Caddis-flies (Trichoptera) in the collection of the Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow

Abstract: The collection of caddis-flies (Trichoptera), belonging to the Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow is described. It includes about 1300 specimens representing 166 species collected and identified by J. Dziedziewicz, and about 220 specimens (unidentified up to the now) representing 72 caddis-fly species collected by other collectors (among other by A. Waga more than 120 years ago).

The collection comprises of all the species described by Dziedziewicz; the lectotypes of the following are designated: Potamophylax carpathicus (Dz.), Acrophylax vernalis Dz., Isogamus czarnohorensis (Dz.), Chaetopteryx polonica Dz. and Annitella chomiacensis (Dz.). I. czarnohorensis, which was given the rank of species is redescribed and illustrated.

New species (Hydropsyche bulgaromanorum Mal. and Triaenodes simulans Tjed.) for the Polish fauna were found.

A list of incorrect identifications by Dziedziewicz is presented.

INTRODUCTION

In 1976 my investigations into the caddis-flies of the Western Carpathians were hampered by the difficulty of identifying many species in the imago stage, caused partly by geographical variation. This resulted in the necessity to conduct comparative studies on the wide systematic range of species distributed along the Carpathian range or appearing in neighbouring mountain ranges in Central Europe. I found the collections of the Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow, to be of great help.

It appeared however that many of the specimens stored here were unidentified or identified incorrectly, and much of the labelling was obsolete nomenclature. Since most of the material came from the areas studied by myself.
in the Carpathians, it was necessary to verify * identify and order the collections. I finished this work by the beginning of 1978.

The total collections was comprised of about 1500 specimens, all in dried state, dating back just over a hundred years. The first entry in the inventory of the collection is from the year 1876 and gives specimens from the order Neuroptera (in former significance, as now the part of the Neuroptera has been divided into 6 different orders, one of which is Trichoptera); among them are caddis-flies acquired by M. Łomnicki, A. Wierzejski and T. Żebrawski, identified by J. Dziedzielewicz. These collectors augmented the collection of caddis-flies over the next 5 years. The identification carried out by the collectors, was probably verified by Dziedzielewicz. The entries in the inventory show, that, beginning from the year 1882, the collection grew mainly through material collected and identified by Dziedzielewicz. The entries become intermittent by 1893, however the last caddis-fly specimen was obtained by Dziedzielewicz with the exact date and place on 4. II. 1912.

In 1901, and probably in the following years as well, the collection of caddis-flies was increased with material collected by F. Schille which were identified by Dziedzielewicz.

Besides the specimens described in the inventory there are several which do not have reference in the inventory. Most of these come from the collections of Antoni Waga, bought by PAU after his death in the 1894. The group of caddis-flies which have been carefully prepared on strips of mica are the oldest. Although none of them has a date of capture, it is easy to establish on the basis of the place of capture that most of the specimens were collected during the middle of the last century, during which time Waga made many trips to Złoty Potok, in 1854 to Ojców, in June 1860 to Szczawnica (Taczanowski, 1964). It may be assumed from the style of writing on the labels that some of these specimens were identified by K. Jelski.

A few specimens which are also not entered into the inventory were collected by K. Jelski in the years 1882–1885, by S. Kamieniecki at an uncertain date which were given to PAU after the death of the collector by his wife in 1913, and by J. Fudakowski between the 1920’s and 1950’s.

The greater part of caddis-flies in the old collection were collected from the Eastern Carpathians in the high Prut region (Czarnohora, Gorgany), from the Carpathian foot-hills in the district of Kolomyja and Stryj, from the southern part of Roztocze in the district Lvov, from Golgobery by Dziedzielewicz and partly by Łomnicki, as well as the Podole Uplands by Kamieniecki. These regions are now part of the USSR.

A smaller portion of the caddis-flies were collected from the Western Carpathians, thus: Dziedzielewicz and Wierzejski collected from the Tatras,

*A number of specimens identified by Dziedzielewicz were verified earlier by K. H. Forsslund (some specimens of Apatania) and C. Tomaszewski. The latter author verified mainly the identifications of specimens coming from the present territory of Poland; he took the verifications into considerations in his paper (Tomaszewski 1965).
SCHILLE from the Sądecki Beskid in the region of Rytro, WAGA from the Pie-
niny at Szczawnica and from the Middle Beskid at Sucha, DZIEDZIELEWICZ
from the Babia Góra Mtn and vicinity of Myślenice, and finally WIERZEJSKI
collected from along the river Skawa.

A few specimens were collected from the Cracow — Częstochowa Uplands,
mainly from the sites Złoty Potok, Ojców and Krzeszowice by WAGA.

Several specimens were collected from the vicinity of Cracow by ŻEBRAW-
ski, JELSKI and FUDAKOWSKI. A similar small number from the Mazovian-
Podlaska Lowlands, mainly in the vicinity of Warsaw and near Grabowo (Kolno
Upland) were collected by WAGA.

There are also occasional specimens of caddis-flies from Western Europe
collected by WAGA.

The collection of caddis-flies at the Institute of Systematic and Experi-
mental Zoology, PAS in Cracow owes its existence mainly to the amateur
entomologist J. DZIEDZIELEWICZ. He collected and identified the majority
of specimens and gave the collection its present form.

Józef DZIEDZIELEWICZ was trained as a lawyer (ŁOMNICKI, 1920). He was
born in Lvov on 4. XI. 1844. There he finished his studies at the university
and in 1871 took up work in the judiciary. His work took him to various places
in the Ukrainian foothills of the Carpathians, and he had the opportunity to
gather a collection of Neuroptera from an area which had not hitherto been
explored by entomologists. The collection of insects, started in the year 1865,
later became his passion, and after his retirement in 1907 he devoted all his
time to his hobby.

He was a member of the Physiographical Commission of the Cracow Science
Society. He cooperated closely with the DZIEDUSZYCKI Museum in Lvov (now
the Gosudarstviennyj prirodovedčeskij muzej Akademi Nauk USSR), where
he corrected and added to their collection of Neuroptera. The outbreak of the
First World War forced him to leave Lvov and move to Myślenice (30 km
south of Cracow) where he died on 24. II. 1918.

DZIEDZIELEWICZ contributed a substantial amount to the knowledge of
caddis-flies, primarily of the Carpathians; he discovered 7 new species. He
was the first to give a detailed scientific literature of the caddis-flies then exis-
ting in Poland, with a full list of species and informations about them.

**SPECIES LIST**

To avoid continually repeating the names of geographical regions the fol-
lowing abbreviations have been employed: R — Roztocze (Łubelskie, Łubelsko-
Lwowskie, Lwowskie), PU — Podolska Uplands (with Gołogóry), CF — Carpa-
thian foothills (only in the Dniestr and Prut basins), EC — Eastern Carpathians,
WC — Western Carpathians, CGU — Cracow—Częstochowa Uplands, MPL —
Mazovian-Podlaska Lowlands. More accurate descriptions of the place of cap-
ture are given when referring to: rare species, important from the taxonomic or zoogeographical point of view, as well as those specimens which DZIEDZIELEWICZ identified wrongly and which were recorded under the wrong name in the inventory book of the collection. This has to be done to enable reference to the scientific literature and thus corrections to be made.

Place names are given in the original notation as they appear in the documents of the collections.

The taxonomy and the nomenclature according to Limnafauna Europaea (BOTOSANEANU, MALICKY, 1978).

A. DZIEDZIELEWICZ’s collection (specimens registered in the inventory book of the collections)

Rhyacophilidae

Rhyacophila fasciata HAU., 26 ♀♀, 3 ♂♂; EC, CF, WC; most specimens bore the labels with the name “R. septentrionis MCL.”, 1 ♀ from the Eastern Carpathians (Dora?) was wrongly identified as “R. intermedia MCL.”.

R. flava KLAP., 2 ♀♂; EC (Czarnohora, Breskul 11. IX. 1909); specimens were noted under the synonym “R. furcata Dz.”.

R. laevis slovenica SYKORA, 4 ♀♂; EC.

R. moesarya KLAP., 5 ♀♂, 1 ♀; EC, Tatras; specimens from the Tatras were wrongly labelled as “R. torrentium PICT.”.

R. nubila (ZETT.), 25 ♀♂, 8 ♀♀; EC, WC.

R. oblitterata MCL., 14 ♀♂, 2 ♀♀; EC.

R. philopotamoides orensis SCHMID, 14 ♀♂, 4 ♀♀; EC; specimens caught on the slopes of Waratek and at Dora were wrongly labelled as: “R. hiruncornis MCL.” or “R. intermedia MCL.”.

R. polonica MCL., 19 ♀♂, 4 ♀♀; EC; some specimens (e. g. from the Tatras) were noted under the synonym “R. hageni MCL.”.

R. tristis PICT., 11 ♀♂, 11 ♀♀; EC, WC.

R. vulgaris PICT., 7 ♀♂, 5 ♀♀; Tatras; 1 ♀ was wrongly labelled as “R. torrentium PICT.”.

Glossosomatidae

Glossosoma boltori CURT., 3 ♀♂, 2 ♀♀; EC (Mikuliczyn on the river Prut), WC (Rytro on the river Poprad); imagines form the vicinity of Rytro are undoubtedly conclusive evidence of the appearance of this species in Poland. It has been given earlier as a species from the Polish Tatras (RIEDEL, 1962). The male and female genitalia are presented in figures 1 and 2.

DZIEDZIELEWICZ did not differentiate between the species G. boltori CURT. (known then as G. vernalis PICT.) and G. conformis NEBOISS (known then as G. boltori MCL.), since all the specimens from this genus were identified by him as G. boltori CURT. (sensu MCL.) that is G. conformis.

G. conformis NEBOISS, 2 ♀♂, 4 ♀♀; WC (Tatras, Babia Góra); all specimens bore the labels with the name “G. boltori CURT.”.
Fig. 1. *Glossosoma boltoni* Curt., genitalia ♀; a — lateral view; b — dorsal view
Fig. 2. *Glossosoma boltoni* Curt., ♀; a, b — genitalia, dorsal and lateral views; c — abdomen, segments 5–7, lateral view; d — abdomen, segments 5–8, ventral view; e, f — bursa copulatrix, lateral and dorsal views
**G. intermedium** (Kalp.), 3 ♂; EC.

*Agapetus delicatus* McL., 4 ♂ 5 ♀; EC (Mikuliczyn); most specimens were labelled wrongly as: "*Agapetus pactus* McL", "*Agapetus laniger* Pict.", "*Agapetus comatus* Pict.".

**A. laniger** (Pict.), 1 ♂; from the river Prut; the specimen bore the label with the name "*Agapetus pactus* McL".

**A. ochripes** Curt., 5 ♂, 5 ♀; EC (Mikuliczyn, Tatarów, Chomiak); some specimens were labelled with the name "*Agapetus comatus* Pict." or "*Agapetus delicatus* McL".

**A. rectigonopoda** Bots., 3 ♂; CF (near the river Prut at Kołomyja); specimens were wrongly identified as "*Agapetus comatus* Pict.".

*Agapetus* sp. 1 (belareca Bots.?), 1 ♀; CF (from the river Prut at Kołomyja); labelled wrongly as "*Agapetus comatus* Pict."

This is a hitherto unknown female from this genus, the shape of the VIII-th segment of the abdomen (Fig. 3) is rather similar to the female of *A. fuscipes*

![Diagram of Agapetus sp.](image)

**Fig. 3. Agapetus** sp. 1 (belareca Bots.?) ♀ genitalia ♀; a — lateral view; b — dorsal view; c — ventral view

Curt. I am provisionally placing it as *A. belareca*, a species known from the region of the South Carpathians (the Banat range) and whose female is still unknown, due to the similarity of genital construction with the males of the species*.

*Agapetus* sp. 2 (rectigonopoda Bots.?), 1 ♀; CF (from the river Prut at Kołomyja); it was wrongly labelled as "*Agapetus comatus* Pict."

* After the paper was given to be printed the problem of identity of the two unknown females has been solved with help of doz. dr. H. Malicky from Lanz; the female *Agapetus* sp. 1 was found to be *A. laniger* (Pict.) and *Agapetus* sp. 2 — *A. rectigonopoda* Bots.
This is the second unknown female from the genus *Agapetus*. I do not believe however that in this case there is a new species hitherto unknown to science. More likely the female belongs to one of the species of *Agapetus* which are known from the Carpathians (Botosaneanu, Malicky 1978), that is, that an error has been made among the hitherto known females of this genus. Such a possibility exists with respect to the female described as *A. rectigonopoda* (Botosaneanu 1957a, Ab. 3 EF). An undetailed drawing published in the work shows the posterior end of the abdomen to be distinctly similar to the abdomen of the female *A. laniger* (Pict.), as shown by Tobias (1965). Also in favour of placing the unknown female as *A. rectigonopoda* is the construction of segment VIII of the abdomen (Fig. 4), similar in form to the female of *A. delicatulus*; similarly the genitalia of the males of these two species show a similar construction (e.g. in the shape of the superior appendages)*.

![Fig. 4. *Agapetus* sp. 2 (*rectigonopoda* Bots. ?)*♀; a — segments 5—6 of the abdomen, lateral view; a, c, d — genitalia, lateral, dorsal and ventral views](image)

**Synagapetus armatus** (McL), 4 ♂♂, 6 ♀♀; EC (Mikuliczyn, Chomiak); the specimens from Mikuliczyn bore labels with the name “*Agapetus practus* McL.”

**Hydroptilidae**

**Hydroptila forcipata** (Eat.), 2 ♀♀; WC (Rytro); they were wrongly identified as “*Hydroptila sparsa* Curt.”

* See foot-note on page 455.
Fig. 5. Wormaldia copiosa MCL., ♀; a — venation of the anterior wing; b — posterior end of the abdomen, lateral view; c, d — abdomen, segments 7–8, dorsal and ventral views
H. occulta (EAT.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; EC (Mikuliczyn); both specimens were wrongly identified as: ♂ — “Hydroptila pulchricornis PICT.”; ♀ — “Hydroptila femoralis EAT.” (synonym of H. tineoides DALM.).

Philopotamidae

Philopotamus ludificatus McL., 11 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; WC.

P. montanus (DON.), 5 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; EC (Waratek, Dora), WC (Babia Góra, vicinity of Myślenice).

P. variegatus (SCOP.), 5 ♂♂, 5 ♀♀; EC (Mikuliczyn, Chomiak), WC (Babia Góra, Tatra, vicinity of Myślenice).

Wormaldia copiosa McL., 3 ♂♂, 1 ♀; Tatras.

W. occipitalis (PICT.), 17 ♂♂, 1 ♀; CF (Dora, Młodiatyn), EC (Mikuliczyn, Chomiak), WC (from the river Raba at Myślenice, Zawoja); all specimens from the Carpathian foothills and Eastern Carpathians were wrongly identified as: “W. triangulifera McL.” or “Dolophilus copiosus” (now known as W. copiosa).

Fig. 6. Wormaldia occipitalis (PICT.), a — venation of the anterior wing; b — posterior end of the abdomen, lateral view
W. pulla (McL.), 10 ♂, 4 ♀; EC (vicinity of Mikuliczyn), WC; all specimens from the Eastern Carpathians were wrongly identified as "Dolophilus copiosus", also 2 ♂ of unknown origin (probably EO) bore the labels with the name "Tinodes lurida CURT.".

In identifying the males of the genus Wormaldia I made use of the works of Roos (1956) and Botosaneanu (1960) however I could not find exact descriptions in the literature of the females of these species. I based their identification mainly on the venation of their wings. The venation is identical for both sexes of the same species, but differences are shown between different species. The venation of the anterior wings and the shape of the posterior end of the abdomen of the females are illustrated in figs. 5—7. The important differences in wing venation are indicated by arrows.

Fig. 7. Wormaldia pulla (McL.), 2: a — venation of the anterior wing; b, c — posterior end of the abdomen, lateral and ventral views
Hydropsychidae

Hydropsyche angustipennis (Curt.), 6 ♂; R (vicinity of Lvov), WC (foothills of Babia Góra); 1 ♂ from near Lvov, was wrongly identified as "H. guttata Pict."

H. bulbifera McL., 4 ♂; CF (Kołomyja), WC (Raba near Myślenice); 1 ♂ from Myślenice was wrongly identified as "H. guttata Pict."

H. contubernalis McL., 4 ♂; CF (on the river Prut in Kołomyja); all specimens labelled wrongly as "H. guttata Pict."

H. dissimulata Kum. et Bots., 2 ♂; on the upper Bug at Poturzyca near Sokal; were wrongly identified as "H. exocellata Duf."

H. instabilis (Curt.), 6 ♂; EC (Mikuliczyn).

H. pellucidula (Curt.), 14 ♂; EC (Mikuliczyn, Chomiak), CF (Kołomyja); all specimens wrongly identified as "H. fulvipes Curt."

H. saxonica McL., 2 ♂; EC (Worochta), WC (Babia Góra).

Hydropsyche spp., 29 ♀; EC, WC, CF.

Cheumatopsyche lepida (Pict.), 3 ♂; CF (Prut at Kołomyja).

Polycentropodidae

Neureclipsis bimaculata (L.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; R.

Plectrocnemia conspersa (Curt.), 3 ♂, 2 ♀; EC, WC, CF.

P. brevis McL., 4 ♂, 2 ♀; EC (Mikuliczyn), Tatra. Posterior end of the female abdomen shown in fig. 9.

---

Fig. 8. Plectrocnemia brevis McL., genitalia ♀; a — lateral view; b — ventral view
Polycentropus flavomaculatus (Pict.), 15 ♂♂ 5 ♀♀; EC, CF, WC; some specimens including those from Mikuliczyn (EC) also from Myślenice and Rytro (WC) bore the labels with the name “P. multiguttatus Curt.”

P. irroratus Curt., 2 ♂♂; place of capture unknown.

P. schmidtii Novák et Bots., 1 ♂; WC (foothills of Babia Góra); wrongly identified as “P. flavomaculatus Pict.”

Holocentropus dubis (Ramb.), 10 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; CF.

Cyprinella flavidus McL., 1 ♂; R (vicinity of Lvov); wrongly identified as “Polycentropus flavomaculatus Pict.”

C. trimaculatus (Curt.), 1 ♂; WC (foothills of Babia Góra).

Psychomyidae

Psychomyia pusilla (Fabr.), 16 ♂♂, 10 ♀♀; EC, WC.

Lype phaeopa (Steph.), 1 ♂, 5 ♀♀; CF (Kolomyja), R; 1 ♀ caught near Kolomyja was wrongly identified as “Tinodes pallidula McL.”.

Tinodes rostocki McL., 2 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; EC, WC.

Phryganyidae

Trichostegia minor (Curt.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; R.

Agrypna obsOLEta Hagen, 3 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; R, Tatras.

A. pagetana Curt., 4 ♂♂; CF.

A. varia (Fabr.), 6 ♂♂, 7 ♀♀; PU, R, CF, vicinity of Cracow.

Phryganea bipunctata Retz., 7 ♂♂, 8 ♀♀; R (vicinity of Lvov), CF, Tatras; one of the specimens from the vicinity of Lvov bore the label “P. grandis L.”, the others "P. striata L."

P. grandis L., 1 ♂, 3 ♀♀; Tatras, CCU.

Oligotrichia striata (L.), 6 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; CF, PU, R, EC, Tatras; all specimens bore the labels with the name “Neuronia ruficrus Scop.”.

Hagenella clathrata (Kol.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; on the upper Bug at Poturzyca near Sokal.

Oligostomis reticulata (L.), 8 ♂♂; PU, CF, in the vicinity of Cracow.

Brachycentridae

Brachycentrus montanus Klap., 2 ♂♂, 1 ♀; EC (Chomiak, Worochta).

B. subnubilus Curt., 4 ♂♂, 6 ♀♀; PU, CF (Kolomyja), WC (Ryтро, Wadowice); 1 ♂ from Kolomyja bore the label with the name “Brachycentrus carpaticus Dz.”

Oligoplectrum maculatum (Fourcr.), 13 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; CF (Kolomyja), EC.

Limnephilidae

Iironocia dubia (Steph.), 3 ♂♂, 1 ♀; CF.

Apatania carpathica Schmid, 13 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EO (Chomiak, Mikuliczyn, Tatary); all specimens wrongly identified as “Apatania meridiana McL.”

A. fimbriata (Pict.), 15 ♂♂; Tatras; 3 ♀♀ were wrongly identified as “Apatania wallengreni McL.”
Drusus annulatus (Steph.), 2 ♂; Tatras.
D. biguttatus (Pict.), 3 ♂, 2 ♀; Tatras; 1 ♂ and 1 ♀ from the spring Łódowe Źródło in Dolina Kościeliska were wrongly identified as “Drusus mixtus Pict.”
D. brunneus Klap., 3 ♂, 3 ♀; EC.
D. carpathicus Dz., 1 ♂; this specimen is labelled with the following notes: “Czarnohora, Dancerz 31. V. 1911” and “Drusus carpathicus Dz. ♂ ver. C. Tomaszewski”, and is registered in the inventory under number 8/25. DZIĘDZIELEWICZ (1911a) described the species on the basis of specimens collected “near the summit of Chomiak by springs of the stream Roskólski during the period 27. V — 11. VI. 1909 and at Czarnohora near Howerla and Dancerz on the days 30. V. 1909 and 10. VI. 1910”. DZIĘDZIELEWICZ also noted that all the specimens collected in this period were deposited in the museum at Lvov. Therefore the male deposited at Cracow does not belong to this series of specimens which enabled DZIĘDZIELEWICZ to describe a new species, nevertheless it does come from the “locus typicus”.
D. discolor (Ramb.), 3 ♂, 7 ♀; EC, Tatras; 1 ♂ from the Tatras was wrongly identified as “Drusus destitutus Kol.”
D. trifidus Mcl., 6 ♂, 3 ♀; EC, CF, Tatras.
Eclosisopteryx dalecarlica Kol., 12 ♂, 16 ♀; EC, WC; specimens from the Eastern Carpathians were labelled with the names: “Pelostomis sudetica Kol.” or “Eclosisopteryx dziędzielewiczii Klap.”, specimens from the Western Carpathians however were noted as “Eclosisopteryx gutulata Pict.”.
E. madida (Mcl.), 3 ♂, 4 ♀; EC, Tatras.
Limnophilus affinis Curt., 1 ♂, 6 ♀; R, CF, EC, Tatras.
L. auricula Curt., 1 ♂, 7 ♀; R, CF, the upper Bug, vicinity of Cracow.
L. binotatus Curt., 3 ♂, 6 ♀; R, CF; the specimens were labelled as “Limnophilus xanthodes Mcl.”
L. bifunetatus Curt., 1 ♂; CF
L. centralis Curt., 1 ♀; WC (Babia Góra).
L. coenosus Curt., 2 ♂, 2 ♀; EC (Czarnohora), WC (Babia Góra).
L. decipiens (Kol.), 6 ♂, 6 ♀; R, CF, Tatras.
L. dispar Mcl., 1 ♂, 1 ♀; R (vicinity of Lvov), WC (vicinity of Myślenice); the male from the vicinity of Myślenice was wrongly identified as “Limnophilus extricatus Mcl.”, the female from the vicinity of Lvov was mistaken as “Stenophylox alpestris Kol.” (now known as Rhadicoleptus alpestris sylvanocarpathicus Bots. et Riedel).
L. extricarius Mcl., 7 ♂, 10 ♀; R, CF (Kołomyja), EC, WC; 1 ♂ and 1 ♀ caught at Kołomyja were wrongly identified as “Limnophilus hirsutus Pict.”.
L. flavicornis (Fabr.), 3 ♂, 5 ♀; PU, R, CF.
L. fuscicornis Ramb., 3 ♂, 5 ♀; CF.
L. griseus (L.), 12 ♂, 16 ♀; PU, R, CF, EC, WC.
L. ignatus Mcl., 4 ♂, 3 ♀; R, CF, EC, Tatras.
L. lunatus Curt., 7 ♂, 14 ♀; PU, R, CF, WC.
L. nigriceps (ZETT.), 13 ♂; R, CF.
L. politus MCL., 14 ♂, 7 ♀; R, CF.
L. rhombicus (L.), 1 ♂, 5 ♀; PU, CF, EC.
L. sericeus (SAY), 1 ♀; EC (Angiełów); wrongly identified as “Limnophilus griseus L.”
L. sparsus CURT., 4 ♂, 4 ♀; R, CF, EC.
L. stigma CURT., 7 ♂, 6 ♀; R, CF, EC.
L. subcentralis BRAU., 1 ♂; R.
L. vittatus (FABR.), 2 ♂, 8 ♀; R, EC.
Colpotaulius incisus (CERT.), 1 ♂; CF.
Grammotaulius nigropunctatus (RETZ.), 11 ♂, 3 ♀!; PU, R, CF, EC, WC;
I have not found any basic morphological difference between the females
of G. nigropunctatus and G. nitidus MULL. deposited in the Cracow collec-
tion, therefore their specific status is doubtful.
Glyphotaulius pellucidus (RETZ.), 3 ♂, 2 ♀; R, CF.
Nemotaulius punctatolineatus (RETZ.), 1 ♂, 2 ♀; R, the vicinity of Cracow.
Phacoptyryx brevipennis (CURT.), 4 ♀; EC.
Anabotlia concentrica (ZETT.), 2 ♂, 8 ♀; CF (Słobódka Leśna, Mlodiatyn);
all specimens were labelled as “Arctoecia dualis MCL.”
A. furcata BRAU., 1 ♀; WC.
A. laevis (ZETT.), 33 ♂, 7 ♀; R, CF.
Rhadicoleptus alpestris sylvanocarpaticus BOTS. et RIEDEL, 5 ♂, 5 ♀; R,
CF, EC; all specimens were labelled with the old name “Stenophylax alpe-
stris Kol.”
Potamophylax carpathicus (DZ). 1 ♂, 3 ♀; 2 ♀ were labelled wrongly as “Steno-
phylax millenii KŁAP.” (now known as Potamophylax millenii (KŁAP.),
their labels had the following notes: nr. 16/20 — “Chomiak (Błotek) 3. 7.
1905 Dz.”. nr. 43/23 — “Chomiak Potok Barani’ zródła 27. 6. 1907”. The two
remaining specimens had identical inventory numbers 6/25, they were named
correctly and bore the following labelling: ♂ — “Worochta 12. VI. 1911”,
♀ (without the last abdominal segments) — “Worochta 24. VI. 1911 pod Re-
chaczem”. The species was described (DZIEDELEWICZ, 1912) on the basis
of specimens collected “near the summits of Chomiak and Rebrowacz at
Worochta during the period 12. VI — 6. VII. 1911”. I believe, the last
two specimens come from the typical series and so satisfy the conditions
for syntypes. I am designating as a lectotypus the male of nr. 6/25 with an
additional labelling “Potamophylax carpathicus (DZ.) ♂ ver. C. TOMASZEW-
ski”.
P. latipennis (CURT.), 11 ♂; EC, WC; some specimens were labelled with
the former name “Stenophylax stellatus CURT.”, however the remainder
were wrongly labelled as “Stenophylax latipennis CURT.” (sensu MCL.),
(now the synonyme of Potamophylax cingulatus STEPH.).
P. luctuosus (PILL.), 6 ♂; EC.
P. nigricornis (PICT.), 6 ♂, 1 ♀; EC, WC.
P. rotundipennis (Brau.), 3 ♂♂; CF.
Acrophylax vernalis Dz., 2 ♀♀; both specimens have the same inventory number 3/25 and identical labels “Czarnohora, Dancerz 15. V. 1911” and “Acrophylax vernalis Dz. ♀ ver. C. Tomaszewski”. Dziędziewicz (1912) described this species on the basis of specimens collected from Czarnohora near the summits of Dancerz and Breskul during the period 15—20. V. 1911 thus the specimens deposited in Cracow belong to the typical series and are syntypes. I am designating one of the females preserved in a better state as a lectotype.
A. zerberus Brau., 5 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; Tatras.
Chionophylax czarnohoricus (Dz.), 4 ♂♂; 2 ♂♂ with the inventory number 4/25 are labelled with the inscription “Czarnohora, Dancerz 29. V. 1911” the other two with the inventory number 5/25 are labelled with the inscription “Czarnohora Breskul 1. VI. 1911”. Dziędziewicz (1911b) described the species on the basis of 3 ♂♂ collected by K. Huppenthal by a small lake near the summit of Tommatek, Czarnohora 30. V. 1909 so none of the specimens deposited in Cracow belong to the typical series. However they do come from the “terra typica”.
Halesus digitatus (Schrk.), 2 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EC.
H. tessellatus (Ramb.), 6 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; CF.

Fig. 9. Melampophylax nepos triangulifera Bots., genitalia ♀; a — lateral view; b — inferior appendages, ventral view
H. rubricollis (Pict.), 2 ♂, 2 ♀; Tatras, Babia Góra; all specimens were wrongly labelled: from the Tatras as "Halesus mendax McL.", from Babia Góra as "Halesus moestus McL."

*Melampophylax nepos triangulifera* Bots., 6 ♂, 2 ♀; EC (Chomiak).

The construction of the genital apparatus of the males which I investigated differed somewhat from that described and illustrated by Botosaneanu (1937b) for *M. nepos triangulifera* from Roumania. The main difference is in the construction of the appendices inferiores, and especially their ventral parts, which in the museum specimens are rather wider (fig. 10) and straighter than in the roumanian specimens. It should be noted however that the shape of the ventral part of the appendices inferiores shows some variability, thus specimens collected by Dżędzielewicz may belong to this subspecies.

Fig. 10. *Melampophylax nepos triangulifera* Bots., genitalia ♂; a — posterior view; b — dorsal view; c, d — eadeagus dorsal and lateral views
In order to be absolutely certain a greater number of individuals from both populations would have to be examined, and a similar comparison for the females. Unfortunately I could not find a description of the females of *M. nepos triangulifera* in the literature. The construction of the genital apparatus of the female from Chomiak, which I believe to belong to this sub-species, is shown in fig. 12.

*Isogamus aequalis* (Klap.), 19 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EC (Czarnohora foothills: Mikuliczyn, Mlodiatyn and Worochta, in Gorgany: Chomiak, Waratek); most specimens were wrongly identified as "Asynarchus coenosus Curt." of these 5 ♂♂ were identified as "Asynarchus coenosus var. paludum Kol.". It should be noted that none of the 23 specimens were caught at Czarnohora, despite

---

Fig. 11. *Melampophylax nepos triangulifera* Bots., genitalia ♀; a — dorsal view; b — ventral view; c — lateral view; d — vaginal structure
being noted there by DZIEDZIELEWICZ (1920). The male and female genital apparatus are presented (figs. 13, 14 and 16).

Isogamus czarnohorensis (DZIEDZIELEWICZ, 1912), stat. nov.

Anisogamus aequalis KŁAP. var. czarnohorensis: DZIEDZIELEWICZ, 1912
Anisogamus aequalis KŁAP. var. czarnohorensis: RACIECKA, 1934
Isogamus aequalis czarnohorensis: SCHMID, 1955

According to the descriptions of DZIEDZIELEWICZ (1912, 1919) and RACIECKA (1934) this species differs at first glance from the closely related I. aequalis KŁAP. in both colour and body measurements. The thorax and abdomen of ♂ and ♀ I. czarnohorensis are dark brown, distinctly darker than that of I. aequalis, the anterior wings of the ♂ are grayish brown darker than the ♀ and distinctly darkening along the veins. These features are often not noticed in museum material.

Genitalia ♂: (figs: 13a—c, 14a, c), the superior appendages have a distinctly rounded shape; the ends of the inferior appendages do not point vertically upwards but are directed posteriorly, in the relation to the segment IX they are situated nearly at right-angles from a lateral view, but from a posterior view they are distinctly parallel. Aedeagus has a narrow semi-cylindrical shape, whose distal end is characteristically narrowed and elongated posteriorly (fig. 14c). Paramerae in the distal part are covered with long narrow spines, rather concentrated on the dorsal surface (fig. 14a).

Genitalia ♀: (fig. 15), the dorsal part of segment IX is short and closely fused with segment X; segment X extended posteriorly into two triangular lobes (fig. 15a), the lobes and the lower plate surrounding the superior aperture are exactly the same length; the ventral lobes of segment IX are long, prominent and completely fused posteriorly, on the lateral and posterior surfaces up to the posterior joint they are characteristically hairy; median lobe of ventral lip of vulva short but distinctly visible and longer than that of aequalis.

In the Cracow collection I found 6 ♂ and 4 ♀ collected by DZIEDZIELEWICZ and 1 ♀ collected by FUDAKOWSKI from Czarnohora in the Eastern Carpathians; 4 ♂ with inventory numbers 37/24, 38/24 and 39/24 were wrongly identified as “Stenophylax millenii KŁAP.” and 1 ♀ with inventory number 2/25 as “Anisogamus eequalis KŁAP.”

DZIEDZIELEWICZ described this form on the basis of specimens caught by the streams and springs of Czarnohora in the sub-alpine and alpine levels between 1300 and 1700 m asl., during the months of August and September. It happened probably in the year 1910 as the specimens dated from this time are already identified as “Anisogamus aequalis KŁAP. var. czarnohorensis Dz.”. In the Cracow collection are 2 ♂ and 2 ♀ which come from this period bearing the same inventory number 1/25, I believe that these may be called the typical series. I am choosing from these the ♂ lectotype; the specimen has the labelling “Czarnohora, Breskul 25. IX. 1910” and “Isogamus aequalis
Fig. 12. *Isogamus czarnohorensis* (Dz.), (a, b, c) and *I. aequalis* (Klap.), (d, e, f) male genitalia; 
a, d — lateral view; b, e — posterior view; c, f — dorsal view.
Fig. 13. *Isogamus czarnohorensis* (Dz.), (a, c) and *I. aequalis* (Klap.), (b, d), aedeagus and paramerae, lateral view

czarnohorensis (Dz.) ver. C. Tomaszewski*.* The abdomen of the lectotype as well as the paralectotypes are macerated in KOH.

*Parachiona picicornis* (Pict.), 4 ♂♂; OF, EC.

*Stenophylax permistus* McL., 1 ♀; R.

*S. speluncarum* McL., 1 ♂; EC (Młodiatyn); wrongly identified as "Stenophylax concentricus Zett."

7 — AZC XXIV, 8—13
Fig. 14. *Isogamus czarnohorensis* (D.z), genitalia ♀; a — dorsal view; b — ventral view; c — lateral view; d — vaginal structure, lateral view (further enlarged)
Fig. 15. *Isogamus aequalis* (Klap.), genitalia ♀; a — dorsal view; b — ventral view; c — lateral view; d — vaginal structure, lateral view (further enlarged)
Micropterna lateralis (Stieh.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; EC (Tatarów); both specimens were wrongly identified: the male as “Stenophylax concentricus Zett.”, the female as “Micropterna sequax McI."

M. nycterobia McI., 1 ♀; EC.

M. testacea (Gmel.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; CF.

Allogamus auricollis (Pic.), 3 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; Tatras.

A. uncatus (Brau.), 6 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; EC, WC.

Chaetopteryx fusca Brau., 1 ♂; WC (vicinity of Rytro); wrongly identified as “Chaetopteryx villosa Fabr.”.

C. polonica Dz., 4 ♂♂, 1 ♀; the specimens undoubtedly come from the typical series from which Dziędzielewicz described this species. In the publication, in which the author describes the species (Dziędzielewicz 1889) is the information that the specimens were caught “at Młodiatyn near

Kolomyja by a stream….. 3. X. and 16. X”. Two males with inventory number 8/6 have the following labels: “Młodiatyn 1887” and “2. 10. Mł.”. The other two males with inventory number 75/9 have identical labels “16. 10. Mł.” and the female with inventory number 33/8 “Młodiatyn 16. 10 (Kołom.)”. A male from no. 75/9 I am designating as lectotype.

C. sakhbergi McI., 7 ♂♂ 2 ♀♀; CF (Słobodka Lesna), EC (Chomiak, Worocha, Młodiatyn).

There is a certain variability in the shape of the male and female genital apparatus. It appears that the most typical specimens differ in, amongst others,
the following features. In the male the appendices intermediaries have very weakly defined and highly placed lateral teeth (fig. 17a, b), the hooklets terminating the aedeagus weakly shaped (fig. 17c, d). The female has a no-

Fig. 17. Chaetopteryx sahlbergi McL., genitalia ♀; a — lateral view; b — dorsal view; c — ventral view

tably short segment IX (fig. 18a, b), the structures of segment X are generally divided at the ends (fig. 18b).

C. subradiata Klap., 9 ♂♂, 1 ♀; EC; one male wrongly identified as “Chaetopteryx maior McL.”.

C. villosa (Fabr.), 3 ♂♂, 1 ♀; CF (Słobódka Leśna), vicinity of Lwov. Słobódka Leśna is the most south-easterly locality for this species. Here is also the boundary between the distributions of two closely related species villosa and sahlbergi, however Dziedzielewicz caught specimens of both species from this locality. The male genitalia of villosa from Słobódka Leśna are shown in fig. 19.

Psilopteryx psorosa carpathica Schmid, 7 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EC.

Annetilla obscurata (McL.), 21 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EC.

A. chomiacensis chomiacensis (Dz.), 9 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; EC (Gorgany to the North of Worochta); 7 specimens were labelled with “Heliconis Klapaleki Dziedz.”.

Dziedzielewicz (Dziedzielewicz, Klapalek, 1908) described this species from a series of specimens collected “by the stream Gnilec, by the lower reaches of Barani stream on the southern slopes of the summit of Chomiak and also
by the rivers Prutee and Błotek" in the autumn of 1907, beginning from
the end of September. 7 ♂♂ and 2 ♀♀ from the collections in Cracow come
frome this time and place given by DZIĘDZIELEWICZ, thus the status of these
specimens as syntypes is certain. They have the following inventory numbers:

82/23—(6 ♂♂, 1 ♀), 69/24—(1 ♂, 1 ♀). From them is designated the lectotype
of male — 82/23 — with the label "Chomiak, Błotek 20. 10. 1907".
"A. kosciuszkii Klap.", 11 ♂♂; EC (the valley of the upper Prut between Tata-
rów and Foreszczanka); identified by DZIĘDZIELEWICZ. According to Sz-
czeszny (1979) all these specimens are hybrids of parental forms of A. cho-
miacensis chomiacensis and A. chomiacensis lateroproducta (Bots.), and
A. kosciuszkii, does not exist as a separate unit.

Georidae

Goera pilosa (Fabr.), 19 ♂♂, 7 ♀♀; CF, EC, WC.
Lithax niger Hag., 3 ♂♂; EC (Czarnohora, Chomiak).
L. obscurus (Hag.), 1 ♂; EC; wrongly identified as "Lithax niger Hag."
I have inserted a detailed drawing of the genitais of this specimen (fig. 19)
since there is no exact description and illustration of this species in the
trichopterological literature.
Silio gr售卖is Ed. Pict., 7 ♂♂, 7 ♀♀; EC (Mikuliczyn); all specimens were wrongly
identified as: "Silio pallipes Fabr." or "Silio piceus Brau."
S. nigricornis (Pict.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; WC.
S. pallipes (Fabr.), 6 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; CF, WC.
S. piceus (Brau.), 11 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; CF, EC, WC.

Lepidostomatidae
Lepidostoma hirtum (Fabr.), 4 ♂♂, 5 ♀♀; PU, CF, EC, WC.
Lasiocephala basalis Kol., 4 ♂♂, 7 ♀♀; EC, WC.
Crunoctia irrorata (Curt.), 6 ♂♂, 6 ♀♀; EC, PU, WC.

Leptoceridae
Athripsodes albifrons (L.), 1 ♂; R.
A. aterrimum (Steph.), 6 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; CF, on the upper Bug.
A. bilineatus (L.), 8 ♂♂, 5 ♀♀; EC.
A. cinereus (Curt.), 3 ♂♂; CF.
A. commutatus (Rostock), 6 ♂♂, 1 ♀; CF (Kolomyja), EC; specimens from Kolomyja were wrongly identified as "Leptocerus albifrons L."

Ceraclea ramburi Morse, 1 ♂; CF (Kolomyja); the male was wrongly identified as "Leptocerus albimaculatus Ramb."

C. senilis (Burm.), 4 ♂♂; on the upper Bug.
Myxocides azurea (L.), 6 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; CF, WC.
M. longicornis (L.), 5 ♂♂, 1 ♀; on the upper Bug, vicinity of Lwów.
M. nigra (L.), 7 ♂♂, 1 ♀; EC.

Triacnodes bicolor (Curt.), 1 ♂; R.
T. simulans Tjed., 3 ♂♂; CF (on the river Prut at Kolomyja), WC (vicinity of Myślenice); 2 males from Kolomyja were wrongly identified as "Triacnodes bicolor?", but the male from Myślenice as "Triacnodes conspersa Ramb."
This is a new species for the Polish fauna within the country's present borders. The genital structure of the male is shown in fig. 20.

Oecetis furva (Ramb.), 7 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; CF (Słońska Leśna), on the upper Bug; the male from Słońska Leśna was wrongly identified as "Oecetis lacustris Pict."

Setodes punctatus (Fabr.), 3 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; CF.

Sericostomatidae
Notidobia ciliaris (L.), 9 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; CF, EC, WC.
Oecismus monedula (Hag.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; WC (near Myślenice).
Sericostoma personatum Spence, 2 ♂♂; EC.
S. flavicornne Schneider, 9 ♂♂; EC.
Sericostoma spp., 19 ♀♀; these are indistinguishable females belonging to the two above-mentioned species of this genus.

Beracidae
Berea pullata (Curt.), 3 ♂♂; R, EC.
Ernodes articularis (Pict.), 3 ♂♂, 4 ♀♀; EC, WC.
Fig. 19. *Lithax obscura* (Hag.), genitalia ♂; a — lateral view; b — dorsal view; c — ventral view; d, e — aedeagus and paramerae, lateral and ventral views; f — ventral process of sixth sternite (further enlarged)
Fig. 20. Triacnodes simulans Tjed., genitalia ♂; a — lateral view; b — dorsal view; c — inferior appendages, dorsal view; d — aedeagus, lateral view

Odontoceridae
Odontocerum albicorne (Scop.), 10 ♂♂, 7 ♀♀; PU, EO, CF, WC.

Molannidae
Molannodes tinctus (Zett.), 6 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; PU, EC (Mikuliczyn), Tatras; a male from Mikuliczyn and 4 ♂♂ from the Tatras were labelled as "Molannodes zelleri McL."

The most interesting part of the collection of Dziedzielewicz is the series of specimens belonging to the species which were described by him: Drusus
carpathicus, Potamophylax carpathicus, Acrophyllax vernalis, Chionophylax czarnohoricus, Isogamus czarnohoresis, Chaetopteryx polonica, Annitella chomiacensis. There were no types (= holotypes) of any of these species here and they are probably not in the museum at Lvov either. It is nearly certain that Dziędzilewicz, when describing the species, did not designate the type, since there is no mention of them in his description of the species. Racięcka (1934) who personally studied the species in the museum at Lvov also omits to mention the types of the species of Dziędzilewicz, while giving them a full and detailed description.

However in the collection are specimens belonging to species identified personally by their discoverer and coming from "terra typica". Among these may be detected specimens from the typical series which were used in the description of the species and from these the lectotypes of the following species have been chosen:

*Potamophylax carpathicus* (Dz.) ♂
*Acrophyllax vernalis* Dz. ♀
*Isogamus czarnohoresis* (Dz.) ♂
*Chaetopteryx polonica* (Dz.) ♂
*Annitella chomiacensis chomiacensis* (Dz.) ♂

While verifying the material I came across many specimens labelled with the names of species which are now accepted as synonyms. There were also two names given by Dziędzilewicz (*Rhyacophila furoata* Dz., *Brachycentrus carpathicus* Dz.).

Moreover many specimens were wrongly identified and some of these were not always consistently assigned to the same wrong species; specimens from the same species appeared under several different names. These species are arranged in a table (Tab. 1) with the exception of those wrongly identified and which Dziędzilewicz (1919, 1920) corrected in his publications.

The verification of the caddis-flies of Dziędzilewicz deposited in Cracow, do not clear up all doubts as to their identification by the collector. Many doubts about the published identifications may be cleared up only by the verification of this collection deposited in the museum in Lwów.

However in some cases it is possible to establish an error in the identification of a species quite definitely. That is for the species of which all the specimens identified by Dziędzilewicz were deposited together at Cracow (Dziędzilewicz 1919, 1920). Wrongly published species are: *Rhyacophila torrentium* Pict. for the Tatras, *Hydroptila sparsa* Curt. for the Sądecki Beskid (near Rytro) and *Apatania wallengreni* McL. for the Tatras.
B. Caddis-flies collections of: Antoni Waga (A. W.), Konstanty Jelski (K. J.), Stanisław Kamiennicki (S. K.), and Józef Fudakowski (J. F.); specimens not registered in the inventory book of the collections

Ryacoophilidae
*Rhyacophila pascoeii* McL., 1 ♂, 1 ♀; “in Rheo prope Bonn” (A. W.).

Glossosomatidae
*Agapetus fuscipes* Curt., 1 ♂, WC (A. W.).

Hydroptilidae
*Oxyethira* sp., 1 ♀; place of capture unknown (A. W.).

Hydropsychidae
*Hydropsyche angustipennis* (Curt.), 4 ♂, 1 ♀; vicinity of Cracow (K. J.), CCU (A. W.).

*Hydropsyche bulgaromanorum* Mal., 2 ♂; WC (Szcawnica), Danube River (A. W.). This is a new species for the Polish fauna. The genital structure of the male from Szcawnica is shown in fig. 21.

*Hydropsyche contubernalis masovica* Mal., 1 ♂; MPL (on the Vistula in Warsaw) (A. W.). This subspecies was recently added to the list of Polish caddis-flies (Malicky 1977).

*Hydropsyche ornatula* McL., 2 ♂, 1 ♀; WC (Szcawnica, det. Malicky), CCU (Krzeszów, det. Jelski, ver. Malicky), (A. W.).

*Hydropsyche saxonica* McL., 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).

Polycentropodidae
*Neureclipsis bimaculata* (L.), 2 ♂, 1 ♀; MPL, Danube River, (A. W.).

*Polycentropus schmidi* Novak et Bots., 1 ♂; WC (Szcawnica), (A. W.).

*Holocentropus picicornis* Steph., 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
Fig. 21. *Hydropsyche bulgaromanorum* Mal., genitalia ♀; a, b — segments 9-10, dorsal and lateral views; c — aedeagus, lateral view; d — aedeagus (further enlarged) ventral view; e — inferior left appendage.

*Cynus crenaticornis* (Kol.), 5 ♀♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).
*C. flavidus* McL., 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).

**Psychomyiidae**
*Psychomyia pusilla* (Fabr.), 3 ♀♀, 2 ♀♀; WC, CCU (A. W.).
*Lypte phaeopa* (Steph.), 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
*L. reducata* (Hap.), 1 ♀; MPL (A. W.).
Economidae
Economus tenellus (Ramb.), 3 ♂, 6 ♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).

Phryganeidae
Trichostegia minor (Curt.), 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
Agrypnia obsoleta Hagen, 2 ♂, 2 ♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).
A. pagetana Curt., 1 ♂; MPL (A. W.).
Oligotrichia striata (L.), 2 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
Oligostomis reticulata (L.), 4 ♂♂; PU (S. K.).
Sembis phalenoides (L.), 1 ♀; place of capture unknown (A. W.).

Brachycentridae
Brachycentrus subnubilus Curt., 2 ♂, 1 ♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).
Oligoplectrum maculatum (Fourcr.), 2 ♂, 1 ♀; WC (A. W.).

Limnephilidae
Drusus tridus McL., 6 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
Limnephilus binotatus Curt., 3 ♂, 2 ♀; PU (S. K.), CCU (A. W.).
L. bipunctatus Curt., 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
L. extricatus McL., 1 ♀; PU (S. K.).
L. flavicornis (Fabr.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
L. fuscoicorns Ramb., 1 ♂; MPL (A. W.).
L. griseus (L.), 1 ♂, 12 ♀; PU (S. K.), vicinity of Cracow (K. J.), CCU, MPL (A. W.).
L. ignavus McL., 1 ♀; COU (A. W.).
L. lunatus Curt., 2 ♂; PU (S. K.), CCU (A. W.).
L. nigriceps (Zett.), 1 ♂; MPL (A. W.).
L. rhombicus (L.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
L. sparsus Curt., 1 ♀; WC (A. W.).
L. vitellus (Fabr.), 3 ♂, 2 ♀; vicinity of Cracow (K. J.), CCU, MPL (A. W.).
Colpotaulius incisus (Curt.), 1 ♂, 2 ♀; CCU (A. W.).
Grammotaulius nitidus (Mull.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; PU (S. K.).
Nemotaulius punctatolineatus (Retz.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
Anabolia furcata Bracu., 10 ♂, 2 ♀; vicinity of Cracow (J. F.), CCU (A. W.).
Polamophylox rotundipennis (Brauc.), 8 ♂, 12 ♀; WC, vicinity of Cracow (K. J.).

Halesus digitatus (Schrk.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
H. tesselatus (Ramb.), 4 ♀; vicinity of Cracow (J. F.), MPL (A. W.).
Isogamus czarnohorensis (Dz.), 1 ♀; EC (Czarnohora), (J. F.).
Stenophylox permistus McL., 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
Chaetopteryx villosa (Fabr.), 1 ♂, 2 ♀; MPL (A. W.).

Lepidostomatidae
Lepidostoma hirtum (Fabr.), 1 ♀; WC (A. W.).
Lasiocephala basalis (Kol.), 4 ♂, 1 ♀; WC, CCU, MPL (A. W.).
List of caddis-flies (*Trichoptera*) wrongly identified and deposited by J. DZIĘDZIELEWICZ in the Museum of Polish Academy of Sciences (PAU) in Cracow (now the collections of the Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, PAS in Cracow)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DZIĘDZIELEWICZ identification</th>
<th>Number of specimens</th>
<th>Correct identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aequalis Klap., Anisogamus</td>
<td>9 5 9 4</td>
<td>Isogamus aequalis Klap.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I. carnozhorensis Dz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albifrons L., Leptocerus</td>
<td>1 1 1 1</td>
<td>Athripsodes commutatus Rost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albimacula Ramb., Leptocerus</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>Ceraulea ramburi MORSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alpestris Kol., Stenophylax</td>
<td>5 11 5 10</td>
<td>Rhacidoleptus alpestris sylvanocarpaticus Bots., Riedel, Limnephilus diepar McL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bicolor Curt., Triagenodes</td>
<td>3 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boltoni Curt. (sensu McL.),</td>
<td>5 6 3 2</td>
<td>G. boltoni Curt. (nec McL.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossosoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. conformis NEBOISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpathicus Dz., Brachycerus</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comatus Pict., Agapetus</td>
<td>6 7 3 4</td>
<td>A. ochripes Curt.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. rectigonopoda Bots.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. delicatulus McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. laniger (Pict.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concentricus Zett. (sensu McL.),</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenophylax</td>
<td></td>
<td>S. permistus McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S. speluncarum McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Microoptera lateralis (Steph.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conspersa Ramb., Triagenodes</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copiosus McL., Dolophilus</td>
<td>7 4 2 2</td>
<td>Hormadia copiosa McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. occipitalis (Pict.),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W. pulla (McL.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>delicatulus McL., Agapetus</td>
<td>3 1 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destitutus Kol., Drusus</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>A. delicatulus McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A. ochripes Curt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exocellata Duf., Hydropsyche</td>
<td>2 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extricatus McL., Limnophilus</td>
<td>7 7 6 7</td>
<td>L. eversulis EXTRICATUS McL.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>femoralis Eat., Hydroptila</td>
<td>1 2 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flavomaculatus Pict.,</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycentropus</td>
<td></td>
<td>P. schmidi Bots., NOVAK,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cyprinus flavidos McL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fulvipes Curt., Hydropsyche</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. pellucidula (Curt.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grandis L., Phryganea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>griseus L., Limnophilus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guttata Pict., Hydropsyche</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hirsutus Pict., Limnophilus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hirticornis McI., Rhyacophila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intermedia McI., Rhyacophila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lacustris Pict., Oecetis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laniger Pict., Agapetus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>latipennis Curt. (sensu McI.),</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenophylax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lurida Curt., Tinodes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maior McI., Chaeopteryx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mendax McI., Halesus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meridiana McI., Apatania</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millentii Klap., Stenophylax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixtus Pict., Drusus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiguttatus Curt.,</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polycentropus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niger Hag., Lithax</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pactus McI., Agapetus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallidula McI., Tinodes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pallipes Fabr., Silo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piceus Brau., Silo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>psorosa Kol., Psilopteryx</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pulchricornis Pict., Hydroptila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sequaz McI., Micropterna</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sparsa Curt., Hydroptila</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subnigra McI., Wormaldia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sudetica Kol., Peltostomis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torrentium Pict., Rhyacophila</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leptoceridae
Aethripsodes albisrons (L.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
A. aterrimus (STEPH.), 1 ♂, 1 ♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).
Ceraclea fulvus (RAMB.), 2 ♀♀; PU (S. K.), MPL (A. W.).
C. senilis (BURM.), 1 ♀; PU (S. K.).
Mystac des azurea (L.), 1 ♂, 3 ♀♀; WC (A. W.).
M. longicornis (L.), 3 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; CCU, MPL (A. W.).
M. nigra (L.), 3 ♂♂, 2 ♀♀; WC, CCU (A. W.).
Oscetis furva (RAMB.), 1 ♀; MPL (A. W.).
O. lacustris (Pict.), 1 ♀; MPL (A. W.).
O. ochracea (CURT.), 4 ♂♂, 3 ♀♀; PU (S. K.), WC, CCU, MPL (A. W.).

Sericostomatidae
Notidobia ciliaris (L.), 1 ♂; CCU (A. W.).
Sericostoma personatum (SPENCE), 2 ♂♂; CCU (A. W.).
S. flavicorne SCHN., 1 ♂; MPL (A. W.).
Sericostoma spp., 1 ♀; CCU (A. W.).

Beraeidae
Beraea pullata (CURT.), 1 ♀; MPL (A. W.).

Molannidae
Molanna angustata CURT., 1 ♂, 1♀; MPL (A. W.).
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STRESZCZENIE

Opracowano zbiory chruszcików (*Trichoptera*) — imagines w stanie suchym — Zakładu Zoologii Systematycznej i Doświadczalnej Polskiej Akademii Nauk w Krakowie. Prace obejmowały weryfikację oznaczeń gatunków w kolekcji

3 — AZC XXIV/8—13
J. Dziędzielewicz oraz oznaczenie dotąd nie opracowanych zbiorów innych kolekcjonerów m. in. A. Wagi z połowy ubiegłego wieku.

Kolekcja Dziędzielewicz, powstała w latach 1875—1912, obejmuje około 1300 okazów należących do 166 gatunków, zebranych głównie w Karpatach Wschodnich i Zachodnich, a także na Podkarpaciu ukraińskim i w południowej części Roztocza. Kolekcja ta zawiera okazy wszystkich gatunków opisanych przez Dziędzielewicza i oznaczonych przez niego osobiście. Wśród nich wyszukano okazy serii typowych (na podstawie których Dziędzielewicz opisał nowo odkryte gatunki) i wyznaczono lektotypy: *Potampohylax carpathicus*, *Acrophylax vernalis*, *Isogamus czarnohorensis*, *Chaetopteryx polonica* i *Annitella chomiacensis*. Dokonano opisu i zobrazowano rycinami *I. czarnohorensis*, nadając mu rangę gatunku.

Zestawiono (Tab. 1) zdezaktualizowane i błędne oznaczenia chrusićków dokonane przez Dziędzielewicza.

Nie opracowane materiały chrusićków zawierały około 220 okazów należących do 72 gatunków zebranych przez A. Wagię w Beskidach Zachodnich, na Wyżynie Krakowsko-Częstochowskiej i Nizinie Mazowiecko-Podlaskiej; K. Jełskiego w okolicy Krakowa; S. Kamienieckiego na Wyżynie Podolskiej; J. Fudakowskiego na Czarnohorze w Karpatach Wschodnich i w okolicy Krakowa.

W zbiorach chrusićków Zakładu Zoologii Systematycznej i Doświadczalnej PAN znaleziono dwa nowe gatunki dla fauny Polski, zebrane w Beskidach Zachodnich: *Hydropsyche bulgaromanorum Mal.* (w Szczawnicy w Pieninach) i *Triaenodes simulans Tjed.* (okolice Myślenic).

Redaktor pracy: doc. dr A. Szeptycki