POLISH JOURNAL OF ECOLOGY	48	3	225-238	2000
(Pol. J. Ecol.)				1. Starter

Werner ULRICH

Nicholas Copernicus University in Toruń, Department of Animal Ecology Gagarina 9, 87-100 Toruń, Poland, e-mail: ulrichw@cc.uni.torun.pl

NICHE SEGREGATION AND COEXISTENCE OF PARASITIC HYMENOPTERA OF THE ASPILOTA GENUS GROUP (HYMENOPTERA, BRACONIDAE)

IN A BEECH FOREST ON LIMESTONE

ABSTRACT: In a beech forest on limestone (Northern Germay) community structure and coexistence of a community of phorid (Diptera) parasitoids (Aspilota and Orthostigma spp., Hymenoptera, Braconidae) was studied. A classical niche analysis including character displacement, temporal and spatial segregation and density fluctuations could not clearly separate the species. In a case where such a separation by morphological factors was possible, hosts and spatial distribution of this species were the same as in morphologically different species. As predicted from aggregation theory of coexistence all species were highly aggregated but aggregation and density appeared not to be correlated. In line with the core-satellite hypothesis bimodal species rank order distributions (temporal and in relation to density) with a high number of rare species were found and patch density was correlated with number of patches occupied. Relative abundance distributions were fitted by Zipf-Mandelbrot but not by log-normal or log-series models.

KEY WORDS: Hymenoptera, Braconidae, Aspilota, coexistence, niche, core-satellite, aggregation, beech forest, Zipf-Mandelbrot Hutchinson (1957, 1959) on there had been a rich literature on niche theory and niche overlap (reviewed in Colwell 1992 and Griesemer 1992). With the notion that species inhabiting a patchy or unpredictable environment may have undistinguishable niches the focus of interest changed to other models. Among these especially the aggregation model of coexistence (Gurney and Nisbet 1978, Shorrocks et al. 1979, Atkinson and Shorrocks 1981, 1984, Shorrocks et al. 1984, Shorrocks and Rosewell 1987, Comins and Hassel 1987) and the coresatellite hypothesis of Hanski (1982) have gathered much interest (Gotelli and Simberloff 1987, Maurer 1990, Nee et al. 1991, Sevenster 1996, Sevenster and Van Alphen 1996, Lee et al. 1998). Recently, the interest in niche theory renewed

1. INTRODUCTION

The question what factors allow species of similar habitat and diet requirements to coexist has inspired ecologists from the beginning (Shelford 1913, Grinnell 1917). From (Leibold 1995, 1998, Li Zizhen and Lin Hong 1997, Wisheu 1998, Austin 1999) mainly due to a redefinition of the classical niche concepts in terms of environmental impacts and requirements and due to the need of more general niche concepts in plant ecology.

All of the theories make explicit predictions on patterns of species abundance and morphology. In modern niche theory species may coexist if there is a trade off in the requirements of the species and if there are different effects on the factor that most limits its growth (Leibold 1995). This means that species may coexist not only if they are sufficiently separated by classical niche dimensions (morphological, temporal, resources or habitats) but also in functional ones like dispersal ability, aggregation, growth rate or density fluctuations. Any analysis of niche segregation has therefore to embrace classical and functional niche dimensions.

The aggregation model and the coresatellite hypothesis especially refer to patchy and unpredictable environments. The first model predicts local coexistence of species with similar resource requirements if they are breeds) difficult and identification with published keys nearly impossible (Ulrich unpubl.). As far as known, all of the species are koinobiontic, internal larval parasitoids of phorid flies (Fischer 1976, Ulrich 1988) and existing breeding records indicate that most species are rather polyphagous and more confined to microhabitat than to certain hosts.

The present study deals with the Aspilota- and Orthostigma-community of a beech forest on limestone (Ulrich 1988, 1998). During an eight year study period 23 Aspilota and 2 Orthostigma species were found using ground-photo-eclectors (Ulrich 1998). 6 Aspilota spp. (Aspilota GW1, GW2, GW3, GW5, GW6, GW8) and Orthostigma GW1 were bred as polyphagous parasitoids of carrion exploiting Phoridae (Megaselia ruficornis, M. angusta, M. ?pulicaria, Gymnophora arcuata) out of dead snails (Ulrich 1999a).

aggregated, if associations in distribution (spatial or temporal) are minimal, if superior competitors are more aggregated than inferior ones, and if inferior competitors have a higher reproduction rate. It also predicts local guild size to be rather independent of the regional species pool (Sevenster 1996). The core-satellite hypothesis predicts a bimodal relative abundance distribution with a high number of rare species. Local extinction probability and regional distribution correlate negatively and there should be a substanspecies turnover through tial time. Additionally, Gotelli and Simberloff (1987) and Maurer (1990) inferred a positive relation between number of patches occupied and the mean density per patch (equivalent to the well known relation between local and regional abundance) and higher density variances of rare species.

Species of the closely related braconid genera Aspilota s. l. and Orthostigma (Wharton 1985, Fischer 1995, 1997) are very abundant in temperate European forests (Ulrich 1988, 1998). Although existing keys deal only with a limited number of species (Fischer 1971, 1972, 1976) there are probably several hundred species in Europe (Tobias 1986). Aspilota is in a process of rapid speciation and the intraspecific variability often makes the separation of species (even in The high number of species raises the question what allows these species to coexist. The group is a good candidate for a comparison between models of niche segregation and models which rely on patchiness and unpredictability. The present study tries to undertake such a comparison and will test some of the predictions from the above mentioned three models of coexistence.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The studies were undertaken 1980 to 1987 on a chalk plateau in a mixed beech forest (Melico-Fagetum subassociation *Lathyrus vernus*, 420 m altitude, roughly 120 years old) on limestone near Göttingen (FRG). Sampling was done using ground-photoeclectors. A detailed description of the study site and the sampling program is given in U1rich (1988, 1998).

Additionally, data from breeding experiments were collected. 6 species of *Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* were bred as polyphagous primary parasitoids out of 4 phorid flies (*Megaselia* spp., *Gymnophora arcuata*) in 90

Species Area of Mandibel Thorax Volumen Length of ovipositor Length of hind leg Wing area weight Body weight Mean density a ₄ Aspilota GW1 0.010 0.107 0.325 1.575 0.811 5.63E-05 0.01 Aspilota GW2 0.007 0.087 0.500 1.700 1.398 4.55E-05 8.08 Aspilota GW3 0.012 0.216 0.575 2.100 1.384 1.13E-04 0.44 Aspilota GW5 0.010 0.131 0.325 1.750 1.332 6.87E-05 2.23 Aspilota GW6 0.021 0.454 0.400 2.275 1.753 2.38E-04 0.01 Aspilota GW8 0.023 0.089 0.400 1.575 1.065 4.68E-05 0.03 Aspilota GW11 0.011 0.125 0.375 1.875 1.447 6.57E-05 0.16 Aspilota GW12 0.014 0.208 0.600 2.200 1.748 1.09E-04 0.01 Aspilota GW15	Mean gregati 1.25 2.84 3.14
Aspilota GW10.0100.1070.3251.5750.8115.63E-050.01Aspilota GW20.0070.0870.5001.7001.3984.55E-058.08Aspilota GW30.0120.2160.5752.1001.3841.13E-040.44Aspilota GW50.0100.1310.3251.7501.3326.87E-052.23Aspilota GW60.0210.4540.4002.2751.7532.38E-040.01Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.225 </th <th>1.25 2.84 3.14</th>	1.25 2.84 3.14
Aspilota GW20.0070.0870.5001.7001.3984.55E-058.08Aspilota GW30.0120.2160.5752.1001.3841.13E-040.44Aspilota GW50.0100.1310.3251.7501.3326.87E-052.23Aspilota GW60.0210.4540.4002.2751.7532.38E-040.01Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	1.25 2.84 3.14
Aspilota GW30.0120.2160.5752.1001.3841.13E-040.44Aspilota GW50.0100.1310.3251.7501.3326.87E-052.23Aspilota GW60.0210.4540.4002.2751.7532.38E-040.01Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	2.84 3.14
Aspilota GW50.0100.1310.3251.7501.3326.87E-052.23Aspilota GW60.0210.4540.4002.2751.7532.38E-040.01Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW120.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	3.14
Aspilota GW60.0210.4540.4002.2751.7532.38E-040.01Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW80.0230.0890.4001.5751.0654.68E-050.03Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW110.0110.1250.3751.8751.4476.57E-050.16Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW120.0140.2080.6002.2001.7481.09E-040.01Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	3.22
Aspilota GW150.0170.0680.4501.4500.7803.57E-050.02Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW160.0090.0980.5001.6251.1535.12E-050.01Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW170.0160.1520.4502.0251.4237.99E-050.01Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW190.0130.2030.5502.0751.6651.06E-040.01Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW200.0140.0860.4501.7251.0964.51E-050.77Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	
Aspilota GW210.0090.0860.4001.4250.7074.49E-050.32Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	5.74
Aspilota GW230.0170.1580.6501.9001.1818.27E-053.91Aspilota GW260.0160.2530.5252.2251.7481.33E-040.01	4.92
Aspilota GW26 0.016 0.253 0.525 2.225 1.748 1.33E-04 0.01	1.32
Aspilota GW27 0.047 1.059 0.900 3.275 3.542 5.56E-04 0.29	3.56
Aspilota GW28 0.038 0.310 0.700 2.700 2.270 1.63E-04 0.06	
Aspilota GW29 0.009 0.061 0.900 1.375 0.874 3.22E-05 0.01	
Aspilota GW30 0.019 0.197 0.500 2.100 2.270 1.03E-04 0.02	
Aspilota GW31 0.021 0.473 1.600 2.650 2.477 2.48E-04 0.05	
Aspilota GW32 0.004 0.035 – 1.250 0.679 1.84E–05 0.01	
Aspilota GW33 0.013 0.071 0.225 1.475 0.679 3.72E-05 0.01	
Orthostigma GW1 – 0.349 0.375 2.000 1.509 1.83E–04 0.04	
Orthostigma GW2 – 0.465 0.450 1.950 1.438 1.83E–04 0.11	

measured by the Lloyd-index.

Table 1. Morphological characteristics, mean densities, and mean aggregation of 25 species of Aspilota and Orthostigma. Lengths are given in mm, areas in mm^2 , and volums in mm^3 , body-weight in g. Data of samplings from 1980 to 1987. Mean density in ind.m⁻² a⁻¹. The numbering GWn refers to the numbering in Ulrich (1998). Aggregation

ION

Coexistence of Parasitic Hymeno ptera

227

dead snails (Arion ater) exposed 1986 in plastic tubes in a 100×100 m grid (every 10 m one snail). A detailed description of the experiments is given in Ulrich (1999a).

The present analysis is based on density data from eclector samplings and morphological data obtained by measuring 5 parameters: mandibel area, thorax volume, wing area, length of ovipositor and hind leg (Table 1). Body weight was inferred from thorax volume by a regression developed in Ulrich (1998), wing area was computed using the regression between wing length and width in Ulrich 1999b). Because of allometric relationships of mandibel and wing area as well as leg length on body weight, in K-means cluster analyses (STATISTICA version 6) the residuals of these allometric regressions were used. Raw data of the morphological variables were used in a canonical discriminant analysis which results in a set of linear combinations of the original variables (the canonical functions) (Juliano and Lawton 1990) and is especially appropriate to combine these variables with the above defined clusters.

Ulrich (1999c) found this model to be the best parametric alternative of the second order jackknife estimator. If more than 80% of the species are already represented in the sample the function is slightly negatively biased and underestimates S_{total} at an order of around 10% (Ulrich 1999c).

3. RESULTS

3.1. NUMBER OF SPECIES AND TEMPORAL STABILITY

After eight years of study 25 species of *Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* had been found. A collector's curve using all combinations of the yearly eclector data (according to the method of Ulrich 1998) and using a parametric asymptotic linear estimator (Ulrich 1999c) resulted in an estimate of 27 ± 3 species (Fig. 1). Because the estimator is slightly negatively biased the most probable number ranges between 27 and 30 species. This is the species number after longer periods of sampling and (assuming a steady species turnover) may serve as an estimate of the regional species pool.

As a measure of aggregation the index of Lloyd was used (Table 1) which assumes a negative binomial distribution and which is (except for very low densities) independent of density (Schenker and Streit 1980). Temporal and spatial associations of species were tested with the density based variance test of Schluter (1984) which compares row and column variances of species occurrence matrixes. The test was run with the emergence data from beginning of May to end of October.

The number of species in the regional



species pool (S_{total}) was estimated using an asymptotic linear model of species accumulation.

 $S_n = (an+b) / (1+(an+b) / S_{total})$ (1)

where S_n is the cumulative number of species after *n* samples, *a* and *b* are constants which determine the shape of the function and which are derived from the fitting process.

Area sampled

Fig. 1. Collector's curves of Aspilota and Orthostigma spp. of the Göttingen beech forest. Plotted are the numbers of species against the area sampled with ground-photo-eclectors (1981 to 1987). To eliminate trends in species numbers per year, all combinations of areas sampled were included in the graph. Included is the fit of the asymptotic linear model (formula 1) which results in a maximum of 27 \pm 3 species

This number can be compared with estimations of the yearly number of species. Such estimations were possible for the years 1981 and 1987. In these years 61 and 20 m², respectively, were sampled (see the detailed description in Ulrich 1998). Similar plots and computations as in Figure 1 resulted in estimates of 17 ± 2 (1981) and 11 ± 1 (1987) species (data not shown). That means that the annual number of species is around half of the species of the regional species pool and that the species turnover rate may be as high as 30%.

3.2. NICHE SEGREGATION

Morphological differences of the species were studied with a K-means cluster and a canonical discriminant analysis (Fig. 2, Table 2). The cluster analysis identified 5 clusters with 1 to 10 species (Table 2). The most abundant species are not evenly distributed throughout these clusters but concentrate in the first cluster. The species which were bred at the same time out of the same host species do not cluster together but are found in clusters 1 (*Aspilota* GW1, GW3), 2 (*Aspilota* GW5, GW8), 3 (*Aspilota* GW6, *Orthostigma* GW1), and 4 (*Aspilota* GW2). is Aspilota GW6 of the third cluster which may better be assigned to the first cluster. The analysis separates therefore Aspilota and Orthostigma spp. Figure 1 shows a rather weak separation of clusters 2 and 4 that contain most of the species. Root 1 correlates highly with wing area and root 2 with biomass.

A ranking of the species according to their body-weight and the wing area, however, gave low mean quotients between the weights of subsequent species of 1.14 ± 0.17 and between the wing areas of 1.08 ± 0.11 . Taking only the 8 dominant species (Table 1) these values are 1.18 ± 0.19 and 1.14 ± 0.10 . Both values are much lower than predicted by models of coexistence (Mac Nally 1988). To test whether the observed quotients are more regularly spaced than expected by chance I compared the above given standard deviations with the one obtained after 50 randomizations of values inside the observed range of quotients (Strong et al. 1979). Such a randomization process resulted in a standard deviation of 0.13 ± 0.03 for the biomass and 0.06 ± 0.02 for the wing area. Therefore, the observed values are even larger than the ones expected just by chance. The result does not point to a regular spacing of quotients and to a community wide character displacement.

A canonical discriminant analysis is able to visualize graphically the resolution of the cluster analysis (Fig. 2). The analysis resulted in 3 roots of which 2 were significant at the 5%-level and 24 of 25 assignments to clusters using these roots were correct. The exception

The more abundant *Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* species are bi- or trivoltine with activity periods in May/June and August (Fig. 3). Probably, this is also true for the rare species which were found in only one season. All



Fig. 2. Canonical discriminant analysis of 5 morphological factors (given in Table 2) of Aspilota and Orthostigma spp. Root 1: Eigenvalue: 15.92, CHI²: 67.97, p < 0.001; root 2: Eigenvalue 1.12, CHI²: 15.64, p < 0.05; root 3: Eigenvalue 0.01, CHI²: 1.74, p = 0.63. \diamond : species of cluster 1, \blacksquare : cluster 2, •: cluster 3, Δ : cluster 4, *: cluster 5. The arrow marks Aspilota GW6 of the third cluster.

Table 2. Cluster analysis (K-means clustering module of STATISTICA; 5 clusters, Euclidian distance) of *Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* spp. Morphological variables: body-weight, residuals of allometric regressions between body-weight and ovipositor length, wing area, length of hind leg, and mandibel area. The most abundant species (mean densities above 0.15 ind. $m^{-2} a^{-1}$) are marked in bold type

Cluster	Species	Distance from cluster centre	Peak of emergence
1	Aspilota GW1	0.068	bred in 1 October
1	Aspilota GW3	0.041	2 June, 2 July, 2 August
1	Aspilota GW15	0.061	1 August
1	Aspilota GW21	0.075	1 June, 2 July, 1 September
1	Aspilota GW23	0.035	1 June, 2 July, 2 August
1	Aspilota GW27	0.057	1 July, 1 August
1	Aspilota GW33	0.023	found in 2 July
2	Aspilota GW5	0.044	2 June, 1 August, 1 September
2	Aspilota GW8	0.032	2 May
2	Aspilota GW16	0.029	-
2	Aspilota GW17	0.07	-
2	Aspilota GW19	0.024	found in 1 September
2	Aspilota GW20	0.069	2 May, 1 August, 1 September
2	Aspilota GW26	0.037	2 June
2	Aspilota GW29	0.051	found in 2 August
2	Aspilota GW31	0.008	2 August
2	Aspilota GW32	0.013	found in 1 September
3	Aspilota GW6	0.138	1May
3	Orthostigma GW1	0.096	2 May, 1 July, 1 September
3	Orthostigma GW2	0.232	2 July, 1 September
4	Aspilota GW2	0.076	1 June, 2 July, 2 September
4	Aspilota GW11	0.054	2 June, 1 August, 1 September
4	Aspilota GW12	0.07	
4	Aspilota GW28	0.115	1 August
5	Aspilota GW30	0	1 June

species hibernate as larvae or pupae inside the host puparium. There they are attacked by a few polyphagous pupal parasitoids (*Basalys* spp., *Trichopria* spp., *Idiotypa nigriceps*, all Diapriidae) (Ulrich 1999a).

Are the species segregated by their activ-

most abundant species (densities above 0.3 ind. $m^{-2}a^{-1}$) (Table 1). This resulted in only 6 (out of 21) negative correlations. 5 correlations were significantly positive (p(t) < 0.05). In none of the cases significantly negative associations could be detected.

ity pattern? Schluter's (1984) variance test showed that the yearly emergences of the species are indistinguishable from a temporal random placement or that they even show a trend to similar timings of emergence (Table 3). The latter trend is indicated by the fact that 7 out of 8 pairwise comparisons have Wvalues above the mean of 12. The same trend came up after pairwise correlations of the 7

Are the species spatially segregated? This question was studied using the breeding results out of 90 dead snails (*Arion ater*) which were placed on the forest ground inside a $100 \times 100 \text{ m}^2$ grid (U1rich 1999a). Table 4 shows the test statistic of Schluter's variance test for the 90 snails separated into 10 weight classes. 40 out of 50 comparisons are indistinguishable from random distribu-



each month. and 1 June or 1 Septemdates each of the first or Phenologies of samplings spp. beech forest. sampling data half weeks Sampling combined abundant of of from the of of in a

231

Table 3. Variance test to detect temporal associations in emergence between species of Aspilota and Orthostigma. Given is the test statistic W of the variance test of Schluter (1984). The W values for positive (W pos) or negative (W neg) associations at $p(CHI^2) = 0.05$ are 21.03 and 5.23, respectively. 12 degrees of freedom. The test was done with the emergence data of Fig. 3. Data from 1 May to 2 October.

Species combination	W	p(CHI ²)		
All species	22.0	0.05		
All species of 1. Cluster	13.0	n.s.		
Aspilota GW3 – Aspilota GW21	12.9	n.s.		
Aspilota GW3 – Aspilota GW23	14.0	n.s.		
Aspilota GW3 – Aspilota GW27	20.5	n.s.		
Aspilota GW21 – Aspilota GW23	12.2	n.s.		
Aspilota GW21 – Aspilota GW27	13.9	n.s.		
Aspilota GW23 – Aspilota GW27	13.4	n.s.		
All species of 2. Cluster	23.0	0.05		
Aspilota GW5 – Aspilota GW20	9.2	n.s.		
All species of 3. Cluster	13.4	n.s.		
All species of 4. Cluster	12.3	n.s.		
Aspilota GW2 – Aspilota GW11	12.3	n.s.		
8 most abundant species	20.9	n.s.		
Species bred out of dead snails	20.5	n.s.		

Table 4. Spatial segregation of Aspilota spp and Orthostigma 1 in patches of dead Arion ater. Given is the test statistic W of the variance test of Schluter (1984). * $p(CHI^2) < 0.05$, ** $p(CHI^2) < 0.01$, *** $p(CHI^2) < 0.001$. Positive associations in bold type. The W values for positive (W pos) or negative (W neg) associations at $p(CHI^2) = 0.01$ are 25.19 and 2.16, respectively. 10 degrees of freedom each (all weight-class 90 degrees of freedom).

Species combination	Weight-class of the snails							All weight-		
	2-3	3 - 4	4 - 5	5-6	6 - 7	7 – 8	8 - 9	9 - 10	10 - 12	classes
All species	11.3	8.9	10.0	11.5	12.0	9.1	12.7	12.2	11.5	97
Aspilota 2 – Aspilota 3	7.1	8.8	9.4	10.8	11.4	8.8	12.6	12.6	13.0	101.7
Aspilota 2 – Orthostigma 1	0.8***	9.1	16.0	38.6***	5.2	33.5***	27.9**	11.2	58.9***	206.1***
Aspilota 3 – Orthostigma 1	0.9***	37.7***	11.8	9.3	8.3	8.2	9.3	35.6***	15.2	116.1
Aspilota 2, 3, Orthostigma 1	0.8***	8.0	8.3	9.8	5.2	7.4	7.4	10.7	12.6	86

tions and the W-values even cluster around the mean value of 10 (10.1 \pm 2.3). Negative associations were only found in the smallest and Orthostigma species are more aggregated than random assemblages of species I compared them

weight class of Arion. Orthostigma GW1 had the tendency to be associated with the Aspilota spp. These results point to largely independent spatial distributions of the species.

3.3. AGGREGATION

Most arthropod species occur in an aggregated manner. To see whether Aspilota with all parasitic Hymenoptera of the beech forest under study and with all ground living species (except *Aspilota*) (Fig. 4). The figure shows that the *Aspilota* spp. are clearly more aggregated than it would be expected from the whole species set. Their mean value of the Lloyd index is around 3.5 whereas



5

0

5

10

of the Göttingen beech forest in each class of aggregation (Lloyd index). Data from all species of which more than 20 specimen were found in one year. Stippled bars: all Hymenoptera, checkered bars: all ground living species (except Aspilota and Orthostigma), shaded Aspilota bars: and Orthostigma spp



25

35

30

Density

15

20

>50

50

\$2

\$

all species and the ground living ones have mean values around 1.5. In all 3 species sets the degree of aggregation appeared to be independent of mean density (data not shown). The Aspilota and Orthostigma species did not show a trend to higher aggregations in the more abundant species but even the opposite (correlation between Lloyd index and mean density: r = -0.65, p(t) = 0.06).

3.4. CORE-SATELLITE SPECIES

The core-satellite hypothesis states a bimodality in species number-density plots (Hanski 1982). This had been criticized by Nee et al. (1991) because it is often possible to receive in a bimodality by an adequate choice of scale. Indeed, figure 5 shows no bimodality when plotting species numbers against logarithmic density classes. Bimodality appeared however when lumping classes of the most abundant species.

Orthostigma spp.: in logarithmic (A) and linear density classes (B)

show that this is the case for all types of relative abundance distributions (Ulrich unpubl.).

Figure 6 shows that the Aspilota and Orthostigma species of the beech forest under study are best fitted by a Zipf-Mandelbrot distribution (Frontier 1985) of the form:

$$p_r = (r + X)^{-z}$$
 (2)

with p_r being the relative abundance of species r with parameters X = 3.0 and z = 3.99. Of other theoretical distributions a random fraction model fitted well but not as good as the



One can overcome this problem by a different reasoning. Communities are characterized by a certain relative abundance distribution and Maurer (1990) and Nee et al. (1991) have shown that for a log-series and log-normal distributions only certain parameter settings and density ranges are able to produce bimodal abundance class distributions. One can generalize these findings and

5 10 15 25 20 0 Species rank order

Fig. 6. Relative abundance distribution of Aspilota and Orthostigma spp. in the Göttingen beech forest. Given are also fits of a random fraction (A) and a Zipf-Mandelbrot model (B). The fits were done with the computer program Frequency Distribution (Ulrich 2000) assuming a total number of 30 species. Parameters of the Zipf-Mandelbrot model: x = 3.0, z = 3.99



Fig. 7. Patch occupancy of 30 model species distributed according to a Zipf-Mandelbrot relative abundance distribution (parameters X = 3 and z = 3.99). Individuals of these species (with a maximum density of the most abundant species of 1, 10, and 100 ind. per patch) were placed at random inside a grid of 300 × 300 cells, afterwards 100 cells were chosen at random and the number of species counted

former and log-normal, log-series or power fraction models failed to fit. This Zipf-Mandelbrot distribution will indeed result in dead snails to obey the first prediction (r = 0.76, p(t) < 0.05). However, more abundant species had clearly higher variances in patch

a bimodality of patch occupancy (Fig. 7), however, only if the most abundant species have densities of 10 to 100 ind. per patch. Lower densities lack typical core species. These densities required for a typical coresatellite pattern are slightly higher than the one observed (mean density of the dominant Aspilota GW2: 8 ind. m⁻² yr⁻¹; maximum annual density of this species: 27 ind. m⁻²; the species had densities above 10 ind. m⁻² only in 1986 and 1987 (Ulrich 1998). The model pattern for 10 ind. per patch resembles very much the real pattern in figure 5. Of course, the pattern of figure 7 is scale dependent. However, enhancing or reducing the number of patches will mainly influence the number of satellite species. The fraction of core species will remain more or less constant.

The core-satellite hypothesis also predicts a temporal bimodality with few species occurring in an intermediate number of years. Such a bimodality could be detected (Fig. 8). 8 species were found in more than 4 study years, 14 in only one, but only 4 species in 2 to 4 years.



Fig. 8. Number of Aspilota and Orthostigma spp. found in exactly 1, 2...7 of the study years. The distribution is bimodal ($\mathbb{R}^2 = 0.80$) and can be fitted by a second order polynomial



Gotelli and Simberloff (1987) and Maurer (1990) predicted on the basis of the core-satellite hypothesis higher mean patch densities and lower density variances of the more abundant species. Figure 9 shows a tendency of the parasitoid species bred out of

Number of patches occupied

Fig. 9. Mean patch density in dependence of the number of patches occupied of 6 parasitoids of necrophagous Phoridae bred out of 90 dead *Arion ater* snails. Given are also the standard deviations of density and a linear regression fit

density than less abundant species. This is the reverse of the prediction of Maurer (1990).

The model also predicts high species turnover rates both in the core and in the satellite species. However, despite high density fluctuations (factor 10 to factor 100) the species composition of the core group remained rather constant. 6 of the 8 dominant species were found in 5 of the 7 study years. The rank abundance order however changed considerably (Fig. 10). Mean value of Kendall's Tau was 0.33 ± 0.26 but no trend to lower concordance values in more distant years was observed.



these species. From a host point of view the niches are indistinguishable.

Douglas and Matthews (1992) compared fish species and found morphological differences mainly to be related with phylogeny but not with diet requirements. Similar conclusions were drawn by Wiens and Rotenberry (1980) after a comparison of morphology and ecology of shrub-steppe bird populations. In arthropods morphological studies (mostly in the form of cluster and discriminant analysis) are often used to infer niche segregation (Pearson 1980, Greene 1987, Warren and Lawton 1987, Juliano and Jawton 1990). The present study indicates that such reasoning has to be accompaof analysis with ecological nied an requirements.

Fig. 10. Concordance (Kendall's Tau) as a measure of constancy in species rank order between different study years. Given are all combinations of years (1981 to 1987: 21 correlations)

4. DISCUSSION

The aim of the present study was to compare three models about species coexistence. A classical niche analysis largely failed to separate the species. Morphological differences appeared to be rather small and only the species of the genus Orthostigma and the large species Aspilota GW30 could clearly be distinguished by their morphology. A community wide character displacement could not be detected. The data also show that morphological separation has its fallacies. Although Orthostigma GW1 could be separated by the cluster analysis it has the same hosts than the abundant Aspilota species of the first, second, and third cluster and even shows a trend to be spatially associated with

Of the annual numbers of species a constant fraction of only 3 to 5 species (out of a pool of 8 dominant species, Table 1) reached densities of 1 ind. $m^{-2} a^{-1}$ or more (Table 1, Fig. 8). 3 of these 8 species were bred out of the same phorid species (*Aspilota* GW2, 3, 5). The species could not be separated unambiguously by morphology and activity period but host preferences and differences in microhabitat requirements could not be studied in detail.

As predicted by the aggregation theory of local coexistence all species studied were highly aggregated and the degree of aggregation was higher than that of two random sets of parasitoid species that served as null models (Fig. 4). If one takes the yearly density fluctuations of the species as a rough estimate of the reproductive potential the second prediction of the aggregation theory also holds: less abundant species had higher density fluctuations. However, contrary to prediction (Atkinson and Shorrocks 1984) they were not less aggregated but even showed a trend to higher degrees of clumping.

Spatial bimodality of species rank order distributions are often a matter of scale (Nee *et al.* 1991), but figures 5 and 8 show that the *Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* species of the

beech forest under study had indeed spatial and temporal bimodal distributions with a high number of rare species. There had also been a tendency for higher local patch densities in the more abundant species. That this trend was rather weak may be due to the fact that the predicted pattern should be produced especially by species which colonize more than two thirds of all patches (Gotelli and Simberloff 1987, Maurer 1990) which was not the case in the breeding experiments used for analysis. However, the predicted lesser variance in density of the more abundant species could not be detected (Fig. 9). The species composition of the core species set was also rather constant (Table 1, Fig. 8)

died using samplings from ground-photo-eclectors and breeding experiments (Fig. 1, Table 1).

A classical niche analysis including morphological character displacement, temporal and spatial segregation and density fluctuations could not clearly separate the species (Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4, Figs 2 and 3). In a case where such a separation by morphological factors was possible, hosts and spatial distribution of this species were the same as in morphological different species.

As predicted from aggregation theory of coexistence all species were highly aggregated (Fig. 4) but aggregation and density appeared not to be correlated. Temporal sequences of the species rank orders of the abundant species (Fig. 10) were more or less stable.

In line with the core-satellite hypothesis bimodal species rank order distributions (temporal and in relation to density) with a high number of rare species were found (Figs 5 and 8). Mean patch density correlated only weakly with the number of patches occupied (Fig. 9). Relative abundance distributions were fitted by Zipf-Mandelbrot but not by log-normal or log-series models (Figs 6 and 7).

and did not change through time (Fig. 9).

Interestingly, the densities of the species ranged at the lower end of the density spectrum required for a typical core-satellite mode (Fig. 7). Only in 1986 and 1987 densities well above 10 ind. $m^{-2} yr^{-1}$ occurred (U1rich 1998) in the other years the densities remained below 5 ind. $m^{-2} yr^{-1}$. The modeling of figure 7 indicates that such densities will not result in a typical core-satellite pattern but will lack the core species end. A core-satellite pattern is therefore density dependent and may not occur in every year. The pattern seems not necessarily to be an intrinsic feature of communities of patchily distributed species.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS I thank Prof. J. Buszko and Dr. Kartanas for critical and valuable suggestions on the manuscript. Miss H. Pearson kindly improved my English. This work was in part supported by a grant from the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft. The author received a scholarship from the Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation.

6. REFERENCES

- Atkinson W. D., Shorrocks B. 1981 Competition on a divided and ephemeral resource: a simulation model – J. Anim. Ecol. 54: 43–59.
- Atkinson W. D., Shorrocks B. 1984 Aggregation of larval Diptera over discrete and ephemeral breeding sites: the implications for coexistence – Am. Nat. 124: 336–351.
- Austin M. P. 1999 A silent clash of paradigms: some inconsistencies in community ecology – Oikos, 86: 170–178.
- Colwell R. K. 1992 Niche: a bifurcation in the conceptual lineage of the term (In: Keywords in Evolutionary Biology, Eds. E. Fox-Keller, E. A. Lloyd) – Harvard Univ. Press, pp. 241–248.
- Comins H. N., Hassell M. P. 1987 The dynamics of predation and competition in patchy environments – Theor. Pop. Biol. 31: 393–421.
- Douglas M. E., Matthews W. J. 1992 Does morp-

5. SUMMARY

In a beech forest on limestone (Northern Germany) community structure and coexistence of a community of phorid (Diptera) parasitoids (*Aspilota* and *Orthostigma* spp, Hymenoptera, Braconidae) was stuhology predict ecology? Hypothesis testing within a freshwater stream fish assemblage – Oikos, 65: 213–224.
Fischer M. 1971 – Untersuchungen über die europäischen Alysiinae mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Fauna Niederösterreichs (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) – Pol. J. Entomol. 41: 19–160.

Fischer M. 1972 – Erste Gliederung der paläarktischen Aspilota-Arten (Hymenoptera, Braconidae, Alysiinae) – Pol. J. Entomol. 42: 323-459.

- Fischer M. 1976 Erste Nachweise von Aspilota-Arten im Burgenland (Hymenoptera, Braconidae, Alysiinae) - Ann. Naturhist. Mus. Wien 80: 343-410.
- Fischer M. 1995 On the old world Orthostigma species and additions to the Aspilota group of the genera (Hymenopetra, Braconidae, Alysiinae) -Linzer Zool. Beitr. 27: 669-752
- Fischer M. 1997 Taxonomic investigations on jaw--wasps (Hymenoptera: Braconidae: Alysiinae) of the Old World - Ann. Naturh. Museum Wien B. Botanik und Zoologie, 99: 97-143.
- Frontier S. 1985 Diversity and structure in aquatic ecosystems (In: Oceanography and Marine Biology - An Annual Review, Ed. M. Barnes) - Aberdeen, pp. 253-312.
- Gotelli N. J., Simberloff D. 1987 The distribution and abundance of tallgrass prairie plants: a test of the core-satellite hypothesis - Am. Nat. 130: 18-35.

- Maurer B. A. 1990 The relationship between distribution and abundance in a patchy environment -Oikos, 58: 181-189.
- Nee S., Gregory R. D., May R. M. 1991 Core and satellite species: theory and artefacts – Oikos, 62: 83-87.
- Pearson D. L. 1980 Patterns of limiting similarity in tropical forest tiger beetles (Coleoptera: Cicindelidae) Biotropica, 12: 195-204.
- Schenker R., Streit B. 1980 Saisonale Verteilungsmuster von Mikroarthropoden – Rev. Suisse Zool. 87: 1017-1028.
- Schluter D. 1984 A variance test for detecting species associations, with some example applications - Ecology, 65: 998-1005.
- Sevenster J. G. 1996 Aggregation and coexistence. I. Theory and analysis - J. Anim. Ecol. 65: 297-307.
- Sevenster J. G., Van Alphen J. J. M. 1996 Aggregation and coexistence. II. A neotropical Drosophila community - J. Anim. Ecol. 65: 308-324. Shelford V. E. 1913 - Animal Communities in Temperate America - Chicago Univ. Press.

- Greene E. 1987 Sizing up size ratios Trends Ecol. Evol. 2: 79-81.
- Griesemer J. R. 1992 Niche: historical perspectives (In: Keywords in Evolutionary Biology, Eds. E. Fox-Keller, E. A. Lloyd) - Harvard Univ. Press, pp. 231-240.
- Grinnell J. 1917 The niche-relations of the California Trasher - Auk 34: 427-433.
- Gurney W. S. C., Nisbet R. M. 1978 Single-species population fluctuations in patchy environments - Am. Nat. 112: 1075-1090.
- Hanski I. 1982 Dynamics of regional distribution: the core and satellite species hypothesis - Oikos, 38: 210-221.
- Hutchinson G. E. 1957 Concluding remarks -Cold Spring Harbour Symp. Quant. Biol. 22: 415-427.
- Hutchinson G. E. 1959 Homage to Santa Rosalia, or why there are so many kinds of animals - Am. Nat. 93: 145-159.
- Juliano S. A., Lawton J. H. 1990 The relationship between competition and morphology. I. Morphological patterns among co-occurring dytiscid beetles – J. Anim. Ecol. 59: 403–419.
- Lee H. L., DeAngelis D., Koh H. L. 1998 Spatial distribution of the Unionid mussels and the core-

- Shorrocks B., Atkinson W. D., Charlesworth P. 1979 – Competition on a divided and ephemeral resource - J. Anim. Ecol. 48: 899-908.
- Shorrocks B., Rosewell J., Edwards K., Atkinson W. D. 1984 – Interspecific competition is not a major organizing force in many insect communities – Nature, 310: 310–312.
- Shorrocks B., Rosewell J. 1987 Spatial patchiness and community structure: coexistence and guild size of Drosophilids on ephemeral resources (In: Organization of Communities Past and Present, Eds. J. H. R. Gee, P. S. Giller) - Blackwell Oxford, pp. 29-51.
- Strong D. R., Szyska L. A., Simberloff D. S. 1979 - Tests of community wide character displacement against null hypothesis - Evolution, 33: 897-913.
- Tobias W. I. 1986 Braconidae II Opred. Fauna SSSR 147, Leningrad. (in Russian).
- Ulrich W. 1988 Welche Faktoren beeinflussen die Populationen und die Strukturen der Gemeinschaften von bodenlebenden parasitoiden Hymenopteren in einem Kalkbuchenwald?. Thesis Göttingen. 231 pp.

-satellite hypothesis - Water-Science-and-Technology, 38:73-79. Leibold M. A. 1995 – The niche concept revisited: mechanistic models and community context -Ecology, 76: 1371-1382 Leibold M. A. 1998 - Similarity and local co-existence of species in regional biotas - Evol. Ecol. 12:95-110. Mac Nally R. Ch. 1988 – On the statistical significance of the Hutchinsonian size-ratio parameter -Ecology, 69: 1974-1982.

Ulrich W. 1998 – The parasitic Hymenoptera in a beech forest on limestone I: Species composition, species turnover, abundance and biomass - Pol. J. Ecol. 46: 261-289.

Ulrich W. 1999a – Species composition, coexistence and mortality factors in a carrion exploiting community composed of necrophagous Diptera and their parasitoids (Hymenoptera) - Pol. J. Ecol. 47: 49-72.

Ulrich W. 1999b – Morphology and ecology of the parasitic Hymenoptera: Analysis of three morphological parameters and their relationship to environmental factors – Pol. J. Ecol. 47: 117–133.

- Ulrich W. 1999c Estimating species numbers by extrapolation I: Comparing the performance of various estimators using large model assemblages – Pol. J. Ecol. 47: 271–291.
- Ulrich W. 2001 Species area relations generated by theoretical relative abundance distributions: parameter values, model fit and relation to species saturation studies – Pol. J. Ecol. (in press).
- Warren P. H., Lawton J. H. 1987 Invertebrate predator-prey body size relationships: an explanation for upper triangular food webs and patterns in food web structure – Oecologia, 74: 231–235.

- Wharton R. A. 1985 Characterization of the genus Aspilota (Hymenoptera, Braconidae) – Syst. Entomol. 10: 227–237.
- Wiens J. A., Rotennberry J. T. 1980 Patterns of morphology and ecology in grassland shrub-steppe bird populations – Ecol. Monogr. 50: 287–308.
- Wisheu I. 1998 How organisms partition habitats: different types of community organization can produce identical patterns – Oikos, 83: 246–258.
- Zizhen L., Hong L. 1997 The niche-fitness model of crop population and its application – Ecol. Mod. 104: 199–203.

(Received after revising January 2000)

sophile combined y E. 1913 - Animal Communities in Tem-

Andrivers B., Altrinson W. D. Charlesworth P.
Andre - Competition on a Ended and ophemeric means E. Annin. Eccl. 46: 899-998
A. D. 1984 - Interpretific competition is not a major organizing factor in usary incert communition - Name 10: 119-912
Anore S. Mana and B. S. Petropolitics is not a major organizing factor in usary incert communition of community communities for a photometal sector in Organization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Organization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Stanization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Stanization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Stanization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Stanization of Communities Factor and For and Ecc. 1 M. M. Gol. Y. S. Gillich - Bactering M. D. Stanization of Communities Factor M. Stanization of Communi

I obias W 1 1980 - Braconidae II - Opred Fauna SSSR 147 Leningrad (in Sussian)
Ution W 1986 - Welche Faktoren besindungen un Fondulungen und die Strukturen der Gemassene Gen menenn kalebauternenden Hymenenie-Silen.
Utineb W 1998 - Fre parasene in menen un ech foren on introdore L Species compouton.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemassen - Pol 1.
Erol 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemassen - Pol 1.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemassen - Pol 1.
Erol 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend mersaher framenen a samion exploring com Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Gemeinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Geneinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Geneinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Geneinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Geneinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Energen der Geneinen ergen der Geneinen ergen der Bend 46 261-289.
Utineb W 1998 - Bend 46 261-289.