas its larva is somewhat resistant to starvation. Other species may be common, but seldom reared. Each 'collection' is given a serial number. If a number of Diptera emerge they will all bear that number.

Reference is made below to Muscina assimilis of which the larva is pre-

hours, nearly all of which will starve and die. One cannot be satisfied that

65

នួ

datory. In the experience of Keilin (1917) this insect will lay its eggs in breeding jars or deposit them in such a way that the small larva can force an entrance. This has not happened in my experience, indeed I have only bred the insect on one occasion.

TABLE 4.—Showing the groups of fungi from which certain flies have been reared. The flies all exhibit a wide choice among the fungi.

Insect	Pyrenomycet	Discomycetes	Tremellales	Thelephorace	Clavariaceae	Polyporaceae	Boletaceac	Agaricaceae	Gasteromycet	Imperfecti	* · · ·
Limonia bifasciata Dicranomyia decem-notata Ula sylvatica Culicoides scoticus Mycomyia marginata Sciophila lutea Sciophila hirta Docosia gilvipes Mycetophila lineola Mycetophila luctuosa Anisopus cinctus Drosophila phalerata Drosophila transversa Helomyza variegata Helomyza bicolor	+ + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	++++	+++	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	+ + +	+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	+		
Tephrochlamys tarsalis Phaonia variegata	١.				+	++	+	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	+		

that all Diptera have emerged? The question is of practical importance because it is burdensome to maintain an unnecessary number of jars and observe them at frequent intervals. It is evident that what one collects in the autumn must be kept until the early part of the next summer as a minimum, as may be shown by three examples. A collection of Amanita muscaria was made on October 20th. In early December several Exechia spinuligera emerged, followed at the end of December and in early January by a number of Docosia gilvipes. No other flies emerged until May when I reared several Helomyza bicolor. Or again, from Boletus collected in October Cheilosia emerged from May to early August. To give another example, I collected Auricularia auricula-judae in November, 1951, and sent it to H. F. Barnes, who reared Camptodiplosis auriculariae from May 18th to June 21st, and a single female on August 8th, 1952. He kept the material a further twelve months, but no more specimens emerged.

But it occasionally happens that the early stages of Diptera remain for a

longer period in one's breeding jars. For instance, a collection of Armillaria mellea was made on October 27th. Before the end of the year adult Ula sylvatica emerged, and a number of Mycetophilid larvae came out and died. In March I bred also Helomyza bicolor and Tephrochlamys tarsalis, and

2 I I 5

larch,

. of

ctions

1960.]

2 I 4 I 4

ī 7

s of lows the lower to a

llec-

oy a one iinly ural

psed

This sms ants luce one

eed-4-36 [March,

observed spiny Muscid larvae in the material. These were still present as resting larvae in September, that is to say eleven months after the date of collection. To quote another example, a collection of Russula ochroleuca made in October, still contained small living puparia of a Muscid 14 months later. Unfortunately both jars were neglected and nothing further emerged.

The writings of other authors illustrate the same point. For instance Edwards (1925) collected larvae of Platyura fasciata feeding on moulds in the early autumn. These remained as half-grown larvae through the winter, pupating in June and becoming adult in July. The same author reared Amiota alboguttata in July, 1936, from Daldinia concentrica collected the previous August.

My custom has been to keep what is collected in the autumn until the following midsummer and that is certainly necessary. As to fungi collected in the summer, flies generally emerge soon, and I throw that material away in the late autumn. In acting in this way it seems that living pupae or even larvae are occasionally rejected: this procedure does not give information on all the species of Diptera that may have been present in the fungus. I have made a practice of recording the date on which the material was thrown away: that information may prove to be valuable when we have a more complete knowledge.

In recording my results the notation '8/1' means that eight collections of a certain fungus were made, and that a certain species of insect emerged from one of them. '8/1, several flies' or '8/1, one only' are self-explanatory. Adopting that convention, it is easy to indicate that a single specimen has been reared from one collection. Such records cannot rightly be omitted, neither can one accept them, for they might be due to a single larva, wandering about before pupation.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS

Turning to the future, we require to develop methods of trapping larvae as they emigrate full-fed from the undisturbed fungus; we must do this without separating the fruiting body from its mycelium in soil or tree trunk. I have made a few attempts, surrounding the base of a toadstool with a cuff of plastic sheet or waxed paper and packing the space with moist sawdust. The sawdust with larvae in it may be removed daily with a spoon and put in a breeding jar. This method could be developed so as to reveal the succession of different species emerging from the food. The fungus requires frequent attention, and must be close to one's home, and protected from birds, cows, boys, etc. Developing this method one could also obtain single larvae which might yield individual identified adults. One would then have critically identified cast skins of early stages, which is certainly a requisite. Most of the work published, for instance on the larvae of Mycetophilidae, is based on a general association: that is to say the author has preserved and studied larvae which he identifies by adults bred from the same material. This may be safe in certain cases, e.g. with species of Bolitophila which generally occur in pure culture. But experience with mosquitoes, the early stages of which have been studied so intensively, shows that it is highly desirable to have individual larval and pupal skins associated with their own reared adult.

There is certainly a need for other methods of isolating single full-fed larvae, and when this can be done a number of enquiries can be pursued. I have had some success by offering small tufts of damp moss or fragments of cloth to Mycetophilid larvae emerging from a fungus in a breeding jar. Some of the larvae will make their cocoons in the moss or fabric. Yet another way of obtaining cocoons or pupae is to put the fungus in a piece of muslin or calico and bury the whole in moist sawdust, which will absorb excess water as the fungus decomposes. At a later date one can recover pupae or cocoons from the inner side of the muslin. This is simpler than

a p e n В

(1

re

a

m

al

h

C

a

o

a

SI

n

of it P OI aı (1 fr

it do no m re ar CC fu

It th su lit is fir ha

of

lo

liv th wi at re fa Sy

m be en

be

hunting for them through a mass of moist sawdust and rotten fungus. Cocoons of Mycetophilids are very delicate, and there is a high mortality

among those which are handled. As to the future, there are many Mycetophilidae, including common species, which have never been reared: the same applies to Diptera of many

other families. If we are to find their food plants we should perhaps give less attention to Agarics and Polypores, which have been rather extensively studied by Edwards and by myself, and more to the Discomycetes, Pyrenomycetes and Gasteromycetes, and other groups too: it must, however, be admitted that these groups have not yet yielded much. There is also the possibility that some of these Diptera feed on groups of plants hardly yet explored, for instance on lichens (most suitable for a fungivore), or on mosses and liverworts (see Cheetham, 1920, who reared the Mycetophilid

Boletina inermis from one of the latter). The subterranean fungi, investigated as food plants of Diptera by Dufour (1839, 1853) and by Laboulbene (1864) have been neglected for nearly a century: these fungi have been recently monographed and discussed by Hawker (1954, 1955) and invite attention. Further, it is possible that many Mycetophilid larvae feed on mycelia of a restricted range of fungi, in soil, or in decomposing vegetable matter. One might also refer to my own encouraging commencement of work on Diptera feeding on Myxomycetes or Mycetozoa (Buxton 1954): it was shown that the common Mycetophila vittipes and two species of Platurocypta breed on particular species of Myxomycetes, but not on other

organisms, so it appears. Until recently I had supposed that no previous author had recorded Myxomycetes as food-organisms of Diptera: Perris

(1839) has priority by more than a century, having described a Mycetophilid

from Lycogala epidendrum (miniata). Our understanding of the biology of any insect is greatly increased if it can be reared continuously in some type of container. Once that can be done the insect becomes available for experimental study and there can be no question of the identity of the early stages. I have not been able to give much attention to this important matter, but have made some attempts to rear Diptera in 'reconstituted fungi'; that is to say, fungi of certain species are taken, exposed to about 50° C. for several hours to ensure that they contain no living insects and then dried. When required one puts the

fungus in water for 24 hours and then in a breeding jar with moist sawdust. It is an easy matter to rear Trichocera hiemalis and species of Sciara in this way, indeed the Sciara frequently maintain themselves for a number of successive generations in decomposed fungus in a breeding jar. But there is little value in maintaining a culture of either of these insects for Trichocera is easy to culture, and by simpler methods: as to the Sciara, one would find them of more interest if it were possible to identify them. On the other hand I have repeatedly failed to obtain early stages of Mycetophilidae by offering reconstituted fungi, though the adults will sometimes live for a long time in a breeding jar. I have, for instance, had Rhymosia fenestralis living for some 6 weeks in a jar in February and March and have seen the adults running at dusk over the reconstituted fungi, agitating their wings and probing the fungus with their abdomens, though I was never able to find that they laid eggs. The small Tipulid Ula syvatica copulates readily in a breeding jar, but I have never reared early stages. I have also failed several times with Forcipomyia ciliata in spite of offering the adults syrup and various crushed insects and woodlice on which it was hoped they might feed.

Most entomologists have little knowledge of fungi, and one could hardly be excused for failing to give a general introduction to these plants. Few entomologists realise the very large number of British species which may be included in the unscientific term 'larger fungi'. The majority of these

THE FUNGI

eared d the I the ected terial ae or

rma-

igus. was

ive a

tions

larch,

nt as

ite of

leuca

onths

rged.

tance

ds in

nter,

1960.]

rged tory. ı has tied, wan-

rvae this unk. cuff lust. put sucuires

from ngle have site. e, is and rial. hich

arly ghly heir l-fed d. I

jar. Yet iece sorb pver

ents

han

- 68

are Basidiomycetes of which there are some 2,700 British species: but other groups of fungi also include some large forms, so that the total number of plants with which one might concern oneself is very great, even if the microscopic forms are excluded.

It is often said that the fungi are difficult to identify. This is partly because, in many, the naked-eye characters such as colour, shape and size are extremely variable; also because the mature organisms, and this applies particularly to the Agaricaceae, are soft and apt to decompose rapidly. There is moreover no effective way of preserving them, so that much of the material on which the systematic mycologist works consists of water-colour sketches or notes made from fresh material: the material which he receives is often decomposed. Microscopic characters are helpful, in some groups of fungi, where there are simple precise differences between species in such matters as the size and shape and other characters of spores. But there are not, generally speaking, a great number of different microscopic characters, and there are large genera among the Agaricaceae within which the spore characters are not very helpful.

There has been a tendency for the early authors to use the naked-eye characters and later workers the microscopic ones. This has resulted not only in changes in nomenclature, but in completely fresh systems of classification. Particularly in the Agarics, the genera which may be defined under the two systems are not consistent with one another. Entomologists, indeed, are familiar with changes in synonymy and the difficulties that result from them in their own science. They will readily understand that the mycologist is confronted with still greater difficulties.

Some of these difficulties and changes in synonymy concern us directly. Several early entomological authors refer to fungus growing on the trunks of trees as 'Boletus'. No species of Boletus in the modern sense of the word has that habit; but Boletus was used until the early part of the nineteenth century for fungi with pores beneath, many of which would now be placed in the Polyporaceae. By 1801 Persoon in his 'Synopsis' recognised 5 sections under Boletus of which the first, the Suilli, represents Boletus in a more modern sense. Fries in 1821 was the first botanist to fix Boletus as a generic name in the modern sense, but not all botanists followed him immediately: it may be supposed that the entomologists were not influenced by his work for some time. Among entomologists who have used Boletus in the older sense is Dufour: for instance in 1839 he described the larvae and cocoons of the Mycetophilid Ceroplatus dispar on 'Boletus ungulatus' growing on a dead oak stump. In 1842 the same author dealing with the life history of Sciophila striata described the larvae living in a mucous trail on 'Boletus suaveolens L.' growing on an old limb of black poplar and pupating in the fungus. Dr. R. W. G. Dennis is satisfied that Boletus ungulatus' refers to the plant now known as Fomes fomentarius L. (which grows on oak in France though not in Britain) and 'B. suavaeolens' as Trametes suaveolens (L.) Fr. As late as 1849 the entomolgist Perris was still using Boletus in the old sense. He described the larva of Sciophila unimaculata Macq. from 'Boletus versicolor'. i.e. Polystictus versicolor L. (Polyporaceae).

The entomologist, wishing to study insects frequenting fungi, should realise that it is not only difficult but impossible for him to learn to identify all the species, even of some familiar group such as the Agaries or Polypores. He must either secure the frequent help of a mycologist, or turn to some other field of study. The entomologist will, however, come to rely on his own identifications as he gains experience and comes to realise where he may do so. As a beginner he will derive a great deal of help from the book by Wakefield & Dennis; these authors have 'attempted to produce simple but accurate descriptions, and adequate illustrations of some 470

it ir ir k

h

17

o

r

p

s

S

S

n

p

d

tl

la

tic ho in fu gr fu

C

tic

sp

Al

rar inte late

the been period after the Lac CE.

has lacti Urb and

1960.]

brief notes on the scope of each item.

common or striking British Basidiomycetes, that is, of mushrooms and toadstools, bracket fungi, coral fungi, puff-balls and their allies'. As to those larger fungi which are not Basidiomycetes, the beginner will be helped by the drawings and text of Ramsbottom (1951). The Foray Committee's 'Guide' (1952) is a selected bibliography of British fungi, with

69

Most of us, when we think of fungi, have in mind a toadstool growing on the ground, or a shelf fungus coming out of a dead log. It is not always realised that these objects, which we may call fruiting bodies or sporophores, are only a specialised part of the plant, developed to give rise to spores. In many fungi, for instance the Agarics, those fruiting bodies are short lived and decompose rapidly: most of them are only found at certain seasons, generally very brief, and in many species the fruiting bodies are not developed in unfavourable years. The long-lived, generally perennial part of the fungus is the mycelium, which is spread through the soil, or decomposing vegetable matter, or rotten wood, in the form of minute threads. There is no way of seeing it in bulk, but it is presumably much larger than the fruiting bodies even when they are fully developed. This mycelium seldom has characters, either naked eye or microscopic, by which it may be identified, even approximately. In certain fungi there are other important stages in addition to the fruiting body and the mycelium. For instance, in certain species of Coprinus a large mass of sterile felted growth known as ozonium may be produced, generally on the surface of logs, occasionally spreading over brickwork and so forth. Nearly all existing breeding records of Diptera (and the same is true of

Coleoptera and Lepidoptera) are from fruiting bodies; but a little information exists as to larvae of Diptera feeding on mycelium. It is not easy to see how we could increase our information on that subject by methods applied in the field. In the laboratory it is possible to culture mycelium of many fungi: this could be developed by an entomologist who might attempt to grow some insects on living mycelium in vitro.

In the present paper, the appendix gives a list of all the species of fungus which have been studied, with authors' names, cited in accordance with the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. For that I am particularly indebted to Dr. Dennis.

SYSTEMATIC LIST OF DIPTERA REARED

TIPULIDAE

The number of Tipulids with fungicolous larvae is not great, and the species referred to below are the only British ones known to have this habit. All, with the exception of Tipula pagana, the status of which as a fungus eater is not established, belong to the Limoniinae.

Tipula pagana M.—A clump of Psathyrella disseminata was lifted (August 30th, Gerrards Cross) with a considerable quantity of earth, and transferred to a large jar, the intention being to maintain the fungi in good health. Two T. pagana emerged six weeks later. There is no evidence that the larva is particularly associated with the fungus.

Limonia (Metalimnobia) bifasciata Schr.-There are several indefinite references to the relation of L. bifasciata to fungi (Cuthbertson, 1926; Edwards, 1938). In France it has been reared from Lactarius azonites and Collybia grammocephala (Riel, 1920). In my experience L. bifasciata is common, large numbers frequently emerging about a month after collection in summer. From material collected November 16th a single adult emerged the following July. Bred from AGARICACEAE, Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/2). emerged the following July. Bled from AGARICACEAE, Theurous connecopine (14/2). Lactarius piperatus, Russula luteotacta and ochroleuca, Amanita muscaria; BOLETA-CEAE, Boletus versipellis; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus fissilis, and squamosus (11/2); GASTEROMYCETES, Scleroderma cepa (one). From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

L. bifasciata is closely related to L. triocellata O.S. which Alexander (1915, 1920) has reared in America from Armillaria sp., Clitocybe sp., Boletus felleus and Hypomyces lactifluorum. Malloch (1917) found larvae of L. triocellata feeding in an Agaric, at the Live formed a compact allutinous tube in the fungue. Urbana, Illinois, in September. The larva formed a compact glutinous tube in the fungus, and pupation occurred in the tube. The larva and pupa are figured. Alexander has reared

but al ven

rch,

beize lies lly. of

erhe me ies 3ut

pic ich eye

not sider inult he

ly. ks rd th ed

eca a med

us ae ıs' he ail hd

us ch as as i-L.

d Гy

to n re e e o

L. cinclipes Say (not British) from Fomes; Weiss and West (1920) reared it from Polyborus dichrous Fr. in New Jersey, U.S.A.

L. (M.) quadrimaculata L.—Coe (1941) records larvae in Polyporus schweinitzi in Epping Forest, Essex, in November, the adults emerging on January 9th: there is a pupal skin with these data in the British Museum (coll. Donisthorpe).

L. (M.) quadrinotata M .- Hinton found a larva in the Agaric Amanita sp., Forest of Dean, Glos., August: it fed on larvae and pupae of Mycetophilidae. I reared one in 1954 from the 'fairy club', Clavaria cinerca (i.e. from a genus from which Diptera are

seldom reared); from Gerrards Cross. L. nubeculosa M.-From Clitocybe nebularis collected in November in Gerrards

Cross, one emerged in May, 1955; from Collybia velutipes collected in December at Wendover, Bucks., one emerged in April, 1955. It is difficult to interpret these specimens, reared from Agarics, having regard to the large number of collections of those fungi which have been made. The fly is common and widely distributed. If its normal food plant is a fungus, it may be some Agaric not yet investigated. Dicranomyia decem-maculata L.-Alexander (1920) quotes European records of this

insect bred from Daedalia and similar fungi (presumably Polyporaceae). The first British record (Verrall, 1912) was based on material bred from a fungus on a decaying beech, at Tarrington: reference is made to its having been bred from Daedalia in Germany. Hinton found larvae in large numbers on a log infested with Polystictus versicolor. He thought that the larvae fed on the fungus, but was not convinced on that point. This insect is less frequent than other fungicolous Tipulids and is confined to POLYPOR-ACEAE. Material of Trametes gibbosa collected in January produced adults from May until September. There was no evidence that a generation was produced in captivity, and I thought that all the specimens were members of the original brood. Their delayed and irregular emergence might be due to unfavourable conditions. An attempt to breed a generation is reconstituted T. gibbosa failed. Bred from Trametes gibbosa (5/2, many specimens), Poria mucida: also from Phlebia merismoides, from material collected in 1954. The record from Poria, based on a single specimen, requires confirmation. As the larva evidently finds what it needs inside the thick tough sporophore of Trametes, it seems unlikely that it could also feed on Poria which makes a layer perhaps a millimetre thick on dead boughs. The fly, which undoubtedly emerged from Poria, may have been from a wandering full-fed larva. From Gerrards Cross.

Ula sylvatica M.—Alexander (1915, 1920) quotes earlier authors, and refers to Perris's (1849) record of this species bred from Hydnum erinaceum Bull. on trunk of living oak; the larvae were gregarious in galleries in the fungus. Alexander also records that the pupa is in the ground, coming to the surface before the adult emerges. U. sylvatica (macroptera) was reared by Riel (1920) from Russula adusta and Tricholoma inamoenum. Coe (1941) adds Pholiota spectabilis, from New Forest, Hants: Audcent (1949) adds Hypholoma fasciculare and Tricholoma album. Hinton has recently reared the insect in numbers from Auricularia mesenterica, and observed the larvae feeding on the fungus. This is a common fungus fly, large numbers of adults frequently emerging from soft

fungi, especially if collected in the autumn. Material collected October 27th (containing larvae, but not pupae) produced adults from December 4th onwards. Material collected in January produced adults for more than two months from April 28th, and material collected in May produced adults after six weeks. In a breeding jar in which fungus is decomposing, larvae may be found in the moist sawdust below the fungus. They move about in rough firm galleries, and the pupae occur in the galleries, the sawdust adhering firmly to them. Adults copulate readily in a jar, even in a 1 lb. jam pot. On several occasions a number have been placed with 'reconstituted' fungi, but no second generation was obtained. Bred from AGARICACEAE, Pleurotus cornucopiae, Russula nigricans (see also Par-

menter (1950) for this fungus), and ochroleuca, Tricholoma rutilans, Laccaria laccata, Amanita muscaria. Armillaria mellea; POLYPORACEAE. Polyporus squamosus (many times), fissilis, gigantcus and adustus, Daedalia biennis, Trametes gibbosa. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

Scleroprocta sororcula Zett.-Hinton has found the larva, on several occasions in the spring, in galleries in Polyporus betulinus, generally in fungi which had fallen from the birch tree and were rotting on the ground. The larvae made a portable case and fed on the fungus. I failed to breed any Diptera from seven samples of P. betulinus (though one Nematocerous larva was seen once) and also failed to find larvae or their workings in numerous sliced sporophores, some young, others old and crumbling. Failand, Somerset (H. E. Hinton).

TRICHOCERIDAE

Trichocera rujescens Edw.--Once from Hypholoma sublateritium, from Tonbridge. T. saltator Herr. Once from Entoloma rhodopolium, from Gerrards Cross. T. hiemalis Deg.-- Form POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus giganteus; AGARICACEAE,

Pleurotus ostreatus. Entelema rhodopolium, Russula sp., Amanita phalloides, A. muscaria; BOLETACEAE, Bolctus versipellis; CLAVARIACEAE, Clavaria vermicularis (a single T. hiemalis, on one occasion only). Though I have had several collections of some of these fungi, T. hiemalis has emerged from a single collection only, of each species,

fro

19

the

Ge

fu fei

ine þа an ma ab

fro we em dar mat

for

Thi the in v Fro

wh Fo1

histo shov

may deco bole is a Agai

out

stem I larva Adul ochre

Armi emer T offere

not a C Culic other

gow, Scotl M are (and :

AGA

ACE. CEA

71 though when present the larva is often numerous. One has an impression that fungi do

not make a large contribution to the total population of this abundant insect. From Gerrards Cross, Bucks., and Windsor Great Park, Berks. T. annulata Mg.—Reared by Dusour (1840) from rotten fungi, and by Falcoz (1921)

from Polyporus frondosus. T. regelationis L .- Reared from rotten fungi (Dufour, 1840).

PSYCHODIDAE

One might expect to breed Psychodids from deliquescent, half decayed fungi of various types. Reil (1920) working in France reared specimens referred to Psychoda phalaenoides L. from Kussula cyanoxantha, Tricholoma inamoenum and Amanita phalloides (the last noted as 'avancé'). Psychoda pacifica Kin. is recorded as reared from Coprinus sp. in California (Kessel and Kessel, 1939). Satchell (1947a and b) examined decaying vegetable material for larvae of Psychoda, but does not mention fungi. It is remarkable that I have not observed any Psychodids.

CHIRONOMIDAE

Three species of Orthocladius are recorded as bred from fungi in California (Kessel & Kessel 1939), two of them from Coprinus and the third from Stereum hirsutum. One might expect to breed Chironomidae from wet decomposing Agarics, Boletus, or Polyporus squamosus. None have emerged from material of that type.

Metriocnemus atratulus Zett.-A number of this common insect emerged from old darkened sporophores of Stereum purpureum, of the crop of the previous autumn; the material was collected at Gerrards Cross in February, the flies emerging early in April. This is a curious record: in 21 collections of Stereum spp. (including 7 of S. purpureum) the insect was found only once.

Eudactylocladius icterica M.—One emerged from a collection of Xylaria polymorpha, in which Sciara larvae were numerous. X. polymorpha seldom contains Dipterous larvae.

From Gerrards Cross.

1960.]

irch,

Poly-

i in

upal

prest e in

are

ards

r at

peci-

hose

rmal

this

itish

a, at any. He

This

OR-

May

vity, ayed

reed

any đ in

the

ems

hick

rom

ris's

ak;

the

tica um.

pho-

bers

soft

ning

cted

erial s is nove

ring eral tion

Par-

ata,

any Ger-

in rom

fed

ugh in

Fset

ge.

ΑE,

CERATOPOGONIDAE

The two fungicolous members of this family both belong to genera in which the majority of species breed in a diversity of other material, indeed Forcipomyia ciliata may be reared from material other than fungi.

Forcipomyia ciliata Winn.—Saunders (1923) first called attention to the diversity of lifehistories in the members of this genus, described the larvae and pupae of several, and showed how valuable their points of difference could be in a genus in which the adults may be difficult. The larvae were found in many types of environment, associated with decomposing vegetable material. He showed on grounds of larval and pupal structure that boleti Kieffer, 1901 (larvae in numbers, on and in decomposing fungi, Boletus confluens.) is a synonym of ciliata Winnertz, 1852. Saunders found early stages of ciliata in rotting Agaries and Polypores, but he also bred the insect from decomposing water weed, raked out on the bank of a river near Cambridge and found larvae in winter inside rotting stems of potato and under bark on a fallen branch.

In my own rearings from Gerrards Cross, F. ciliata has not proved common. Many larvae were found, in little groups in a single decomposed Agaric collected in December.

Adults emerged in the end of March and in April. The insect was also reared from Russula schroleuca (6/1), collected in October and beginning to decompose. Reared in 1954 from Armillaria mellea, rather decomposed, collected October 19th, some hundreds of F. ciliata emerging in early November: also a small number from 'ozonium' of Coprinus.

The adults only live a couple of days in captivity, even in a moist atmosphere. I fered them syrup, honey, fresh fruit, crushed woodlice, and live caterpillars, but was at able to observe them feed.

Culicoides scoticus Dow. and Ket .- There is no published record of the rearing of Calicoides from any fungus. C. scoticus was separated by Downes and Kettle (1952) from ther members of the obsoletus group on the male terminalia. The type was from Glas-Lanarkshire, and the species was identified in material from several places, all in sodand. The breeding places have not been found.

My Culicoides material has been examined by Kettle who reports that all the 42 males C. scoticus; the 30 females from the same fungi must be assumed to be the same, are the first recognised females of that species. My specimens were bred from GARICACEAE, Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/1), Russula ochroleuca (6/1); POLYPOR-LAE, Daedalia biennis (2/1). In 1954 further material was reared from AGARICA-AE, Hypholoma fasciculare, Lactarius turpis, Armillaria mellea; BOLETACEAE,

(a me es,

Boletus bovinus. In addition, 3 females of the obsoletus group, but no males, were reared from Polyporus adustus. Excluding the latter it will be seen that the midge has been reared from seven different species of tungi, on one occasion only from each. It was never numerous, a maximum of a dozen being bred from one collection. All emergences of adults occurred in the autumn. My impression is that this midge is only reared from rather moist fungi, in an early stage of decomposition. To this D. biennis, which is rather tough and does not deliquesce, seems to form an exception, but only one midge was bred from it. The discovery of the characteristic breeding place of C. scoticus confirms its specific distinctness. Specimens from Gerrards Cross, and Stoke Common, Bucks.

CECIDOMYIDAE

In a recent paper a description was given of a new gall-midge, Camptodiplosis auriculariae, bred on many occasions from the fungus Auricularia auricula-judae, and reference was made to published information on gallmidges associated with fungi (Buxton and Barnes, 1953).

Lestremia cinerea Macq.—Already recorded from 'mushrooms' (Barnes, 1946). I have reared it from Stereum purpureum (7/1), but not from other species of Stereum.

MYCETOPHILIDAE

There are no papers dealing primarily with the biology of European Mycetophilidae, though several authors (e.g. Mansbridge, 1932) have studied a limited number of species. The large systematic papers (e.g. Landrock, 1926) contain some facts on food plants and other biological details; Edwards (1925) is particularly valuable as his fungi were often examined by his colleague Dr. J. Ramsbottom. There is some reliable information in Madwar (1934a and b; 1935a and b), Riel (1920), Bonnamour (1926), Barendrecht (1938) and Séguy (1940). Séguy's works (1950, 1951) are of general interest. For North American species see Johannsen (1909-1912, almost entirely systematic), Weiss and West (1920, with careful identification of fungi), and Kessel and Kessel (1939), who have collected many published records, American and European.

Even when the literature has been ransacked one is still ignorant of the biology and early stages of fungus gnats, though they are better known than other Diptera feeding on fungi. I have reared only 36 of the total British fauna of about 400 Mycetophilids. But even among that small number, there were undescribed species of Sciophila and Phronia (Freeman, 1956). I also established the food plant of several quite common insects: for instance, I have shown that Trichonta vernalis feeds regularly on Calocera cornea, a common plant. One sees our ignorance also in the large discrepancies, referred to below, between the breeding records of Edwards and of myself, though we both worked in south-east England. These are probably due to a difference in method, for it appears that Edwards examined large amounts of material in the field and selected fragments in which he observed larvae; whereas I have endeavoured not to be selective and collected the material into breeding jars. But whatever the reason the difference in results shows how imperfect knowledge still is, and how far we are from being able to give a general account of the relation between these insects and fungi.

To a very high degree, larvae of Mycetophilidae require their fungus food alive. They differ here from most fungivorous members of the other families. If one picks a toadstool and puss it in a moist atmosphere, one may frequently see hundreds of Mycetophilid larvae (but not other larvae) emerge within 48 hours or even 24 hours. Most of them die of starvation; a few may even make cocoons and then die, presumably due to undernourishment. Methods of trapping the larvae as they emerge from the undisturbed fungus must be developed.

The period passed by these insects in the cocoon (i.e. as a resting larva, pupa and perhaps resting adult) is often very short. For instance, I once surrounded the base of a *Polyporus giganteus* with cellophane and moist

ences from ather

arch.

eared

been

bred

s its

pto-

aria

gall-

). 1

ean

ave

e.g.

ical

ten

in-

our

51)

109-

eful

ted

of

wn

otal

ım-

an,

for era

ep-

of

bly

rge

0**b-**

ted

in

om cts

rus

ıer

ne

ae)

n: erın-

a,

previous 24 hours: in September the cocoon stage of Mycetophila ornata lasted less than 14 days. I had occasion to observe a single cocoon of Rhymosia domestica spun against the glass of a breeding tube early in September: the total duration of life in the cocoon was 11 days. I observed a similar duration, 11 days or rather less, in Mycetophila signatoides.

sawdust so that I was able to recover larvae which had emerged within the

It is difficult to understand how a species of Mycetophilid can maintain itself, particularly if it feeds only on a few species of fungi, for the fruiting bodies or sporophores are individually short lived and the period for which they are available may be only a few weeks: moreover, in some years the crop of sporophores may be exceedingly small or none may come up. Even if the insect is prepared to put its eggs on various fungi there are periods in the year when it would be a matter of great difficulty to locate a sporophore. There is an additional difficulty if the insect breeds in small Agaries, especially those which come up singly and not in clumps, such as Omphalia sibula and species of Galerina. But though these little sungi are no. often infested with larvae of Mycetophilidae or other Diptera, they do from time to time produce these insects: this seems to imply that an individual larva may have the power of searching rather widely and feeding on a succession of sporophores.

DITOMYINAE

Ditomyia fasciata M.-Edwards (1925), after referring to the larvae of the subfamily as living 'either in hard Polyporaceous fungi or in rotten wood impregnated with mycelium', says that pupation takes place in the fungus, without formation of a cocoon, the pupae coming to the surface at emergence. As to \bar{D} , fasciata 'its range is probably coextensive with that of its host fungus (Polystictus versicolor) from which it may easily be reared in numbers'. Madwar (1937) also obtained his material of D. fasciata from Polystictus versicolor and refers to earlier authors who had associated the insect with this lungus: others, however, obtained it from different polypori.

My experience does not entirely agree with Edwards or Madwar. From 16 collections of P. versicolor, I have only reared D. fasciata on a single occasion, from a collection made in November at Gerrards Cross: though many of the other collections were made in autumn. On the other hand I have bred \bar{D} . fasciata from other POLYPORACEAE, Fomes ulmarius (9/3, flies in numbers), Daedalia biennis and Polyporus picipes (several flies, on a single occasion from each), and P. adustus (8/1, only two flies). All the records are from Gerrards Cross. It is to be noted that all the food plants are hard Polypores. I have not bred the insect from 11 collections of the soft Polyporus squamosus. One knows from his success with other species that Edwards gave much time to rearing from Polyporaceae and I cannot explain the inconsistency between his results and mine.

BOLITOPHILINAE

Bolitophila.—From the fact that one may rear a couple of hundred flies from half-a-dozen toadstools, it seems evident that the eggs are laid in large numbers, either in mass or close to one another. The relation of the eleven British species to particular food plants merits further study: in some at least the relation is close. So far as is known all the food plants are Agarics.

B. saundersi Curt.—Edwards (1925) said 'this species seems to be specially associated with Hypholoma fasciculare in which I have on several occasions found the larvae'. He refers to Audcent who had reared this insect from the same fungus, but also from Tricholoma personatum. I have examined five collections of Hypholoma fasciculare, and bred B. saundersi from two, collected in early April and December: from Gerrards Cross, and Wisley, near Ripley, Surrey. Newly emerged adults copulate in a jar of about half a cubic foot. I have failed to secure a second generation, offering moist reconstituted fungi. cinerea M.-Recorded by Edwards from Hypholoma velutinum, and by

Falcoz (1924) from H. sublateritium. Reared by myself from H. sublateritium (1/1) collected in January at Tonbridge. If further experience shows that B. saundersi and cinerea are associated respectively with H. fasciculare and sublateritium that will be interesting: the fungi are regarded as closely related.

R. hegydelybyidg I. m. Paged by Edwards from the sublateritium that will be in-

B. pscudohybrida Lw.—Reared by Edwards from larvae found in the stem of Clitocybe nebularis. Reared by myself, a single specimen only, from Tricholoma nudum collected in Gerrards Cross, November.

ce ist B. hybrida M.—Edwards found the larvae in Paxillus involutus, and Paxillus sp. Riel (1920) reared the insect (referred to as B. fusca Mg.) from Paxillus lateralis and Boletus luteus in France. Riel, who had an expert knowledge of fungi, recalled the view that Paxillus and Boletus may be closely related, and observed that this affinity was better appreciated by the female fly than by certain mycologists. This insect was also reared by Madwar (1934a) from Paxillus involutus, from near Cambridge, and by Tollet (1953) from the same fungus, on two occasions, in France. Madwar (1937) notes that Degcer (1776) figured a larva, obtained from Boletus luteus, which has the structural characteristics of Bolitophila sp.

In my investigation I examined two collections of *Paxillus involutus*; one was negative; from the other (Gerrards Cross, collected in October), several hundred *B. hybrida* were bred. I have not reared *B. hybrida* from *Boletus* spp. (12/0).

SCIARINAE

Owing to the difficulty of identification I have no precise records for this subfamily. I have reared Bradysia sp., from fungi which are only attacked by very few Diptera, e.g. from Xylaria polymorpha on several occasions, Hypoxylon fragiforme (coccineum), Polystictus versicolor (16/1) and several species of Polyporus, both hard and soft: also from Auricularia mesenterica (10/2), but not A. auricula-judae 10/0. Falcoz (1921) reared a Sciara from Schizophyllum commune, an Agaric seldom attacked by Diptera.

Some species of *Bradysia* may easily be maintained for an indefinite number of generations in decomposed fungi: for instance a crop of them may emerge at monthly intervals, in summer, in a closed breeding jar. Certain species referred to *Sciara*, have been reared in 'mushroom meal' and studied by cytologists (see Metz and Moses (1928), Metz and Ullian (1929) and earlier papers by Metz).

SCIOPHILINAE

The common insects referred to below select their food without any regard to the accepted taxonomy of fungi. One may ask why they have not been reared from many more genera of fungi, and what it is that determines the choice.

Mycomyia marginata Mg.—Reared by Edwards from a number of fungi of different families, all growing on bark: POLYPORACEAE, Poria versipora (vaporaria) and Polystictus versicolor; THELEPHORACEAE, Phlebia radiata (mcrismoides) and Stereum hirsutum; TREMELLALES, Auricularia mesenterica. He describes the formation of the webb and suspension of the pupa in it. Reared by myself from Stereum hirsutum (7/1), and S. purpureum (7/1), from Gerrards Cross. The web is inhabited by a considerable group of larvae.

Sciophila lutea Macq.—Reared by Edwards from Polyporus giganteus from which I have not reared it (4/0), and by Falcoz (1921) from Polyporus nigricans and Stereum hirsutum. I have reared it from a curious assortment: POLYPORACEAE, Daedalia biennis; PYRENOMYCETES, Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris); AGARICACEAE, Russula ochroleuca (6/1). From Gerrards Cross, and Burnham Beeches, Bucks.

S. hirta Mg.—Reared by Edwards from POLYPORACEAE, Daedalia quercina, Poria versipora (vaporaria) and Polystictus versicolor; TREMELLALES. Auricularia (Herniola) auricula-judae; AGARICACEAE, Lactarius volemus (and oviposition on this fungus witnessed). Chapman (1904) describes the egg and pupa; his material was from Daedalia quercina. Reared by myself from DISCOMYCETES, Bulgaria inquinans; POLYPORACEAE, Trametes confragosa (6/1); AGARICACEAE, Collybia maculata. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

S. buxtoni Freem.—Bred from Trametes confragosa (6/1) collected in September, and T. gibbosa (5/1) collected in October, from Gerrards Cross. The material is in the British Museum (Nat. Hist.).

Rondaniella dimidiata Mg.—This distinctive insect was described by Edwards as 'rare but widely distributed'. There is no record of its having been bred. Reared five times from fungi collected in the autumn of 1954: CLAVARIACEAE, Sparassis crispa (once, in numbers); POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus adustus (from two collections, numerous), Fomes annosus (from two collections). Adults emerged in November and December, and one in May. From Gerrards Cross and Wisley, Surrey.

Docosia gilvipes Hal.—According to Edwards a fairly common and widely distributed species; reared by him from TREMELLALES, Auricularia mescularica; AGARIC-ACEAE, Hypholoma fasciculare; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus betulinus. I have examined a considerable number of collections of the above fungi, but not rearred this insect from them. I have, however, reared numbers of it from three Agarics, Amanita

wl of ca be

ju:

m

D

frode Re ru. Tr sel

bri

Ge lat Bo lar ins

fro and Fro

ger and my

fur Py: ma a f

a to fun to Ha

Ha tre yea

fro: Gei

and sing Por

in] *cor*

Sun No sev

spe

not

muscaria, Clitocybe nebularis, and Tricholoma nuduon; also a single specimen from the Discomycete, Peziza (Aleuria) micropus: from Gerrards Cross.

MYCETOPHILINAE

Exechia spinigera Winn.—According to Edwards, the adult is common, but he reared it on one occasion only, from Hygrophorus chlorophanus. Reared by myself once only, from Amanita muscaria at Gerrards Cross.

E. fusca Mg.—Edwards refers to this as 'the commonest species of the genus everywhere with us': he reared it from Boletus versicolor, and from 10 Agarics of a wide range of genera. Several of them are rather small, e.g. Marasmius erythropus, of which the cap is about 1 inch in diameter. Edwards noted that larvae are found in quite small numbers, generally in the stem. (See also Riel 1920, who reared this insect, referred to as fungorum, from two Agarics.) Reared by myself from Mycena galericulata a single specimen on one occasion, and from Trametes gibbosa (5/1, half a dozen specimens), both from Gerrards Cross. The two fungi are curiously different, the Mycena a small and delicate Agaric, the Trametes a hard lumpy Polypore.

E. dorsalis Staeg.—Recorded by Edwards from Boletus and two genera of Agarics. Reared by myself once, from Collybia maculata, from Gerrards Cross.

Rhymosia domestica Mg.—Regarded by Edwards (1925, i.e. before the distinction from rustica Edw. was detected) as 'fairly common everywhere'; larvae found in three Agarics, Tricholoma nudum, Clithocybe infundibuliformis and Marasmius oreades. Reared by myself from similar fungi, Tricholoma gambosa (collected May 26th), Clitocybe geotropa and Marasmius oreades, from the latter 8/3 and in numbers. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

R. rustica Edw.—A single specimen from one collection of Tricholoma nudum, from Gerrards Cross. It would be a matter of interest to investigate whether the closely related species of Rhymosia are associated with separate food plants.

R. fenestralis Mg.—This common species was reared by Edwards from a small Boletus, and from Agarics of five genera. My records add Clitocybe geotropa, C. nebularis, and Pleurotus corticatus (1/1). I have examined 22 collections of Pleurotus spp., the insect emerging on one occasion only. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

Allodia lugens Wied.—An abundant widely distributed species recorded by Edwards from Russula sp. and Armillaria mellea. Reared by myself from Hebeloma crustuliniforme and Pleurotus serotinus (but not met with in numerous other collections of Pleurotus sp.). From Chobham, Surrey, and Gerrards Cross.

A. ornaticollis Mg.—An abundant insect, recorded by Edwards from Agarics of four genera. Reared by myself from Hebeloma crustuliniforme (several, from one collection) and Hygrophorus virgineus (one only). From Chobham, Surrey, and Gerrards Cross.

A. silvatica Land.—Edwards gives no food records. Reared by myself from the Discomycete Peziza (formerly Aleuria) repanda (8/4, in numbers), from Gerrards Cross. These records, and that of A. triangularis below demonstrate the importance of exploring the fungi widely. The Discomycetes, and the same might be said of other groups such as the Pyrenomycetes, have been neglected by entomologists.

A. triangularis Strobl.—A rare insect, of which the British Museum only has two males, from Scotland, apart from my material. Reared from Peziza (Aleuria) repanda (8/1, a few specimens, among many silvatica); from Gerrards Cross.

Brachypeza radiata Jenk.—Edwards found the larva of this insect 'abundant in a fungus (Pleurotus sp.) which grows on old but standing elm trunks. I have never failed to find them in this fungus, nor on the other hand have I ever found them elsewhere': Hamm found larvae in the same fungus. Madwar (1937) found larvae in Pleurotus on elm trees at and near Cambridge, in August, September and November, and adults all the year round. I failed to rear it from 14 collections of Pleurotus cornucopiae from elms, or from 8 collections of other species of Pleurotus, some from elms: most of above from Gerrards Cross.

Cordyla nitidula Edw.—In his original description Edwards (1925) says that 'the specimens were all reared from fungi of the genus Russula (R. chloroides, R. lutea and another species).' In my experience reared once only, from Russula ochroleuca (6/1, a single fly), collected in early October, Gerrards Cross.

Trichonta vitta Mg.—Regarded by Edwards as common and reared repeatedly from Poria versipora (vaporaria). In my experience reared once, from the same fungus collected in December at Cranbrook, Kent.

T. vernalis Land.—I have reared half-a-dozen, on a single occasion, from Calocera comea collected October 23rd at Gerrards Cross. The larvae were bright yellow, presumably from the colouring matter of the fungus. They emigrated from the fungus on November 12th and made cocoons, from which adults emerged December 5th to 7th. On several other occasions I have observed yellow larvae, doubtless of this species, in C. cornea, but failed to rear adults.

Phronia sinuata Freem.—I have reared this species from Calocera viscosa (6/2 several

specimens on both occasions) in September and December, from Gerrards Cross. It has not been reared from C. cornea (5/0), nor from a number of collections of other Tremellales, or other fungi.

his

Riel

etus

that tter

ired 953)

geer

ter-

ga-

rida

ns, ind ria red by

ite em ar. nd

29)

ny ve er-

ent lyum the 1), ble

I Iia Iia E,

ria his m s; la. nd sh

re m in i),

d)-K-

Knla So far as they are known (Edwards, 1925: 623, 627; Madwar, 1937), larvae of Phronia live externally, generally on the surface of dead branches, sodden and attacked by moulds. The known larvae fall in three groups, (a) whitish, without cases, with a thin coating of mucous (P. jorcipula, tarsata, conformis); (b) 'covered with a thick black slimy covering and therefore particularly slug-like' (P. annulata); (c) 'bearing regular and fairly hard conical black cases resembling tiny limpets' (P. strenua). The larvae of P. sinuata is bright yellow from ingested Calocera, but otherwise falls in the first group, except that it is an internal feeder in the finger-like growths of the fungus. The larvae of

yet possible for the taxonomist to take much account of these considerable differences between living larvae.

Of Phronia forcipula, Edwards (1925) says that he 'reared specimens from whitish, non-case bearing larvae sent me by Mr. J. C. F. Fryer from Kew. The larvae were said to occur in such numbers on a certain fungus of the genus Corticium as to render its cultivation almost impossible'. It is difficult to interpret this word 'cultivation': perhaps as Dr. Dennis has suggested, 'cultivation' is a misprint for 'identification'. Miss E. M. Wakefield, formerly on the staff of the Herbarium at Kew, and a specialist in Corticium, tells us that she has frequently found numerous cream-coloured larvae with a mucous sheath in Corticium (Glæocystidium) praetermissum, but that she has not noticed them

most species, of which Edwards (1925) gives 24 as British, are not yet known. It is not

c

F

Ī

d

F

i

ŀ

tl

la a

F

o

(1

C

ir

tŀ

b

fr

p

0

N

in other species of Corticium.

Dynatosoma fuscicorne Mg.—Reared by Edwards from a number of POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus squamosus, P. betulinus, Polystictus versicolor, Daedalia quercina and Lenzites betulina. Madwar (1935a) also reared it from the first two of these. I have reared it from Daedalia biennis (2/2), but never from the fungi mentioned by Edwards; for instance P.

squamosus (11/0) and P. versicolor (16/0).

Mycetophila fungorum Deg.—According to Edwards, this insect is hardly ever absent from Armillaria mellea, which he regards as its 'natural food-plant'. He also bred it from several species of Boletus and Agarics of a number of genera. I have reared it from Armillaria mellea (3/1), Pluteus cervinus, and Hebeloma crustuliniforme; also from Polyporus squamosus (11/1), a single specimen, presumably accidental, for this is the only record from the POLYPORACEAE. From Chobham and Gerrards Cross.

M. lineola Mg.—Reared by Edwards from Sparassis laminosa and from seven Agarics. In my collections reared from Hebeloma crustuliniforme, and Polyporus squamosus (11/2,

In my collections reared from Hebeloma crustituniforme, and Polyporus squamosus (11/2, but in numbers on both occasions). From Chobham and Gerrards Cross.

M. ocellus Walk.—'Common everywhere, and breeds in varius bark-growing fungi' (Edwards). He records it from members of four families, Poria versipora, Phlebia

merismoides, Sparassis crispa and Pleurotus ostreatus. I have bred it in numbers from a PYRENOMYCETE, Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris); THELEPHORACEAE, Corticium laeve (7/1), Corticium sp.?, Coniophora puteana, Stereum purpureum (7/1): all from Gerrards Cross. I have not reared it from other Stereum spp. (14/0), nor from Pleurotus spp. (22/0), indeed Edwards' record from P. ostreatus is the only one from an Agaric. The distribution of host plants is curious, but all grow on bark, as Edwards remarked.

M. formosa Lund.—Reared by Edwards from Phlebia merismoides; by myself from the very closely related Phlebia radiata (1/1, two only), from Gerrards Cross.

M. ornata Steph.—Edwards bred this insect from 'various bark-growing fungi, including Polystictus versicolor, Polyporus giganteus, Stereum sp., and Pleurotus ostreatus. My records are from Polyporus giganteus (4/1) and Pleurotus ostreatus (4/2, in numbers). I have not reared it from other species of Pleurotus, nor from Polystictus versicolor: from Gerrards Cross. The cocoon is cylindrical and fragile, and the ends of the cylinder are looser than the sides. When I have been examining cocoons I have seen the adult insect suddenly emerge from the end and fly away. I have put numbers of bred M. ornata in a jar with wet reconstituted fungi (Boletus, Lycoperdon, Auricularia and Agarics, all in one jar, on sawdust). After dark they ran over the surface of the fungi, probing with the abdomen. No larvae developed.

M. marginata Winn.—According to Edwards, the larvae feed in bark-growing fungi: he mentions several POLYPORACEAE, also Stereum sp. and an undetermined Agaric in fallen elm. Madwar (1935a) reared the insect from Poria versipora and Polystictus versicolor. My records are from Collybia velutipes (an Agaric, growing on old trunks of elder, Sambucus), Fistulina hepatica, and Xyluria hypoxylon (8/1, a single adult). The last fungus is seldom associated with larval Diptera. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

M. finlandica Edw.—Reared once from Tricholoma rutilans (numerous flies, October,

M. Inctuosa M.—An insect with a curious list of food plants, of several families, some growing on bark, others on the ground. Edwards reared it from Paxillus involutus (an Agaric doubtless growing on the ground), and an undetermined Agaric on an oak trunk. I have reared it from Russula ochroleuca, an Agaric on the ground (6/1 several specimens), also from Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris), and Stereum purpureum; both grown on dead wood, the first a PYRENOMYCETE, the second THELEPHOR.

ACEAE. From Gerrards Cross.

M. signatoides Dzied.--Recorded by Edwards as bred from Boletus. Reared by my-

self once only, from Russula nigricans, from Gerrards Cross.

M. trinotata Staeg.—Edwards regarded it as specially associated with Polystictus versicolor from which he reared it on several occasions, but he also had it from Polyporus adustus. I have reared it from P. adustus (8/2, in May and November), but never from Polysticius versicolor (16/0). From Gerrards Cross.

M. cingulum Mg.—Edwards bred this insect, on several occasions, and 'exclusively' from Polyporus squamosus. I also have it from the same fungus (11/1, several specimens, in May). From Gerrards Cross.

Platurocypia punctum Stann.—Bred on several occasions, and in numbers, from the Myxomycete Lycogala cpidendrum (Buxton, 1954). I regarded it as an interesting discovery that Diptera feed in Myxomycetes, but Perris (1839) has priority by more than a century. The author collected Dipterous larvae in 'Lycogala miniata' in the Landes, France: Miniatum Persoon is given by Lister as a synonym of L. epidendrum Fries, and Dennis assures me that there is no reason for interpreting it otherwise. The larvae produced an insect described and figured by Perris (1839) as Mycetophila lycogalae. Mr. P. Freeman has examined Perris's description and figure, and writes to me that 'Neither fits Platurocypta punctum at all well... without examination of the type it is not possible to be certain of the identity of the species'. In any case the synonymy would not be disturbed for punctum Stannous, 1831, has priority.

SCATOPSIDAE (BIBIONIDAE)

It is supposed that Scatopsidae breed in decomposing vegetable material, and are not specific. That view is supported by the few records of these insects reared from fungi. Bonnamour (1926) has reared Scatopse flavicollis Mg. from Tricholoma pessundatum in France. Rhegmoclema atrata Say was bred from two unrelated fungi, Stereum hirsutum and Mycena sp., near San Francisco, California (Kessel & Kessel, 1939). Undetermined Scatopsid larvae are recorded from inside a polypore, in Morocco in October, by Séguy (1940).

Scatopse fuscipes Mg.—I have reared this cosmopolite insect from Fistulina hepatica and Polyporus squamosus, once from each; Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

S. picea var. scutellaris Lw.—One emerged in January, 1955, from Polyporus adustus collected in November, 1954, in Gerrards Cross. Freeman states that the determination follows Edwards not Duda.

ANISOPODIDAE

Anisopus cinctus F.—From Bulgaria inquinans (twice) and Pleurotus ostreatus, once. Having regard to the large number of collections (22) of Pleurotus spp. examined, it seems that this insect is no more than occasional. There are no records of this insect being reared from the variety of decomposing vegetable materials so frequently inhabited by larvae of A. fenestralis. The evidence suggests that A. cinctus may be particularly associated with fungi, presumably when decomposing. It is easy to maintain A. cinctus in a cage for a number of generations, on 'reconstituted' fungi. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

SCENOPINIDAE

Scenopinus fenestralis L.—Bred in August from Polyporus hispidus, at Vienne, Dauphiné, France: other records quoted suggest that the insect is a miscellaneous scavenger (Falcoz, 1922).

EMPIDIDAE

Drapetis nigritella Zett.—Two were reared from young plasmodium of Fuligo septica (Myxomycetes), but none from considerable quantities of older material: the relation to the Myxomycete was regarded as doubtful (Buxton, 1954). Dr. B. R. Laurence has bred this insect from fairly old cow pats, but not from fresh ones. He suspects that the larvae feed on fungi in cow pats.

DOLICHOPODIDAE

Systenus scholtzii was reared by D. Sharp from a fungus on beech in the New Forest, Hants (Verrall, 1905). Larvae of many species of the genus Medeterus, to which both my records relate, feed on larvae of bark beetles, and pupate under bark (Collin, 1941). My records, both of them from bark-growing fungi, may be due to mature larvae which chanced to pupate in this material. M. apicalis, of which a number were reared, only occurred once, from numerous collections of P. cornucopiae. Only a single specimen of M. impiger was bred, but there are two more in the British Museum labelled 'bred from larch' (Collin, 1941).

aid
its
aps
M.
m,
ous

iem

of

bv

hin

ick lar

of

up,

of

not

ces

sh,

AE, ites rom P.

ent rom rom rom the

rics. 1/2, ngi' ebia m a

AE, all rom an re-

initus.
ers).
roin
are

in a

the
ngi:
lc in
verlder,
last

e.

ber.

ome (an unk. pecium; OR-

my-

Medeterus apicalis Zett. -- Several males (and females doubtless co-specific) bred from Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/1), on bark of a dead elm log, Gerrards Cross, collected in

M. impiger Coll.—One male, bred from Daedalia biennis (2/1) growing from a dead strain, Gerrards Cross, September.

PHORIDAE

Schmitz (1948) finds that most of the fungivorous species belong to the subgenus Megaselia, within the enormous genus Megaselia; this particular habit is characteristic of four groups of species. There is also a fungivorous group within the subgenus Aphiochaeta. Colyer (1954) described a species reared by myself, and listed the British fungivorous species, 5 in the Phorinae, 26 (all Megaselia) in the Metopininae. My earlier finds were included by Colver, but three are now added to his list. I am indebted to Mr.

Colyer, and before him Mr. Collin, for examining and identifying my material. Certain Phorids which have been bred from fungi feed also on other substances, e.g. Megaselia giraudii has been bred from a living grasshopper and M. rusipes is also a facultative parasite (Colyer, 1954). It will be a matter of great interest to discover whether some fungivores are limited to that food material, and how specialised they are within the fungi. The limited amount of information available (Colver, 1952) indicates that Triphleba minuta F. feeds only on the Agaric Pholiota spectabilis.

The difficulties in identification of Phorids are perhaps greater than appeared a few years ago, and the synonymy is far from stable. With all respect to the authors, it seems wisest to disregard identifications published before Schmitz's paper of 1948, e.g. those in the papers by Dufour (1840), Riel (1920), Bonnamour (1926) and Kessel & Kessel (1939). Papers dealing with cultivated mushrooms (Psaliota hortensis) mention Phoridae as major pests, feeding in the mycelium in the bed, and also entering the previously undamaged stem and cap (Thomas (1942), Min. Agric. & Fisheries (1950)).

Fungus-eating Phorids are not frequently reared. My records are from 10 species, and 17 collections of Agarics, roughly a tenth of the total species and collections. When Phorids occur they may be extremely numerous, hundreds sometimes emerging within a few days. They are associated with decomposing materials, but the species which feed in fungi, or at least some of them, oviposit in the young fresh plant and may be reared from fungi picked in that state. My specimens have been bred from conspicuously soft plants; the majority are such Agarics as Pleurotus and Russula. The only Discomycete is Peziza (Aleuria), and the only Polypores, P. squamosus and fumosus. The food-fungi recorded by Schmitz (1948) are also soft, and include a number of Boletus spp. There is probably enough evidence to say that Phorids do not consume hard, woody Polypores, or Pyrenomycetes.

Megaselia giraudii (Egg.).-Reared from Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/2) and Coprinus micaceus (12/1), from Gerrards Cross.

M. flava (Fall.).—From Peziza (Aleuria) repanda (8/2), from Gerrards Cross.

M. impolluta (Schmitz).-From Pluteus umbrosus, from Gerrards Cross.

M. lutea (Mg.).—From Russula ochroleuca (6/2), from Gerrards Cross. M. scutellarisormis (Schmitz).-from Russula ochroleuca, R. vinosa, and Tricholoma

atrocinereum, from Gerrards Cross. M. rusipes (Mg.).-From Bolbitius titubans, from Seahouses, Northumberland.

M. pygmaeoides (Lund.).—From Russula ochroleuca (6/1), Tricholoma gambosa, and Coprinus (?) micaceus (12/1); from Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

M. sylvatica (Wood).—Mr. Colyer (in litt., 6.x.54) states that the insect he had identified the control of the contr

fied as M. nigrescens (Wood) is sylvatica (Wood), a conclusion reached by Father Schmitz and himself. After examining Wood's types, Colyer finds that 'what I have always regarded as nigrescens is Wood's sylvatica, and that Wood's nigrescens is in fact a separate species but very close ' M. sylvatica is an addition to the list of British fungicolous Phorids: nigrescens Wood is not to be deleted, for there is British material of that species, recorded by Schmitz. My material was reared from Coprinus radians, from Gerrards Cross. M. imberbis Schmitz.-From Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/1), from Gerrards Cross.

M. buxtoni Colyer.—Described by Colyer (1954) from material of both sexes reared by

m oc P. wi Sc

ad 19

tic

re

Ple

Ple

Pla

Pla

Plo

Plc

PlaCaCaPccri (tc

La

cai

of

bre

wc

ma $M \alpha$ squ

þyr duc

phi cril fen

wit as edu

and

the occ

pap dov

Réa to'

clea pup that

Lab the *Bol

myself from Pleurotus cornucopiae, from Gerrards Cross. Subsequently bred on several occasions (14/3 in all) from the same fungus; also from Polyporus squamosus (11/2), and P. fumosus; all from the same locality. The species belongs to the fungivora-group, within Lundbeck's Group II'. It is closely related to imberbis Schmitz and frameata Schmitz.

M. cinercifrons (Strobl) .- Reared from Merulius corium, from Gerrards Cross. An addition to the list of British fungivorous Phoridae.

M. frameata Schmitz.—Recorded once only from Britain (Colyer 1954). Several emerged in April from Hypoxylon multiforme collected at Gerrards Cross in February,

PLATYPEZIDAE

All Platypezid larvae live in fungi. Czerny (1930) made a careful collection of European records of rearing, which may be tabulated thus, indefinite references to 'Pilze' and 'fungus' being omitted:

Platypeza (Clythia) dorsalis Mg. (holoserica Mg.) Platypeza (Clythia) dorsalis Mg. (holoserica Mg.) Agaricus campestris Perris, 1876 Platypeza (Clythia) subfasciata Mg. Agaricus campestris Perris, 1876 Platypeza (Clythia) boletina Fln. Platypeza (Clythia) fasciata Fin. Platypeza (Clythia) fasciata Fln. Platypeza (Clythia) infumata Hal. Calomyia amoena Mg.

Calomyia amoena Mg.

Agaricus campestris Perris, 1876 *Boletus pruni cerasi Zetterstedt, 1844 *Boletus pruni cerasi Zetterstedt, 1844 Lepiota polymyces Frauenfeld, 1864 Polyporus de Meijere, 1901 'fairy rings' Sznall, 1881 Corticium Lundbeck

Agaricus campestris Dufour, 1840

Bonnamour (1926), working in France, reared Platypeza picta Mg. from Polystictus (Polyporus) versicolor, a single specimen. Willard (1914) described Platypeza agarici and polypori from Stanford University, California to judge from the title of his paper, for there are no localities in the text). large numbers of Platypeza agarici were reared from a cluster of Agaricus californicus. The larva, which is figured, fed on the soft tissues at the base of the gills, and pupated on the surface of the fungus, or in the soil in the breeding jar. P. polypori was reared from Polyporus. Kessel & Kessel (1939) worked at the University of California and presumably collected their material in that neighbourhood. They reared P. agarici from a species of Marasmius, and P. polypori from Polystictus versicolor.

Platypeza furcata Fall.—Reared on three occasions (11/3, numerous) from Polyporus squamosus. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

P. modesta Zett.-Reared (9/1, in small numbers) from the puff-ball Lycoperdon prisorme, collected in August, adults emerging the following May; from Gerrards Cross. P. fasciata Mg.—Reared from Lycoperdon pyriforme (the same collection that produced P. modesta), small numbers emerging in May.

SYRPHIDAE

Early authors, starting with Réaumur, were aware that there are Syrphid larvae in truffles and other subterranean fungi. Goureau (1852) desgibed the caudate larva and the pupa which he states was 'smooth', the semale fly being 'analogue' with Cheilosia scutellata Macq., and the male with mutabilis Macq. Dufour (1840) had bred Syrphids, which he identified as Cheilosia scutellata, but his material was from Boletus, particularly B. idulis and pinetorum. Larvae collected in June produced pupae in July, and adults in August: but larvae collected in November did not pupate until the spring and produced adults in September. The larvae (figured) often occurred in numbers. Dufour (1853), directed Goureau's attention to the paper of 1840, and insisted that his insect from Boletus bovinus, with a downy pupa, was C. scutellata. As to the insects from truffles seen by Reaumur, and by Goreau, he suggested that they were no doubt 'similar to' scutellata. Laboulbène (1864) gave a balanced account of the matter and dearly held that there were two Syrphids, that from Boletus with a downy pupa, that from truffles smooth. Verrall (1901), under C. scutellata, said that there are two specimens in Bigot's collection labelled 'tubericola Laboulbene': the male was scutellata, the female soror: they represented the species mentioned by Laboulbène as bred from Boletus. Verrall gave no

Boletus here evidently signifying a Polyporaceous fungus.

he lar us

om

in

ead

ies he inl۲. ny

er er a to he ri-

an all ed b), ng or ly).

m es s, th ne gi ft

ly ba nay us

na nd

itz reite us es,

ti-

īs. bу

[April, other records of Cheilosia sp. from fungi. This confusion surely requires

S Ί

C

Þ (I N

1 SI

b

tl

ó۵

D

A aı

in

la

Α

C

cc

tr F

Si

P

ta

lo

al

Cl

D

sp

рc

be

m

kr

in

rin

PC fro

rin

PΥ

Au

To

tro

 Au_i

in .

Ple

sul free

the examination of specimens bred from truffles, and from Boletus.

There are no British records of Syrphids reared from fungi, though C. scutellata, referred to above, is one the British list; other species of the genus are known to feed in a variety of plant tissues (Coe, 1953).

Cheilosia longula Zett.—In 1954 I collected Boletus bovinus at Stoke Common, Bucks., on October 3rd and 10th, and both sexes of this species (det. R. L. Coe) emerged from the end of May until July, 1955. Several specimens also emerged from Boletus luridus collected on October 3rd at the same place.

OTITIDAE (ORTALIDAE)

Weiss & West (1920) record Pseudotephritis van Say from Lenzites betulina and Polyporus hirsutus, both in New Jersey. The genus Pseudotephritis is purely North American.

DRYOMYZIDAE Townsend (1893) states that larvae of Dryomyza occur in fungi. No

further information is available.

SAPROMYZIDAE Dufour recorded Sapromyza from fungi: in his second paper he corrected this and stated that the insect was Calyptrate, and referable to Anthomyza (Dufour, 1839-1840). This error is perhaps the origin of the statement by Townsend, 1893, that Sapromyza has been reared from various decaying material and from fungi.

DROSOPHILIDAE

There are a number of unsatisfactory records of species of Drosophila bred from unnamed fungi. To quote the earliest only, Haliday (1833) bred D. cameraria 'from Boleti' at Holywood in Downshire. Dufour (1840) records D. fasciata and maculata as fungivorous. Spencer (1942) makes the sound point that members of the D. quinaria group (which includes phalerata, transversa, and the American munda) feed regularly on fungi in the larval stage. Basden (1954a) has recorded information on the relation between species

of Drosophila and toadstools in Scotland. He records both those species

which had been bred from toadstools, and those which as adult flies visit

fresh or decomposing toadstools. He distinguishes between toadstools growing on the ground and those growing on trees, but does not publish identifications. Basden points out that three species of Drosophila (phalerata, transversa and cameraria) breed exclusively, or almost so, in healthy toadstools. The first two are closely related and belong to the quinaria group of species; cameraria is not closely related to them. His paper includes a photograph of the Agaric, Russula cyanoxantha with eggs of D. phalerata and cameraria embedded in the surface of the pileus or cap. Basden informs me by letter that he has reared these two and also transversa from that toadstool, near Edinburgh. He can distinguish the egg of cameraria which has four thin filaments from that of phalerata with two thin and one longer and thicker filament and he has shown me a preserved specimen in which this difference may be observed. Basden finds that D. transversa is the rarest of the three in the Edinburgh district and phalerata the commonest: the latter is also capable of breeding in a wider range of fungi than the others, but this doubtless requires fuller and more precise investigation.

Basden finds that, in Scotland, three other species of Drosophila, D. funebris, buschii and subobscura, are less specialised; they have been reared from toadstools among other things. D. subobscura has been reared on several occasions from fresh toadstols: the adult has been found only at two natural baits, tree sap and toadstools. The adult was the most frequent 1960.] 81

es species in an 'autumn flush' of Drosophila at Edinburgh in November, 1950. These flies were rare in the cold weather, but subobscura again became the

ζh commonest species in February and March. A few adult D. cameraria and he phalerata were caugh, in autumn and spring, and cameraria also in winter Basden, 1953). Wild D, subobscura females have undeveloped ovaries from November to February: some show fully developed eggs in March (Basden, m

1954b). Basden (1954a) has reared funebris and busckii from decaying toadus stools collected in a heap, but not from healthy ones; funebris has been bred from many other types of fermenting material as well. The adults of these three species may be caught at toadstools. es Basden records an adult Scaptomyza graminum (Fall.) taken on a 0-

bracket fungus near Edinburgh: the larva is a leaf miner (Basden, 1954a: ó48). Amiota alboguttata (Wahlberg) has been bred from the Pyrenomycete Daldinia concentrica collected from burnt birch at Studland Heath, Dorset, August, 1935, adults emerging in the following June and July. The puparia

Ю

rto

ıe

ıs

3) 0)

es

es

n

ès.

S

it

ls

are to be found in the fungus (Edwards, 1936; Wakeley, 1953, reared this insect from the same fungus, in Surrey, adults emerging in June). The larva of A. alboguttata perhaps feeds only on Daldinia. Riel (1920), in France, bred Drosophila phalerata from the following Agarics: Russula nigricans, R. adusta, R. virescens, R. cyanoxantha, Collybia dryophila, C. grammocephala, Tricholema inamoenum, Cortinarius collinitus, Amanita phalloides, A. pantherina and A. rubescens; also D. transversa from Russula depallens, R. cyanoxantha and Boletus bulbosus.

Falcoz (1924) working at Vienne in the Dauphiné records D. unistriata Strobl from Polyporus hispidus and P. intybaceus; D. obscura Fall. from P. hispidus; D. histrio Mg. from P. intybaceus; D. phalerata from Laclarius piperatus. Bonnamour (1926) records the following from French localities: Drosophila phalerata from Russula foetens and Tricholoma album; also D. rubrostriola Beek. from Russula integra, Paxillus involutus. Clitocybe gigantea and Boletus edulis. From what is in print, and my own records, one sees that no species of Drosophila is restricted to one or a few fungus food plants. The larvae of all species feed on many soft fungi. Agarics preponderate, but soft Polyporaceae, are used and in one instance a Discomycete. Amiota alboguttata

behaves quite differently, the larva feeding in the hard Daldinia (Pyrenoh Drosophila phalerata, transversa and cameraria comprise the species y known to specialise in breeding in healthy fungi. When Drosophila occurs P in a sample of fungus, large numbers are generally present. а a 1-Drosophila phalerata Mg.-Reared from AGARICACEAE, Pleurotus cornucopiae, Cop-

rinus micaceus, C. radians, Psathyrella pygmaea; BOLETACEAE, Boletus sp.; POLY-PORACEAE, Polyporus squamosus; once only from each species of fungus. Collected n afrom June to August, Gerrards Cross. ie D. transversa Fall.—Reared from AGARICACEAE, Coprinus micaceus (12/2), Copinus sp., Psathyrella disseminata; DISCOMYCETES, Peziza (Aleuria) repanda. (8/2); n is PYRENOMYCETES, Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris). Collected from May to August, Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge. 1-

D. cameraria Hal.—Reared once from Russula luteotacta collected in August at Tonbridge. D. funebris F.—Bred from AGARICACEAE, Lactarius piperatus and Clitocybe geo-lropa; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus giganteus, dryadeus and fissilis. Collected from August to November, Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.). D. repleta Woll.-Reared from Lactarius vellereus and Paxillus involutus, collected n

D. repleta Woll.—Realed from Latarias observes and Latarias involuties, conected in August at Tonbridge. Also bred from the Myxomycete, Fuligo septica (Buxton, 1954).

D. vibrissina Duda.—Bred from AGARICACEAE, Lactarius vellereus, L. piperatus, Pleurotus cornucopiae; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus squamosus (14/7), fissilis, and sulphureus. Collected from May to August, Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge. The most d at ìt frequently bred member of the genus (twelve times).

D. subobscura Coll. and buschii Coq.—Both have been bred from fungi and other materials (Bassley 1051a).

Leucophenga maculata Duf.—Bred from Pleurotus cornucopiae, Polyporus squamosus and Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris) collected in June, July and August at Gerrards Cross.

SEPSIDAE

SEPSIDA

Nemopoda nitidula Fall.—Reared once from a plasmodium of an unidentified Myxomycete (Buxton, 1954). It is probably a general scavenger.

ASTEIDAE

Leiomyza laevigata Mg.—Reared twice from Pleurotus cornucopiae from Gerrards Cross.

BORBORIDAE

Prof. O. W. Richards informs me that one British Borborid, Leptocera parapusio, is reared from fungi and not commonly found in any other material: females are much more frequent than males. Adults of one or two species of Copromyza (Borborus) are found on toadstools: the species have not been reared.

Leptocera parapusio Dahl.—A number (det. O. W. Richards) emerged during October from Russula ochroleuca collected at Gerrards Cross in September.

HELOMYZIDAE

Breeding records are not numerous, but larvae of certain Helomyzids feed in subterranean fungi, of others on various fungi on the surface of the ground. As to the first, of which I have no experience, Dufour (1840) and Laboulbène (1864) deal with species occurring in France. Falcoz (1921) remarks that species of Suillia (=Helomyza) and Allophyla have been bred from subterranean Ascomycetes, Tuber and related forms: he was probably referring to early French authors. Helomyza variegata has been bred from a 'tree fungus', and H. humilis 'has been bred from truffles by Dr. Norman Joy': several other species have been reared from nests of certain mammals and birds (Collin, 1943). As to surface growing fungi, Kessel & Kessel (1939) reared Suillia limbata Thom. from Lepiota rhacodes and Tricholoma sp., both of them Agarics. Falcoz (1921) reared H. variegata in Vienne, Dauphiné, from Hypholoma fasciculare. Bonnamour (1926) records Helomyza fuscicornis Zett. from Clitocybe gigantea and Amanita citrina; also Helomyza notata from A. citrina, Tricholoma pessundatum and Clavaria formosa (a single specimen); all from localities in France. Helomyza variegata Lw.—Reared from an extremely wide selection of fungi:- DIS-

COMYCETES, Priza (Aleuria) repanda; TREMELLALES, Auricularia auricula-judae; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus giganteus, P. squamosus, BOLETACEAE, Boletus versipellis; AGARICACEAE, Pleurotus cornucopiae, Russula luteotacta, Amanita sp., Pluteus cervinus, Paxillus involutus, and the ozonium of Coprinus. Auricularia produces a very limited number of species of Diptera: this is even more true of the ozonium, a dry tough mat from which, however, I have on one occasion (16/1) reared several H. variegata. It is unlikely that the presence of several larvae was accidental, and it is supposed that the ozonium is an occasional food plant. In summer, adults emerge about a month after the fungi are collected. Larvae collected in late autumn pass the winter in that stage in the moist sawdust in a breeding jar, and become puparia in the spring. From Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

Helomyza notata Mg. var. hilaris Zett.—Reared in considerable numbers on a single occasion, from Entoloma rhodopolium, collected in November, flies appearing in March;

from Gerrards Cross.

H. bicolor Zett.—Reared from PYRENOMYCETES, Hypoxylon fragiforme (coccincum) (3/1, half-a-dozen), BOLETACEAE, Boletus versipellis; AGARICACEAE, Amanita muscaria, Armillaria mellea, Tricholoma atrocinereum, T. cuneifolium, T. nudum, Laccaria laccata, Mycena inclinata, M. galericulata, M. epipterygium, Entoloma rhodopolium, Hebeloma crustuliniforme, Psilocybe elongata; GASTEROMYCETES, Lycoperdon pyriforme (9/1, only a single fly). The last record might, perhaps, be attributed to a full fed larva which had pup, ted in the puff-ball (see, however, the record of several Tephrochlamys tarsalis reared from this fungus). The rest of the list is curious. Most of the fungi are large soft Agaries, but there are no records from Pleurotus spp. (22/0), or Polypores, even from the moist P. squamosus (11/0). The record of several specimens from Hypoxylon fragiforme (coccineum) is remarkable: the fungus is tough, corky and gen-

November, at Sevenoaks, Kent. . Allophyla atricornis Lw.-Reared from AGARICACEAE, Amanita phalloides, Mycena galericulata, Lactarius vietus; collected September to November, flies appearing in April and May; from Gerrards Cross. MUSCIDAE Keilin (1917) and Muirhead Thomson (1937), only refer incidentally to fungi as breeding material. I have gained a few records from these papers and from other sources referred to under the separate species. Muscids are relatively infrequent in fungi and I have reared only 14 species from 28 collections. When a predatory larva occurs it does not generally exterminate the other Dipterous larvae, so that one may breed a predator and a considerable variety of other flies: see records below under . Muscina assimilis, Mydaea urbana and Mydaea spinipes (the last presumed to have a predacious larva). Of the species which do not have carnivorous larvae Pegomyia winthemi breeds, solely perhaps, in various species of

Boletus. In general Muscids have emerged from soft fungi such as common

Agarics, Boletus and Polyporus squamosus. Fannia canicularis may be a

partial exception, for I have reared it from a rather harder plant Fistulina hepatica, and even from the woody Polyporus dryadeus. One or two authors

erally produces no Diptera. From fungi collected in summer or early autumn, flies

emerge after about a month. The insect winters as a larva, becoming a puparium in midwinter or early spring, the adult emerging from March to May. From Gerrards Cross,

H. fuscicornis Zett.-Reared from Clitocybe nebularis, collected in November, flies

Tephrochlamys tarsalis Zett .- Reared from CLAVARIACEAE, Clavaria inaequalis

(4/1), but not from a considerable number of collections of other species of this genus; POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus giganteus (4/1, in numbers); AGARICACEAE, Amanita muscaria; Armillaria mellea, Tricholoma nudum, T. atrocinereum, Coprinus micaceus; GASTEROMYCETES, Lycoperdon pyriforme (9/1 four specimens). As with H. variegata and bicolor the list is remarkable. Clavaria are not commonly food plants of Diptera; the

record from the puff ball, L. pyriforme should be accepted, based as it is on several

Hypoxylon fragiforme (coccineum), from the same collection that produced H. bicolor; collected at the end of April, the fly emerging in May; from Gerrards Cross.

Neoleria ruficeps Zett.—Two females emerged from Amanita muscaria; collected in

Tephrochlamys rusiventris Mg. var. canescens Mg.—One reared from the Pyrenomycete,

specimens. The larva overwinters in the soil. From Gerrards Cross.

83

have recorded breeding Muscids from fungi which were somewhat decomposed. That probably means that the larvae are not full-fed until the soft fungus is decomposed, as is natural enough: there is no evidence that the female fly chooses decomposing fungi for oviposition. Muscina stabulans Fall .- Keilin (1917: 420) states that the larvae may be either carnivorous or saprophagous. They feed on a variety of decomposing substances or on other larvae. Reared once, in numbers, from Pleurotus cornucopiae; from material collected in June at Gerrards Cross, adults emerging July. In spite of the presence of numerous larvae which are potentially predatory, this collection yielded adult Brachypeza radiata (one), numerous Drosophila phalerata, Metalinnobia bifasciata, Megaselia buxtoni and several Leptocera. M. assimilis Fall .- Keilin quotes authors who reared this fly (in France and Germany) from Boletus edulis and Agaricus campestris. He found larvae in decomposed remains of A. campestris, with larvae of other flies. He observed that the female M. assimilis would force her way into an incompletely closed box and oviposit in fermenting mushrooms. She would also place eggs on a closed breeding box in such a way that the emerging

larvae could make their way in through a small crack. Keilin also observed larvae of M. assimilis in a variety of decomposing animal and vegetable materials. The larva of this

insect was shown to be predatory, ripping open and devouring other maggots. Riel (1920)

reared it from Russula virescens (collected in August, adults emerging the same month),

also from R. depallens, Amanitopsis virginata and Polyporus (Melanopus) squamosus from France. Falcoz (1921) reared it from Hypholoma fasciculare, from Vienne, Dauphiné, France. The female has not put eggs on my breeding jars, perhaps because the type of fermentation in mine, with ample ventilation and much sawdust, is not attractive. I have only reared the fly once, from Boletus sp., from Gerrards Cross; several individuals emerged, also considerable numbers of Helomyza variegata, Drosophila phalerata, Pegomyia ulmaria and Fannia canicularis.

lyxorards

pril,

other

iosus

Ger-

1960.

Stoke Common and Chobham, Surrey.

appearing in April; from Gerrards Cross.

ptother e or

cies

tober zids the

921) bred ably rom man nals ssel

and

oma nne. ords ina ; and DISdae :

versp., luces dry ÌЙ. it is bout inter

ring. ingle irch;

ccinanita lum. odo-

rdon full veral st of), or

from gen-

[April,

Allocostylus diaphanus Wied .- A number of adults emerged in May, 1955, from Boletus luridus collected on Stoke Common, Bucks., 3rd October, 1954, also reared from Pholiota squarrosa, collected 1st November, 1954, in Gerrards Cross, adults emerging in mid-April.

Phaonia variegata Mg.—Dufour (1839) found a pupa in sand on which a mass of fungus had been lying for some months. Keilin (1917) found larvae in slightly decomposed Boletus edulis coming from the forest of Fontainbleu, France. The larvae of P. variegata were consuming those of Pegomyia winthemi; when the supply of prey was exhausted he reared his P. variegata on Pegomyia transversa Fall. from Armillaria mellea. Keilin also found that P. variegata might go through its larval life in rotten wood.

e a

to

c.

a

fa

f١

ſ١

p L

Λ

c

C Ί

I

b

I

S

f

Séguy (1923) states that the insect may be reared from decomposing vegetable matter: he has found larvae in May in rotten fungi with larvae of Pegomyia rufina. Bonnamour (1926) records rearing it from Tricholoma pessundatum. Muirhead Thomson (1937), during his work in Ayrshire, Scotland, observed this insect during three years. He observed

oviposition on the upper surface of a pileus of Polyporus growing beside a beech stump at the end of September. Oviposition was recorded once on a rotting Polyporus, on dead leaves on it, or on damp moss close to the fungus. He never saw the eggs on any other fungus, or elsewhere. The eggs were laid singly or in small groups, and the total per fly

was not great. After about 9 days (at 10°C.) the larva, which is already in the third instar,

emerged from the egg. It was carnivorous, feeding on the abundant larvae of Mycetophila

ornala in the fungus: it did not prey on Fannia larvae and did not find those of Trichocera

attractive. The larva of P. variegata was full-grown in less than two weeks, and wintered as a larva, pupating in January or February, the adults emerging at the end of March or April. Phaonia spp. have predatory larvae: he collected some information on larval biology of eleven species, of which four were certainly and others probably carnivorous. Reared from Pleurotus cornucopiae, and Clitocybe nebularis, from Gerrards Cross. P. goberti Mik.-Larvae found by Keilin under the bark of poplar logs near Paris were

Vienne, Dauphiné, France (Falcoz, 1921). Fannia ciliata Stein.-Recorded by Dufour from rotten Boletus edulis. Half a dozen F. ciliata emerged within a few weeks from a Boletus (subtomentosus?) collected in August, the material also produced Leptocera and Metalimnobia. From Tonbridge. F. canicularis L.—Breeds in a great variety of decomposing vegetable materials and

shown to be predatory on those of Heteroneura. Reared from Polyporus hispidus, near

may be reared from fungi. Falcoz (1921) reared it from Hypholoma fasciculare, in France. I have reared it from POLYPORACEAE, Polyporus dryadeus, P. adustus, Fistulina hepatica, BOLETACEAE, Boletus sp., AGARICACEAE Lactarius piperatus, once each; from Gerrards Cross and Tonbridge.

F. monilis Hal.—Reared from Pleurotus cornucopiae (14/1) and Polyporus squamosus (11/1); from Gerrards Cross.

Piezura pardalina Rond.—One emerged from Coprinus micaceus, Gerrards Cross. Mydaea tincta Zett.-Keilin was informed by Edwards that he had reared this insect

from larvae in a Russula where they were preying on larvae of Mycelobia. It was recorded by Riel (1920) in France from Russula nigricans. I have reared it from three Agarics, on one occasion from each, Pleurotus cornucopiae, Amanitopsis fulva and

Russula ochroleuca: from Gerrards Cross. M. urbana Mg.-Common and breeds frequently in cow dung. The larvae is copro-

phagous in the second instar, an active and obligate carnivore in the third (Muirhead Thomson, 1937). One reared from Polyporus squamosus, from Gerrards Cross, collected

in July. From the same collection I also reared Metalimnobia bifasciata, Ula sylvatica, Drosophila phalerata and D. vibrissina, Mycetophila sp., Fannia monilis and Megaselia M. spinipes Karl.-Reared once only, several specimens (in British Museum) from Polyporus squamosus, from Gerrards Cross; collected in May, flies emerging at the end

of June. The fungus contained hundreds of larvae of Mycetophila cingulum and lineola, also larvae of Drosophila, Ula, Helomyza and Platypeza furcata.

Hylemyia (Delia) albula Fall.—A score reared from the Agaric Psilocybe ammophila, growing among marram grass on a sand dune, Newborough Warren, Anglesey: collected July 15th, reared early August. H. (D.) antiqua Mg.—Recorded by Bonnamour (1926) as reared from a number of

single collection in each case; from Gerrards Cross and Whipsnade.

Agarics, in France. The 'Onion fly' is 'a well known pest of onions, leeks and shallots' (Miles 1953), but not known to breed in other plants. The identification should be accepted with hesitation until confirmed. H. (Pegohylemyia) cinerea Fall.-Reared from the Agarics Amanita sp. and Hygro-

phorus virgineus, from Gerrards Cross and from Sevenoaks, Kent. Pegomvia ulmaria Rond.-Reared twice, several flies each time, from Boletus sp. and Pholiota aegerita, from Gerrards Cross.

P. winthemi Mg.—The few available facts suggest that this insect feeds only on species of Boletus. Keilin refers to these larvae being devoured by those of Phaonia variegata in Boletus edulis. The fly was reared in France by Riel (1920) from two species of Boletus. I have reared P. winthemi from Boletus badius and versipellis, numbers of flies, from a

P. transversa Fall.-Larvae in Armillaria mellea at Fontainebleau, France (Keilin,

P. iniqua Stein .- Reared from Psalliota (Agaricus) angusta in France (Bonnamour, 1926). Mrs. M. Miles informs me that she has bred this insect 'from a seemingly healthy Agaricus which decomposed only after the larvae reached maturity', from Wye, Kent. The mushroom was collected in September, the flies emerging at the end of April and in early May. P. rufina Fall.—From Psalliota (Agaricus) flavescens collected in France in October.

a number of these flies emerged from January to May (Bonnamour, 1926).

Anthomyia pluvialis L.—Reared from Phallus impudicus in France (Bonnamour, 1926).

DISCUSSION

Dufour (1839) set down a number of biological generalizations relating to those Diptera the larvae of which are found in fungi. His general conclusions, which still hold good, are that one species of fungus may be attacked at one and the same time by larvae of Diptera belonging to several families: that one may find the larvae of a single species of fly in several fungi, even unrelated ones: that there is a seasonal effect, for a particular fungus may harbour a succession of larvae in different months. One might perhaps say that, since Dufour's time, our knowledge of these numerous Diptera has only advanced in regard to certain families, particularly the Mycetophilidae. It might indeed be claimed that this paper is the first to give a general view, based on a wide collection of fungi and on the identification of nearly all the Diptera bred from them, and also on a consideration not only of breeding records but also of negative evidence.

COMMENTARY BASED ON THE FUNGI

The material must be considered botanically and entomologically. A rather crude classification of the fungi, condensed from the Appendix, is given as Table 1. The table shows what proportion of particular families or orders of fungi have been found to contain Diptera: in the Polyporaceae and Agaricaceae it is close to 50 per cent., it is less in the Tremellales, and considerably less (20 or 25 per cent.) in the Thelephoraceae and Clavariaceae. The Appendix gives the same type of information in a more extended form. It is evident that there are certain species and genera of fungi which have been collected repeatedly and almost always found to be infested with Diptera: others have seldom or never been found infested, even if a considerable number of collections have been examined. Clearly then, we have here a problem for further consideration.

Fungi with many associated insects,

If we consider the distribution of families and genera of Diptera among the fungi, it would seem best to select first a few examples of single collections which yielded relatively rich insect faunas:

(1) From mature but not decomposed Polyporus giganteus collected September 14th, Gerrards Cross: - Mycetophila ornata and Drosophila funebris, (emerged by end of September, note rapidity), Ula sylvatica (October 20th onwards), Megaselia sp., Trichocera

hiemalis (December), Tephrochlamys tarsalis (March). (2) From mature not decomposed Hebeloma crustuliniforme, collected December 7th at

Chobham, Surrey:—Mycetophila fungorum, M. lineola, Allodia lugens, A. ornaticollis four species of Mycetophilidae from one collection. The fact that one may do so emphasizes that it is not wise to identify larvae by reference to reared adults, except in those cases (few at present) where one has good reason for believing that only one Mycetophilid feeds in a certain fungus.

(3) From several mature but not decomposed Pleurotus cornucopiae, collected August end, on an elm log, Gerrards Cross, there emerged in mid August and early September: Metalimnobia bifasciata, Ula sylvatica, Mydaea tincta, Culicoides scoticus, Leptocera sp., Megaselia giraudii; and in October, Phaonia variegata. In contrast, from immature ruiting bodies (under 1 inch) of the same fungus collected on August 2nd, nothing merged: from immature fruiting bodies, about 12 inches across, I reared Megaselia

grandii and Lencophenga maculata.

Records given above relate to single collections. One might proceed to nake a general list of the insects reared from some species of fungus,

bringing together material from several collections. But in the material under study there are few species of fungus collected frequently enough to permit this. We may, however, attempt to make such general lists for one member of the Polyporaceae, (Polyporus squamosus), and two of the Agaricaceae (Russula ochroleuca and Pleurotus cornucopiae), all of them supporting a rich and varied fauna of Diptera. The three lists are as follows:-

f

Þ

e

f

r

iı

a

C

ť

iı

a

b

o

c

o

v

a

a

e

ť.

c

b

t

17

1:

p

i

- (1) From seven collections of Polyporus squamosus from Gerrards Cross I reared:—
 Metalimnobia bifasciata, Ula sylvatica, Lestodiplosis (Coprodiplosis) sp. near polypori,
 Megaselia buxtoni, Leucophenga maculata, Drosophila vibrissima, D. phalerata, Helomyza
 variegata, Mydaca pagana, M. urbana, M. spinipes and Fannia monilis. One collection
 from Tonbridge, in the month of May, produced several of the above, also Bradysia? sp.,
 Scatopse fuscipes, and Platypeza furcata. Including the latter there are 15 species, of 9
 families.
- (2) From four collections of Russula ochroleuca (collected in Gerrards Cross in June, September, October and November), I reared:—Metalimnobia bifasciata, Ula sylvatica, Culicoides scoticus, Forcipomyia ciliata, Sciophila lutea, Cordyla nitidula, Mycetophila luteuosa, Megaselia pygmaeoides, M. lutea, M. scutellariformis, Limosina parapusio, Mydaea tincta. A total of twelve species, of six families.
- (3) From three collections of Pleurotus cornucopiae, gathered in June and July at Gerrards Cross, the following insects were reared:— Metalimnobia bifasciata, Ula sylvalica, Culicoides scoticus, Lestodiplosis (Coprodiplosis) sp., Brachypeza radiata, Medeterus apicalis, Megaselia giraudii, M. imberbis, M. buxtoni, Drosophila phalerata, Dibrissina, Leucophenga maculata, Limosina sp., Leiomyza laevigata, Mydaea tincta, Phaonia variegata, Fannia monilis, Muscina stabulans. A total of 18 species of 11 families.

What is striking about these three lists is surely their similarity. It is evident that many species of Diptera can be reared from soft Agarics and also the soft Polypore, though it is indeed true that there are species of flies and larger groups associated with one or very few species of fungi.

For the sake of comparison it is perhaps of interest to select three species of fungi which have yielded smaller insect faunas:

(1) From eight collections of the Discomycete Peziza (Aleuria) repanda made in summer and autumn at Gerrards Cross:—Allodia silvatica (several times), A. triangularis (once), Drosophila transversa, Megaselia flava, Helomyza variegata.

(2) From four collections of *Pleurotus ostreatus* (October to December, Gerrards Cross and Windsor, Berkshire), I reared:—Mycetophila ornata (large numbers), Trichocera hiemalis, Anisopus cinctus. The contrast between the three species reared from P. ostreatus in autumn, and the 18 reared from the closely related P. cornucopiae in June and July (see above) is interesting. It seems possible that P. ostreatus, which generally produces

its fruiting bodies rather late in the year, has for that reason a more limited fauna.
(3) From ten collections of Coprinus micaceus (in the broad sense), made at Gerrards Cross from April to September I obtained only:—Mycetophilid larvae in numbers, (nothing emerged), Megaselia giraudii, Drosophila transversa, D. phalerata, Helomyza bicolor, Tephrochlamys tarsalis. One collection of C. micaceus from Tonbridge added

Megaselia pygmaeoides.

Fungi which appear 'unattractive' to insects.

Fungi seldom or never producing Diptera we call 'unattractive'. The Appendix shows that a diversity of species of different families fall in this group. Records of species of which a considerable number of collections have been made are presented in Table 3, which relates only to material collected in or about Gerrards Cross. This table shows that when Diptera are present in these unattractive fungi, the insects belong to few families; species of fly, however, exhibit a wide choice of food. One observes, for instance, that a characteristic species of Mycetophila is ocellus; one notes also Helomyza sp. and Bradysia sp. But though the majority of the Diptera are polyphagous, two or three of the Mycetophilids shown in Table 3 are restricted, so far as we know, to one or two food plants, e.g. Trichonta vernalis, Phronia sinuata and Sciophila buxtoni.

Further study of Table 3 reveals several tentative conclusions, e.g.:

1960.] (1) Some of these unattractive fungi are hard and dry. For instance the

fruiting body of Polyporus betulinus, even when fresh, is tough and pithy. I have bred no Diptera from 6 collections, and have sliced up many others, but never found early stages of Diptera, though one or two insects are recorded from it by other entomologists. With it one may contrast Polyporus squamosus (above) from a few collections of which 15 species of Diptera appertaining to 9 families were reared. To the human being the essential difference between these two fungi appears to be in consistency: for betulinus is tough and resistant, but squamosus is soft and decomposes rapidly. This possible explanation receives some support from the

Appendix, which shows that in Polyporaceae in general the proportion infected is low, the majority of these plants, except P. squamosus, hispidus and one or two others, being hard and tough. Table 3 includes also a number of other hard, dry organisms, for instance the two Pyrenomycetes (Xylaria spp.), the three species of Stereum, the Agaric Schizophyllum commune, the 'ozonium' of Coprinus and the Gasteromycete Lycoperdon pyriforme. Among these S. commune is particularly interesting, for it is the only Agaric in my collections which is

tough and dry; consistently no Diptera are reared from it; there is further information from 1954 and 1955 confirming this. The possibility that the absence of flies from S. commune may be due in part to season is discussed below. One may conclude that hardness appears to be one of the qualities which reduces the number and variety of Diptera attacking certain kinds of fungus. But it is to be observed that many of the plants shown in Table 3, for instance Auricularia, Clavaria and the small Agarics, are soft and liable to rapid decomposition: in spite of that, they are unattractive. In classifying a fungus as 'hard and dry' some caution must be used, for most of the plants mentioned above (Stereum, Xylaria, etc.) die and dry up without evident decomposition, so that there is some risk of collecting them after they are dead: whereas this cannot occur with a soft plant such as P. squamosus because it decomposes rapidly. It is important to guard against an error arising from this difference.

restricted and in which Diptera tend to be rare. The first six Agaric species shown in Table 3, i.e. down to and including Psathyrella pygmaea, are examples; there are others in the Appendix, for instance Mycena spp. All these are small, the cap less than ½ inch in diameter in average specimens and sometimes much less, and all of them come up singly (with the exception of P. pygmaea which grows in dense clumps). It might, therefore, be very difficult for a fly larva, after consuming one of these little toadstools to find another. The proportion infested with Diptera in the collections shown in the table is 9 out of 28, i.e. one third, with which one would compare approximately 50 per cent. (Table 1) for Agarics in general. Moreover the Dipterous fauna is limited, few species being recorded: with this, compare the lists of Diptera from the larger Agarics Hebeloma crustuliniforme, Pleurotus cornucopiae, Russula ochroleuca and even Coprinus

(2) There is a group of small Agarics of which the insect fauna is

micaceus (above). One cannot attribute the fauna of these small Agarics to insufficient material. They generally come up in abundance and most of my collections have consisted of 50-200 fruiting bodies, so that the total amount of material is comparable to what one might collect from some larger Agaric. (3) Table 3 also suggests that the season of the year may have an important effect in determining whether Diptera will be found in a particular species of fungus. For instance, one collection of Polyporus adustus made in May contained Diptera of 4 species, whereas 7 collections made in November or December either contained nothing or (in two cases) single

species. Also the collection of Lycoperdon pyriforme made in August yielded

are nta g.:

rial

ı to

one the

iem as

l:--

bori.

nysa

tion

of g

une,

tica,

hila

ssio,

v at

Med-

, D.

icta, lies.

t is

and of

cies

in

laris

ross cera

atus

July

uces

ards

ers,

yza Ided

The

this

ons

rial

era

es; for

tes

era

[April,

4 species of Diptera, but seven collections made from September to November (and several dozens sliced up at the same period) showed no sign of Dipterous larvae). The absence of Diptera from the dry Agaric Schizophyllum commune may be due in part to its texture, but in part to the fact that it is found in winter.

There are singularly few records of Diptera from edible mushrooms, i.e. wild and cultivated members of the genus Psaliota (Agaricus). As to cultivated mushrooms, best referred to as Psaliota hortensis, the paper by Brauns (1950) is of considerable value; see also Thomas (1942), Austin (1933), Austin and Jary (1934). Both in the Old World and the New, cultivated mushrooms are attacked by Sciarines, Phorids and Cecidomyids, to which Austin adds Drosophila funebris. The absence of Mycetophilids (except the Sciarines) is remarkable, having regard to their abundance in Agarics. There are extremely few records of Diptera from wild species of Psaliota: if entomologists have studied them, they have not recorded the negative evidence.

COMMENTARY BASED ON THE INSECTS

If we now view our material as entomologists, we can consider first the distribution of Diptera among fungi, and the degree of specialization shown in choice of food plant, and then a number of other biological observations.

Association of species of Diptera with fungi.

It is evident from the records of breeding given above that the association of fly with fungus may be very general or specific to various degrees. Tentatively it is suggested that one might distinguish four categories, representing an increasingly close nexus between insect and plant. The categories might be defined as follows:-

(1) Species reared from fungi: larvae probably eating fungi, but feeding also on decomposing vegetable material of other sorts.

Examples: - Trichocera hiemalis and spp., Forcipomyia ciliata, Scatopse fuscipes, Scenopinus fenestralis, Megaselia giraudii, M. rusipes, Drosophila funebris, Muscina stabulans and Fannia canicularis.

It may be remarked that in decomposing vegetable material of any type, it is possible that the fly larvae confine themselves to eating mycelium, or moulds, or fungus material of some sort.

(2) Insects reared from fungi only, but from a wide range of families.

A number of examples are given in Table 4. It will be noted that nearly all these insects occur in Agaricaceae and many of them also in Polyporaceae: beyond that, the choice of families of fungi is curiously different for different insects. Further work may show that many of the insects shown in this table breed in a still wider range of fungi.

(3) Insects which are reared only from fungi and which appear to be limited to a particular family.

For example: -Polyporaceae, Ditomyia fasciata (hard Polypores only), Dynatosoma fuscicorne; Agaricaceae, Allodia ornaticollis; Boletaceae, Pegomyia winthemi.

(4) Insects which have been reared only from fungi and are perhaps confined to one

species or to a few related species.

Pyrenomycetes, Daldinia concentrica, Amiota alhoguttata; Discomycetes, Peziza (Aleuria) repanda, Allodia silvatica; Tremellales, Calocera viscosa, Phronia sinuata; Polyporaceae, Trametes spp., Sciophila buxtoni; Polyporaceae, Poria versipora, Trichonta vitta; Polyporaceae, Polyporus squamosus, Mycetophila cingulum; Agaricaceae, Hypholoma fasciculare, Bolitophila saundersi (one record, Tricholoma); Agaricaceae, Hypholoma sublateritium, Bolitophila cinerea (one record, Hypholoma velutinum); Agaricaceae, Paxillus involutus, Bolitophila hybrida (also from Boletus); Agaricaceae, Russula spp., Cordyla nitidula.

Other biological notes.

I seldom disturbed the material in my breeding jars, so that little information has been gathered as to which larva may be predacious or vegetarian: or whether a vegetarian larva attacks undamaged tissues or those in which some other insect has already made tunnels; or whether it eats the gills, or the solid tissues of the cap or of the stem. The following points of general interest have, however, presented themselves. Other season. For instance, among the Agarics, St. George's mushroom (Tricholoma gambosum) is traditionally associated with the saint's day, April 23rd, and a few other Agarics appear in the spring or early summer: they are, however, irregular in appearance and seldom common. During the same season, there are few fresh fruiting bodies of Polyporaceae, except that Polyporus squamosus is abundant. The Pyrenomycete Hypoxylon deustum (Ustulina vulgaris) is common, and is a food plant of a number of flies. Stereum* and many other fungi are not available at all. The number of fruiting bodies and the variety of species is quite inadequate for the numerous Diptera on the wing in spring and early summer. Flies emerging in

biological notes will be found in the text, particularly in the systematic list

Many Diptera of a number of families emerge from the pupa in April

or May, though few of the fungi are producing fruiting bodies at that

Stereum* and many other fungi are not available at all. The number of fruiting bodies and the variety of species is quite inadequate for the numerous Diptera on the wing in spring and early summer. Flies emerging in April and May probably live for a long period, in a state of sexual immaturity, until they can avail themselves of the abundance and variety of fungi appearing in late summer and early autumn. If this is the case, the annual cycle must depend on an elaborate type of adult diapause, and the number of generations of the insect may be very low, even one only. Assuming this to be correct, there is a remarkable contrast between the longevity of the adult fly and the extremely rapid development of the early stages in the short lived fruiting body.

*Dead fruiting bodies of Stereum, Xylaria and woody Polypores are persistent and may be found. They produce no Diptera in my experience.

(2) Possible importance of mycelium.

Though it appears likely that the adult flies, or at least the females which emerge in the spring, must live some months until fungi are available for egg-laying, there is another possibility to be considered. As we have seen above, the mycelium is generally more bulky and longer

have seen above, the mycelium is generally more bulky and longer lived than the fruiting bodies or sporophore. It is possible that larvae of flies which have reared from sporophores are capable of feeding also on the mycelium, either in the soil or in rotten wood. This is true of cultivated mushrooms, Psaliota hortensis, for it is recorded that a Cecidomyid, Mycophila speyeri, feeds on the mycelium in the mushroom bed (Anderson, 1936). Moreover, Thomas, (1942) writing of mushroom culture in North America, states definitely that the mycelium is attacked not only by that Cecidomyid, but also by larvae of Phorids (Megaselia) and Sciarines. Thus there is reason for thinking that in nature the mycelia of a variety of fungi may be more important as food material than we have supposed. It will not be easy to confirm this, but one might endeavour to rear insects from the soil immediately under a clump of Agarics,, for comparison with other samples from spots a few feet away. One could also investigate the soil immediately in and around 'fairy rings' which must no doubt be full of the perennial mycelium of Marasmius oreades or of one of the other fungi with a similar habit. I have already given some little attention to the 'ozonium' of Coprinus. This is a mass of sterile tissue growing on the surface of dead wood: it cannot, however, be said that my efforts have been rewarded, for out of 17 samples of this 'ozonium' two only produced Diptera (Table 3). Another type of sterile perennial fungal tissue which could be obtained in fair quantity, is the rhizomorphs of Armillaria mellea.

(3) Enemies of larvae.

Little is known of the enemies of Dipterous larvae in fungi. In any suburban garden toadstools may often be seen torn and broken into pieces. I expect that this is done by thrushes and blackbirds (Turdus) searching for Dipterous larvae. The growths of Stereum are also often destroyed,

first tion gical

soci-

rees.

ries,

aprii,

rem-

n of

iizo-

fact

oms,

s to

r by

ıstin

lew,

vids,

ilids

e in

s of

the

of insects reared.

(1) Seasonal cycles.

The on

cipes, scina ssible terial

the may gi. to a soma

these

eziza lata ; lonta loma loma ceae,

spp.,

ittle or or

er it ving ther and from the tooth marks I think that this is probably done by grey squirrels (the introduced Sciurus carolinensis). They are eating the fungus, not searching for larvae: whatever may be the explanation, large quantities of Stereum disappear early in the winter.

(4) Parasitic insects.

The study of the insects which parasitize the Dipterous larvae in fungi will be greatly facilitated when methods have been brought into use for isolating single larvae or cocoons. It has been shown by Séguy (1940) that certain Proceetrupids and Braconids are parasitic on particular genera of Mycetophilids, and a useful list was given by Madwar (1937:93) of organisms found as parasites in Mycetophilid larvae. He records four Proctotrupids, one Braconid and ten Ichneumonids: also Nematodes and Protozoa. Madwar himself, and others quoted by him, have bred the Ichneumonid Proclitus edwardsi Roman from the larva of the Mycetophilid Brachypeza radiata Jenk. The parasite may be common, and as suggested by Edwards a high degree of parasitism might account for the scarcity of adults of the fly though the larvae are abundant. An unusual observation was recorded by Thompson (1938), who examined larvae, probably of the genus Sciara, collected near Paris. In one of these he found a first instar larva the structure of which suggests that it may be that of an unknown Acalyptrate. As Thompson remarks, if this parasitic fly normally develops in Sciara, the adult must be very small. No corresponding insect has emerged from my numerous collections containing numbers of Sciara. As Thompson points out, it is rare for a larva of a Dipteron to be parasitized by another Dipteron.

(5) Fungivorous Nematodes.

In breeding jars, in which fungi are decomposing, one may frequently observe creamy streaks in the water of condensation on the inside of the jar. These consist of great numbers of immature Nematodes, of several genera. Among them the late Tom Goodey rediscovered *Iotonchium* (Tylenchus) fungorum, which was described by Bütschli in 1873 and had not been seen since: it is an organism of great interest to specialists (Goodey, 1953).

SUMMARY

(1) The basis of the paper is the Diptera of all families bred from 447 collections of 154 species of fungi in the period 1950—1953 (Table 1 and Appendix). A 'collection' means one or more fungi of a single species collected at one time and place. Almost all the material was from south-east England. The paper also includes published records of Diptera reared from fungi from Britain, continental Europe and America.

(2) The Diptera reared belong to 98 species of 16 families (Table 2). In addition, five flies are referred to in the text, reared from fungi collected in 1954, and 10 further species may be added which have been reared from fungi in Britain as has been known from published records. This, however, in no way makes a complete record of British Diptera

known to have been reared from fungi.

(3) As to the fungi, I have sought material widely among the larger forms and reared Diptera, or attempted to do so, from many species of fungi which are common enough, but have never before been examined by entomologists. Partly for that reason the paper contains records of quite a number of flies which have been reared once or more from particular species of fungi, no previous records of the food plant being available. Lists are given showing the considerable number of species of Diptera which may be reared even from one collection of a favourable type of fungus. If one brings together the information derived from a number of collections, one may make a total list of between ten to nearly twenty species of Diptera of as many as eleven families reared from a single fungus species (page 86). All the fungi which support large Dipterous faunas are soft and decompose rather rapidly. Some are Agarics but certain soft Polypores (e.g. Polyporus squamosus) produce a great variety of insects.

(4) A number of species of fungi of different families support few Diptera or even none,

even though a considerable number of collections of the fungus have been made. When Diptera occur in these plants they tend to be of species exhibiting a wide choice of food plant and to belong to few families. It seems that a fungus may be relatively 'unattractive' for one of several reasons. Fungi which are hard, dry and tough form one group; it is significant that species of unattractive fungi belonging to several families

share this characteristic. Another group consists of small Agaries which though soft and fleshy are seldom infested with larvae of flies, perhaps because they are so small and provide insufficient food. There is also a suggestion that sporophores which become mature very late in autumn or in winter may contain no Diptera or almost none: in a few instances I have shown that within one species of fungus the winter sporophores may be without Diptera whereas those found in summer may support several species (page 63, Table 3).

ls

ot of

r

2)

a

ρf

ır

d

1-

d

d

ρf

n ie

ir n

95

ts

s

d

ly

ıe

al m

d

ts

of

he of

ve

es

m

ra

nd on

he

re e.

be

er of

ed

us

es

e, en od

n-

ne

which has been devoted to the subject.

(5) The degree of association between the fly and fungus may be very general or specific to different degrees (pages 85-86). Some of the Diptera may also be reared from decomposing vegetable material of other sorts. Other Diptera appear to be associated invariably with fungi, but of a wide range of families (Table 4). Others again have been reared repeatedly from fungi within one family only, or are even more specific and

associated with a single species of fungus, or two or three related species.

(6) Adults of many of these Diptera are known to emerge in the spring, a season at which fungi of almost all families are exceedingly scarce or non-existent. It may be that some of these adults live some months until sporophores become available in the late summer and autumn, but others possibly feed upon the appropriate mycelium either in the soil or in rotten wood. The mycelium, except that of cultivated mushrooms, is a food material which has not yet been studied. It is suggested that there are several types of unexplored types of food material and it is certain that there are a large number of Diptera (particularly among the Mycetophilidae) which must be assumed to be fungus eaters, but which have never been reared in spite of the considerable amount of work

APPENDIX

List of fungi examined.

This appendix gives a list of all fungi examined, to the end of 1953, arranged systematically. The first number gives the number of collections examined; the second number, the collections in which Dipterous larvae were observed. In many cases larvae were seen, but no adults bred, so that the list does not agree in all respects with the text of the paper, which is based on adult Diptera bred and identified. All were from South-East England, the great majority from Gerrards Cross, Bucks.

MYXOMYCETALES

(See Buxton, 1954.)

ASCOMYCETES

Pyrenomycetes

Nectria cinnabarina (Tode ex Fr.) Fr., 3, 0; Daldinia concentrica (Bolt. ex Fr.) Ces. and de Not., 2, 0; Hypoxylon fragiforme (Pers. ex Fr.) Kickx., (= H. coccineum Bull.), 3, 1; H. deustum (Hoffm. ex Fr.) Grev., (= Ustulina vulgaris Tul.), 3, 2; Xylaria hypoxylon (L. ex Fr.) Grev., 8, 2; X. polymorpha (Pers. ex Fr.) Grev., 9, 2.

Discomycetes

Coryne sarcoides (Jacq. ex Fr.) Tul., 3, 0; Orbilia leucostigma Fr., 2,0; Peziza (Aleuria) micropus Pers. ex Fr., 1,1; Peziza (Aleuria) repanda Pers. ex Fr., 8, 7; Bulgaria inquinans [Pers.] Fr., 2, 1; Aleuria aurantia (Pers. ex Fr.) Fuckel, 1, 0.

BASIDIOMYCETES

TREMELLALES

Auricularia auricula-judae (Fr.) Schröet, 11, 6; A. mesenterica Fr., 10, 2; Calocera cornea (Fr.) Loudon, 5, 4; C. viscosa (Pers. ex Fr.) Fr., 6, 1; Dacrymyces deliquescens (Bull. ex Mérat) Duby, 3, 0.

APHYLLOPHORALES

Thelephoraceae

Stereum hirsutum (Willd. ex Fr.) Fr., 7, 1; S. purpureum (Fr.) Fr., 7,3; S. gausapatum Fr., 7, 0; Corticium laeve (Pers.) Quél., 7, 1; C. ? sp., 1, 1; C. (Glococystidium) lactescens Berk., 1, 1; Peniophora setigera (Fr.) Bres., 1, 0; P. gigantea (Fr.) Massee, 1, 0; P. quercina (Pers. ex Fr.) Cooke, 1, 0; Phlebia radiata Fr., 1, 1; Coniophora puteana (Schum. ex Fr.) Karst., 2, 1.

Clavariaceae

Clavaria corniculata Schaess. Fr., 1, 0; C. stricta Pers. ex Fr., 1, 0; C. vermicularis Fr., 1, 1; C. sumosa Pers. ex Fr., 1, 0; C. inaequalis Müller ex Fr., 4, 1; C. argillacea Pers. ex Fr., 1, 0; C. rugosa Bull. ex Fr., 1, 0.

19

D Y A S. D al Ja

H M

ec

19 Τĺ

sp

op S fo

ar 19 en as R R 19 **C** (L

È P

M

m ha (P

D L re

L

la

m Aı M Se

vi

Αı

19

67

N

 F_{i} Vi

th

(Ď

ob

les E_{I} 23

 M_{i}

9:

111

ľ

Polyporaceae

Polyporus squamosus [Iluds.] Fr., 11, 10; P. giganteus [Pers.] Fr., 4, 3; P. frondosus [Dicks.] Fr., 2, 0; P. sulphureus [Bull.] Fr., 2, 1; P. betulinus [Bull.] Fr., 7, 0; P. hispidus [Bull.] Fr., 2, 1; P. dryadeus [Pers.] Fr., 5, 2; P. adustus [Willd.] Fr., 8, 3; P. fissilis Berk. & Curt., 2, 2; P. picipes Fr., 3, 1; P. fumosus [Pers.] Fr., 1, 1; P. ? sp., 1, 0; Fomes annosus (Fr.) Cooke, 4, 1; F. ulmarius ([Sow.]Fr.) Sacc., 9, 4; F. pomaceus (Pers.) B. and G., 3, 0; Polystictus versicolor ([L.]Fr.) Sacc., 16, 6; Trametes confragosa ([Bolt.]Fr.) Jörstad (= rubescens Fr.), 6, 2; T. gibbosa ([Pers.]Fr.) Fr., 5, 4; Dacdalia quercina [L.] Fr., 6, 2; D. biennis [Bull.] Fr., 2, 2; Lenzites betulina ([L.] Fr., 1, 0; Poria versipora (Pers.) Baxter (= mucida ([Pers.] Fr.) Bres.), 2. 2: P. ? so., 1, 0: Fistulina hebatica (Huds.) Fr., 8, 3; Merulius corium Fr., 1, 0. 2, 2; P. ? sp., 1, 0; Fistulina hepatica (Huds.) Fr., 5, 3; Merulius corium Fr., 1, 0.

AGARICALES

Boletaceae

Boletus Iuridus Schaeff. ex Fr., 2,0; B. subtomentosus Fr. (= Xerocomus subtomentosus (Fr.) Quél.), 2, 1; B. badius Fr., 1, 1; B. versipellis Fr. (= Leccinium versipelle (Fr.) Snell), 3, 3; B. ? sp., 4, 1.

Agaricaceae

Amanita phalloides (Vail. ex Fr.) Secr., 1, 1; A. muscaria (Linn. ex Fr.) Hooker, 3, 3; A. rubescens (Pers. ex Fr.) S. F. Gray, 1, 0; A. 7 sp., 1,1; Amanitopsis fulva (Secr.) W. G. Smith, 1, 1; Lepiota cristata (A. & S. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; Armillaria mellea (Vahl. ex Fr.) Kummer, 3, 2; Tricholoma rutilans (Schaeff. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; T. atrocinercum (Pers. ex Fr.) Quél. sensu Bresadola, 2, 2; T. gambosum (Fr.) Kummer, 2, 2; T. nudum (Fr.) Kummer, 2, 2; T. nudum (Fr.) Kummer, 2, 2; T. personatum (Fr.) Kummer, 1, 0; Clitocybe nebularis (Batsch ex Fr.) Kummer, 1,1; C. aurantiaca ([Wulf.] Fr.) Studer = Hygrophorupsis aurantiaca ([Wulf.] Fr.) Maire, 1,0; C. geotropa (Bull. ex Mérat) Quél., 3, 3; C. cyathformis (Bull. ex Fr.) Kummer = Cantharellula cyathiformis (Bull. ex Fr.) Singer, 1,1; C. nibecina (Fr.) Ouél., 2, 1: Laccaria laccata (Scop. ex Fr.) Cke., 1, 1: Collybia radicata C. vibecina (Fr.) Quél., 2, 1; Laccaria laccata (Scop. ex Fr.) Cke., 1, 1; Collybia radicata (Rehl ex Fr.) Quél., 2, 1; C. maculata (A. & S. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; C. velutipes (Curt. ex Fr.) Kummer = Flammulina velutipes (Curt. ex Fr.) Karst., 6, 1; Marasmius oreades (Bolt. ex Fr.) Fr., 8, 5; Mycena avenacea (Fr.) Quél., 2, 1; M. filopes (Bull. ex Fr.) Kummer non Kühner, 1, 0; M. flavo-alba (Fr.) Quél., 5, 1; M. olida Bres., 2, 0; M. galericulata (Scop. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; M. inclinata (Fr.) Quél., 1, 1; M. ? sp., 3, 2; Omphalia fibula var Swartzii (Fr.) Karst = Hemimycena Setipes (Fr.) Singer, 4, 1; Pleurotus corticatus (Fr.) Kummer = P. dryinus (Pers. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; P. cornucopiae (Paulet ex Persoon) Gillet = sapidus Schulz., 14, 9; P. ostreatus (Jacq. ex Fr.) Kummer, 4, 4; P. lignatilis (Fr.) Kummer, 1, 0; P. nidulans (Pers.) Fr., 1, 0; P. serotinus (Schrad. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; Panus stipticus (Bull. ex Fr.) Fr., 1, 0; Schizophyllum commune Fr., 3, 0; Hygrophorus niveus [Scop.] Fr., 1, 0; H. virgineus Wulf. ex Fr., 4, 2; H. coccineus Schaeff. ex Fr., 1, 1; H. puniccus Fr., 1, 0; Lactarius vellereus (Fr., Fr., 1, 1; L. piperatus (Scop. ex Fr.) Fr., 1, 1; L. ? sp., 1, 0; Russula nigricans Fr., 1, 1; R. ochroleuca (Fr.) Fr., 6, 4; R. luteotacta Rea, 1, 1; R. vinosa Lindb., 1, 1; R. ? sp., 1, 1; Volvaria (Volvariella) speciosa (Fr.) Kummer, 1, 0; Pluteus cervinus (Schaeff. ex Secr.) Kummer, 1, 1; P. umbrosus (Pers. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; Entoloma rhodopolium (Fr.) Kummer, 2, 1; Pholiota squarrosa (Müll. ex Fr.) Kummer, 1, 1; P. aegerita (Brig.) Quél. = Agrocybe cylindracea (DC ex Fr.) R. Maire, 1, 1; P. mutabilis (Schaeff. ex Fr.) Kummer = Kuehneromyces mutabilis (Schaeff. ex Fr.) Singer & Smith, 1, 0; P. marginata (Batschr ex Secr.) Quel. = Galerina marginata (Batsch ex Secr.) Kühner, 1, 0; Inocybe lacera (Fr.) Kummer, 1, 0; Hebeloma crustuliniforme (Fr.) Quél., 1, 1; Naucoria semiorbicularis (Bull. ex Mérat) Quél., 1, 0; Tubaria furfuracea (Pers. ex Fr.) Gillet, 1, 0; Galerina graminea (Vel.) Kühner, 3, 0; G. clavata (Vel.). Kühner, 4, 2; Bolbitius titubans (Bull.) Fr. = B. vitellinus (Pers. ex Fr.) Fr., 1, 1; Paxillus involutus (Batsch ex Fr.) Fr., 1, 1; Psaliota? sp., 1, 0; Hypholoma sublateritum (Fr.) Quél., 1, 1; H. fasciculare (Huds. ex Fr.) Kummer, 5, 4; Anellaria separata (Linn.) Karst = semiorala Sow, ex Fr., 1, 0; Panaeolus fimicola (Fr.) Quél. var. ater Lange, 1, 0; P. papilionaceus (Bull. ex Fr.) Quél., 1, 0; Psathyrella subatomata (Lange) Moser, 1, 0; P. disseminata (Pers. ex Fr.) Quél., 7, 3; P. pygmaea (Bull. ex Fr.) Singer sensu Quélet non Favre = consimilis Bres. & P. Henn, 7, 3; P. ? sp., 1, 1; Coprinus comatus (Fr.) S. F. Gray, 1, 0; C. micaceus (Bull. ex Fr.) Fr., 12, 9; C. radians (Desm.) Fr., 2, 1; C. 'ozonium' stage, 16, 2; C.

GASTEROMYCETES

Phallus impudicus Pers., 1, 0; Lycoperdon pyriforme Pers., 9, 1 (and several dozen sliced up; negative); Scleroderma cepa Pers., 1, 1; S. verrucosum Pers., 1, o.

FUNGI IMPERFECTI

Oidium sp., 1, 0; Monilia fructigena Pers. ex Westend., 1, 0; Trichothecium roseum Link ex Fr., 1, 0;

P.

3; P. F. 6; r.)

tes

s.),

en-

lle

3; W. hl. in-

Т.

ris Sis

hi-

I; ta rt. les r.) M.

2; u-) u n . .) , R E m (.) .)

Alexander, C. P., 1915, The biology of the North American crane flies (Tipulidae, Diptera). III. The genus Ula Haliday, J. Ent. Zoo. 7:1-9; 1920, The crane flies of New York. Part III. Biology and phylogeny, Mem. Cornell agric. Exp. Sta. no. 38:699-1133.

Anderson, J. A. T., 1936, Gall-midges (Cecidomyidae) whose larvae attack fungi, J. S.-E. agric. Coll. Wye, 38:95-107. Audcent, H. L. F., 1949, Bristol insect fauna: Diptera., Proc. Bristol Nat. Soc. 27:409-470. Austin, M. D., 1933, The insect and allied fauna of cultivated mushrooms, Ent. mon. Mag. 69:16-19. Austin, M. D. &

Jary, S. G., 1934, Investigations on the insect and allied pests of cultivated mushrooms: II & III, J. S.-E. agric. Coll. Wye, 34:70-86.

Barendrecht, G., 1938, The Dutch Fungivoridae in the collection of the Zoological Museum at Amsterdam, Tijdschr. Ent. 81:35-54. Barnes, H. F., 1946, Gall midges of economic importance, 1, Gall midges of root and vegetable crops, London. Basden, E. B., 1966. 1953, The autumn flush of Drosophila (Diptera), Nature, Lond. 172:1155-1156; 1954a, The distribution and biology of Drosophilidae (Diptera) in Scotland, including a new species of 'Drosophila'. Trans. roy. Soc. Edinb. 62:603-654; 1954b, Diapause in Drosophila (Diptera: Drosophilidae) Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (A), 29:114-18. Bonnamour, S., 1926, Les insectes parasites des champignons. II Elevages et nouvelle liste de Diptères fongicoles, Ann. Soc. linn. Lyon. 72:85-93. Brauns, A., 1950, Zur Kenntnis der Schädinsekten an Champignon-kulturen, Nachr Bl. dtsch. Pflsch Dienst, Berl. 2: 153-156. Buxton, P. A., 1954, British Diptera associated with fungi. 2. Diptera bred from Myxomycetes, Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (A), 29:163-171. Buxton, P. A. & Barnes, H. F., 1953, British Diptera associated with fungi. 1. Gall midges (Cecidomyidae) reared from the larger fungi, Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (B) 22:195-200.

Cheetham, C. A., 1920, A liverwort-eating larva, Naturalist. Lond. 1920: 190. Coe, R. L., 1941, Some breeding records of British Tipulidae (Dipt.), Ent. mon. Mag. 77:172; 1953, Diptera, Syrphidae, in R. ENT. SOC. LOND., Handb. ident. Brit. ins. 10, (1), London. Collin, J. E., 1941, The British species of the Dolichopodid genus Medeterus Fisch. (Dipt.), Ent. mon. Mag. 77:141-153; 1943, The British species of Helomyzidae (Diptera), Ent. mon. Mag. 79:234-251. Colyer, C. N., 1952, Notes on Triphleba minuta F. (Dipt., Phoridae and its immature stages, Ent. mon. Mag. 88:226-229;1954, A new species of Megaselia (Dipt., Phoridae) from Britain: notes on British fungicolous Phoridae, Ent. mon. Mag. 90:108-112. Cuthbertson, A., 1926, Studies on Clyde crane-flies. Larval habits of some local species, Ent. mon. Mag. 62:84-88. Czerny, L., 1930, Clythiidae (Platypezidae), in LINDNER, E., Flieg. Palaearkt. Reg. 4 (34): 1-29.

Degeer, C., 1776, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des insectes, 6:361, Stockholm. Downes, J. A. & Kettle, D. S., 1952, Descriptions of three species of Culicoides Latreille (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae) new to science, together with notes on, and a revised key to the British species of the pulicaris and obsoletus groups, Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (B) 21:61-78. Dufour, L., 1839, Mémoire sur les métamorphoses de plusieurs larves fongivores appartenant à des Diptères, Ann. Sci. nat. 12 (Zool.): 5-61; 1840, Seconde mémoire sur les métamorphoses de plusieurs larves fongivores appartenant à des Diptères, Ann. Sci. nat. 13 (Zool.):148-163; 1842, Histoire des métamorphoses du Sciophila striata, Mem. Soc. Sci. Lille, 1841:201-208; 1853, Mélanges entomologiques. (Suite) (1), Ann.

Soc. ent. Fr. (3) 1:383-388.

Edwards, F. W., 1925, British fungus-gnats (Diptera, Mycetophilidae). With a revised generic classification of the family, Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (1924):505-662; 1936. Amiota alboguttata Wahlb. in Dorset (Diptera, Drosophilidae), Entomologist, 69:218; 1941, Notes on British fungus-gnats (Dipt., Mycetophilidae), Ent. mon. Mag. 77:21-32,

67-82.

Falcoz, L., 1921, Notes sur divers Insectes fungicoles. Misc. ent. 25:57-62; 1922, Notes biologiques sur divers insectes des environs de Vienne en Dauphine, Bull. Soc. ent. Fr. 1922:223-228; 1924, Observations biologiques sur divers Insectes des environs de Vienne en Dauphine (3e note). Bull. Soc. ent. Fr. 1924:221-224. Foray Committee of the British Mycological Society, 1952, Guide to the literature for the identification of British fungi, London. Freeman, P., 1956, Two new species of Mycetophilidae (Diptera, Nematocera), Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond. (B), 25:26-28.

Goodey, T., 1953, On certain eelworms, including Bütschli's Tylenchus fungorum, obtained from toadstools, J. Helminth. 27:81-94. Goureau, C., 1852 [Observations sur

les insectes qui vivent au dépens de la truffe], Ann. Soc. ent. Fr. (2), 10 :lxxv-vi.

Haliday, A. H., 1833, Catalogue of Diptera occurring about Holywood in Downshire, Ent. Mag. 1:147-180. Hawker, L. E., 1954, British hypogeous fungi, Phil. Trans. (B), 237:429-546; 1955, Hypogeous fungi, Biol. Rev., 30:127-158.

Johannsen, O. A., 1909-1912, The fungus gnats of North America Parts I-IV, Bull.

Me agric. exp. Sta. nos. 172:209-276; 180:125-192; 196:249-328; 200:57-146.

Keilin, D., 1917, Recherches sur les Anthomyides à larves carnivores, Parasitology, 9:325-450. Kessel, E. L. & Kessel, B. B., 1939, Diptera associated with fungi, Wasmann Collector, 3:73-92.

Laboulbène, A., (1864). Observations sur les insectes tubérivores. Avec refutation de l' erreur qui, attribuent les Truffes à la piqure d'un Insecte, les a fait assimiler aux galles

[April,

végétales, Ann. Soc. ent. Fr. (4) 4:69-114. Landrock, K., 1926-27. Fungivoridae (My-

cetophilidae), in Lindner, E., Flieg. Palaearkt, Reg., 2(1) 8:1-105.

Madwar, S., 1934a. The biology and morphology of Bolitophila hybrida Meigen (Diptera Nematocera), Bull. Soc. ent. Egypte; 17:126-135; 1934b, The biology and morphology of the biology and morphology of the biology and morphology. phology of Pnyxia scabiei Hopkins (Diptera: Nematocera), Bull. Soc. ent. Egyptef 17: 136-149; 1935a, Biology and morphology of the immature stages of Mycetophila marginata Winnertz and Dynalosoma fuscicorne Mg., Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. (10), 15:108-117; 1935b. The biology and morphology of the immature stages of Macrocera anglica Edwards. Psyche, Camb., Mass., 42:25-34; 1937, Biology and morphology of the immature stages of Mycetophilidae (Diptera, Nematocera), Phil. Trans., (B), 227:1-110. Malloch, J. R. 1917, A preliminary classification of Diptera, exclusive of Pupipara, based upon larval and pupal characters, with keys to imagines in certain families. Part I, Bull. Ill. Lab. nat. Hist. 12:161:409. Mansbridge, G. H. & Buxton, H. W., 1933, On the biology of some Ceroplatinae and Macrocerinae (Diptera, Mycetophilidae) with an appendix on the chemical nature of the web fluid in larvae of Ceroplatinae. Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond. 81:75-92. Metz, C. W. & Moses, M. S., 1928, Observations on sex ratio determination in Sciara (Diptera). Proc. nat. Acad. Sci., Wash. 14:930-932. Metz, C. W. & Ullian, S. S., 1929, Genetic identification of the sex chromosomes in Sciara (Diptera). Proc. nat. Acad. Sci., Wash. 15:82-85. Miles, M., 1953, Studies of British Anthomyild Flies. V. The onion fly, Delia antiqua (Mg.), Bull. ent. Res. 44:583-588. Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries, 1954, Mushroom growing, 6th ed., Bulletin No. 34, London: H. M. Stationery Office. Muirhead Thomson, R. C., 1937, Observations on the biology and larvae of the Anthomyidae. Parasitology, 29:273-358.

Perris, E., 1839, Notice sur quelques Diptères nouveaux, Ann. Soc. ent. Fr. 8:47-57; 1849, Notes pour servir à l'histoire des métamorphoses de diverses espèces de diptères.

(Deuxième partie), Ann. Soc. ent. Fr. (2) 7:331-351.

Ramsbottom, J., 1923, A handbook of the larger British fungi. London. Riel, P., 1921, Les insectes parasites des champignons. I. Elevages et première liste de Diptères

Satchell, G. H., 1947a, The larvae of the British species of Psychoda (Diptera: Psychodidae), Parasitology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology, 38:51-69; 1947b, The ecology of the British species of Psychology of the British spec choda (Diptera: Psychodidae), Ann. appl. Biol. 34:611-621. Saunders, L. G., 1924, On the life history and the anatomy of the early stages of Forcipomyia (Diptera, Nemat., Ceratopogoninae), Parasitology, 16:164-213. Schmitz, H., 1948, Zur kenntnis der fungi-colen Buckelfliegen (Phoridae, Diptera), Natuurh. Maandbli 37:37-44. Séguy, E., 1923, Faune de France, 6 (Diptères Anthomyides), Paris; 1940, Faune de France, 36 (Diptères nématocères) (Fungivoridae, Lycoridae, Hesperinidae, Bibionidae, Scatopsidae, Phrynidae, Pachyneuridae, Blepharoceridae), Paris; 1951, Ordre des Diptères (Diptéras Linné, 1758) in GRASSE, P. P., Traité de Zoologie, 10 (1):449-744, Paris. Spencer, W. P., 1942, New species in the quinaria group of the subgenus Drosophila, Univ. Tex. Publ., no. 4213. 53-66.

Thomas, C. A., 1942, Mushroom insects: their biology and control. Bull. Pa agric. Exp. Sta., no. 419. Thompson, W. R., 1938, A Dipterous parasite of Mycetophilids, Parasitology, 30:176-180. Tollet, R., 1953, Elevage de Bolitophila hybrida Meigen. Bull. (Ann.) Soc. ent. Belg. 89:270. Townsend, C. H. T., 1893, A general summary of the known larval food-habits of the Acalyptrate Muscidae, Canad. Ent. 25:10-16.

Verrall, G. H., 1901, British flies, 8, (Platypezidae, Pipunculidae & Syrphidae of Great Britain), London; 1904, List of British Dolichopodidae, with tables and notes, Ent. mon. Mag. 40:164-173; 1912, Another hundred new British species of Diptera, Ent. mon. Mag. 48:20-27.

Wakefield, E. M. & Dennis, R. W. G., 1950, Common British fungi, London. Wakely, S., 1953, Amiota alboguttata (Wahlb.) (Dipt., Drosophilidae) in Surrey, Entomologist, 86:199. Weiss, H. B. & West, E., (1920). Fungous insects and their hosts, Proc. biol. Soc. Wash. 33:1-20. Willard, F., 1914, Two new species of Platypeza found at Stanford University, Psyche, Boston, 21:166-168.

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine.

July 6th, 1956.

Hallodapus montandoni (Reuter) (Hem.-Het. Miridae) in a new locality in Kent.-On June 20th, 1959, I took a single specimen of this rare bug in a chalk-pit between Eccles and Burham, Kent. This appears to be only the fifth British locality.

In 1923 two specimens were recorded, one from Swalecliffe, Kent (E. A. Butler, 1923, Ent. Mon. Mag. 59:130-31) and the other from Colesborne, Gloucs. (J. Edwards, 1923, Ent. Mon. Mag. 59:130). No more was heard of the species in Britain until several specimens were captured on August 11th, 1944, at Stroud Common, Gloucs. by the late T. Bainbrigge Fletcher. Since then B. J. Southgate, in correspondence with Dr. A. M. Massee, reports the occurrence of the species at Brean Sandhills on September 3rd, 1953.

I wish to thank Dr. A. M. Massee for confirming my identification of the specimen and also for tracing the earlier records .- K. C. Side, 107 London Road, Stone, Dartford,

Kent: February 24th, 1960.