

SPIDERS (ARANEAE) ON THE RED LISTS OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

VALERIÁN FRANČ

Department of Biology, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Matej Bel University, SK-97401 Banská Bystrica, Slovakia. Fax: +421 88 4138643

Abstract

FRANČ V.: Spiders (Araneae) on the Red Lists of European countries. In GAJDOŠ P., PEKÁR S. (eds): Proceedings of the 18th European Colloquium of Arachnology, Stará Lesná, 1999. Ekológia (Bratislava), Vol. 19, Supplement 4/2000, p. 23-28.

Spiders rank among the less popular groups of animals and this is reflected in Red Lists of rare and threatened animals throughout the countries of Europe. They are absent in approximately 2/3 of European Red Lists. On the other hand, wingless spiders often have a very high bioindicative value, because they are usually more strongly tied to a biotope than flying insects. This paper includes a comparison of the ecosozological positions of spiders in several European countries and a proposal for a scheme to assess the extent to which they are endangered.

Introduction

Spiders have formerly been ranked among the less popular groups of animals and this situation has not fundamentally changed until now. This is also reflected in Red Lists of rare and threatened animals throughout Europe. Spiders are totally absent in approximately 2/3 of the accessible European Red Lists. Moreover, the ecosozological (= ecological conservation, "sozological" is based on Greek word "sozein" which stands for "to protect") category of each spider species in the rest of the Red Lists is measured more or less subjectively on the basis of the author's knowledge and experience. This paper includes a comparison of the ecosozological status of spiders in several European countries and a proposal for a scheme to assess the extent to which they are endangered.

Spiders in European Red Lists

Although spiders are missing from the majority of European Red Lists, this does not mean that they are less threatened by human activities in the landscape than the well-known

Table 1. Number of species of spiders in various endangerment categories, compiled from the Red Lists of seven European countries. Ex – extinct, E – endangered, V – vulnerable, R – rare, D – decreasing, CD – care demanding, I – insufficiently known, sp. – estimated number of species. * including 10 species „rare and endemic“ + 3 species indicated as „endemic“

Country	Endangerment categories							Σ	sp.	%
	Ex	E	V	R	D	CD	I			
Finland	2	1	5	20	1		9	38	650	5.85
Sweden	4	4	5	14		17		44	700	6.29
Germany	17	1	22	60	14			114	850	13.41
Great Britain		23	31	26			7	87	600	14.5
Italy			7	17*				23	1300	1.77
Czechoslovakia		26	4					30	900	3.33
Slovakia	11	88	137	157			21	414	900	46.0

and popular butterflies, for example. Spiders are wingless animals and often have a very high bioindicative value, because they are usually more strongly tied to a biotope than are flying insects. Unfortunately, the occurrence of many spiders can be decreased by even subtle changes of their environment.

More or less serious attention to spiders was paid only in the Red List of Finland (RASSI et al., 1992), Sweden (EHNSTRÖM, GÄRDENFORS, LINDELÖW, 1993), Germany (HARMS, 1984), Great Britain (MERRETT, 1991), Italy (GROPALI, PRIANO, 1993), the former Czechoslovakia (ŠKAPEC et al., 1992) and Slovakia (GAJDOŠ, SVATOŇ, 1993; GAJDOŠ, 1995). An annotated checklist of spiders has also been published for Bohemia (BUCHAR, 1992). Although it is not a standard Red List, the abundance and ecology of a number of species are commented upon in the current paper; and the least frequent species are specified as being „rare“. Comparison of the ecosozological status of spiders in various European countries is presented in Table 1.

This situation clearly differs between countries included in Table 1. In this connection we can distinguish three groups of countries:

- less attention to spiders is paid in Finland, Sweden, Italy and the former Czechoslovakia. Only 2-6% of the whole spider fauna is included in these Red Lists. They have been constructed as a model approach instead of with the aim of listing threatened spider species completely;
- intermediate attention to spiders is paid in Germany and Great Britain, where 13-15% of the whole spider fauna is included in the Red Lists;
- high attention to spiders is paid in Slovakia, where more than 40% of spiders appear in the Red Lists.

These results do not imply that spiders in Slovakia are much more threatened than in the other countries! The Red Lists of the Slovak spider fauna have been constructed very carefully and thoroughly. The distribution of spider species in Slovakia is often poorly known. Species documented by only one or two records are automatically listed in category E [*Centromerus levitarsis* (SIMON), *Cinetata gradata* (SIMON), *Lepthyphantes midas* SIMON]

but their actual distribution is likely to be less restricted. I do not doubt the scarcity of these species, but do draw attention to the fact that their ecosozological status (referred to hereafter as „ESS“) has been estimated on the basis of only a few isolated records. On the other hand, many xerothermic species (quite common in Central Europe) have a very high ESS in Fennoscandia or in Great Britain. For example, *Alopecosa cursor* (HAHN) and *Hypsosinga heri* (HAHN) are listed among endangered „E“ species in Sweden; the same applies to *Callilepis nocturna* (LINNAEUS), *Gibbaranea bituberculata* (WALCKENAER), *Alopecosa fabrilis* (CLERCK), *Pistius truncatus* (PALLAS) and *Pellenes tripunctatus* (WALCKENAER) in Great Britain.

The most threatened ecological groups of spiders in Central Europe include species characteristic of ancient forests and xerothermic rocky slopes, and especially species of eolian sandy steppes and wetlands - marshes and peat bogs: *Taranucnus setosus* (O. P.-CAMBRIDGE), *Arctosa perita* (LATREILLE), *Lycosa singoriensis* (LAXMANN), *Pirata uliginosus* (THORELL), *Dolomedes plantarius* (CLERCK), *Argyroneta aquatica* (CLERCK), *Amaurobius erberi* (KEYSERLING), *Anyphaena furva* MILLER, *Cheiracanthium campestre* LOHMANDER, *Echemus angustifrons* (WESTRING), *Gnaphosa microps* HOLM, *Diaea pictilis* (BANKS), *Neon valentulus* FALCONER, *Sitticus zimmermanni* (SIMON), etc.

Comparison between Red Lists (not only concerning spiders!) in relation to specific categories of data is not easy, and is sometimes nearly impossible. Therefore, it is necessary to define precisely and objectively the process of spider endangerment assessment throughout Europe, so that the results can be made compatible and suitable for comparison. This is discussed in the next part of this paper.

Ecosozological status evaluative scheme

The idea of an endangerment evaluation scheme does not have a long history. The first version known in the former Czechoslovakia was developed by VLAŠIN (1984) for amphibians, but it was, for a while, forgotten. JEDLIČKA et al. (1994) discussed the potential of this method in relation to the whole animal kingdom. The new version, modified for spiders, has recently been published by FRANC, HANZELOVÁ (1996). I would like to offer this evaluation system to arachnologists throughout Europe. The ecosozological status of each species can be calculated by adding up the nine scores for the following evaluation criteria:

I. Distribution

1. The whole range

- | | |
|---|---|
| – cosmopolitan or nearly cosmopolitan | 0 |
| – species with a large range (Palaeartic and wider) | 1 |
| – species with a lesser range (Eurosiberian, etc.) | 2 |
| – species with a local range (Central Europe, etc.) | 3 |
| – endemic or relict species | 5 |

2. *Position of the country with regard to the species distribution*
- inside the range 0
 - at the border of the range 2
 - outside the range 4

3. *Occurrence of the species within the country*
- widespread throughout the country 0
 - occurs in a part of the country 1
 - occurs only in several regions 3
 - occurs only on a few isolated sites 5

II. Abundance

4. *The abundance*
- very frequent species 0
 - frequent species 1
 - less frequent species 2
 - infrequent (relatively rare) species 3
 - rare species 4
 - very rare species 5

5. *The trend during the last decades*
- abundance increasing -1
 - abundance more or less stable 0
 - abundance decreasing perceptibly 2
 - apparently retreating species 4
 - rapidly disappearing species, which have already become extinct in some regions 6

III. Ecology

6. *Range of habitat requirements*
- euryoecious or up to expansive species 0
 - species with less broad habitat requirements 2
 - species with narrow habitat requirements 4
 - specialised species with very narrow habitat requirements 6

7. *The mobility of the species, and capacity to spread to new biotopes*
- high 0

- average 2
- limited or very low 4

IV. Anthropogenic factors relating to degree of habitat protection

8. *Change in degree of human disruption of habitats*

- is improving –1
- is more or less stable 0
- biotopes are disrupted without major changes 1
- biotopes are highly disrupted 3
- biotopes are apparently vanishing 5

9. *Likelihood of protection by habitat conservation*

- the species is well-known among arachnologists (and partially among conservationists), it ranks, or it has a chance to rank, among protected species, the data concerning its threat status and ways of protection are available in Red Lists, etc. 0
- the species is little-known and we cannot state the preceding facts 1

We can use the following hierarchic system of ESS in practice:

- 2 – 5 adaptable, little vulnerable
- 6 – 12 presently not threatened
- 13 – 19 care demanding (CD)
- 20 – 26 rare (R)
- 27 – 33 vulnerable (V)
- 34 and more endangered (E).

Discussion

Finally I would like to test this evaluation system on selected spider species, including well-known or significant ones from both faunistical and zoogeographical points of view. The extent to which these species are endangered may obviously be different in the other countries of Europe!

Eresus cinnaberinus (OLIVIER), score: 223314220 = 19 → CD (potentially R)

Uloborus walckenaerius LATREILLE, score: 223414220 = 20 → R

Centromerus levitarsis (SIMON), score: 205546341 = 30 → V

Lepthyphantes midas SIMON, score: 325526331 = 30 → V

L. varians (KULCZYŃSKI), score: 505414211 = 23 → R

Trichoncus hackmani MILLIDGE, score: 325525221 = 27 → V

Walckenaeria acuminata BLACKWALL, score: 201314221 = 16 → CD
Cyclosa oculata (WALCKENAER), score: 324424321 = 25 → R
Arctosa maculata (HAHN), score: 303324231 = 21 → R
A. perita (LATREILLE), score: 235546441 = 34 → E
Lycosa vultuosa C. L. KOCH, score: 324435330 = 27 → V
Pardosa nigra C. L. KOCH, score: 203214211 = 16 → CD
Dolomedes fimbriatus (CLERCK), score: 203324230 = 19 → CD (potentially R)
Mastigusa arietina (THORELL), score: 324416321 = 26 → R
Liocranum rutilans (THORELL), score: 324424221 = 24 → R
Gnaphosa microps HOLM, score: 525546451 = 37 → E
Nomisia exornata (C. L. KOCH), score: 323314321 = 22 → R
Thanatus striatus C. L. KOCH, score: 324424321 = 25 → R
Pseudicius encarpatus (WALCKENAER), score: 213324221 = 20 → R

References

- BUCHAR, J., 1992: Komentierte Artenliste der Spinnen Böhmens (Araneida). Acta Univ. Carol. (Biologica), 36, p. 383-428.
- EHNSTROM, B., GÄRDENFORS, U., LINDELÖW, Å., 1993: Rödlistade evertrebrater i Sverige 1993. Databanken för hotade arter, Uppsala, 69 pp.
- FRANC, V., HANZELOVÁ, A., 1996: New and Remarkable Findings of Spiders (Araneida) and their Ecosozological Value. Acta Univ. Carol. (Biologica), 40, p. 365-382.
- GAJDOŠ, P., 1995: Spiders (Araneae). In JEDLIČKA, L. (ed.): Prehľad taxónov fauny Slovenska. Projekt RVT 20-517-03 Ekosoziologický výskum a manažment ohrozených druhov organizmov. Prírodovedecká fakulta UK, Bratislava, p. 1-16. (In Slovak)
- GAJDOŠ, P., SVATOŇ, J., 1993: The red list of spiders of Slovakia. Boll. Acc. Gioenia (Italy), Sci. Nat., 26, p. 115-133.
- GROPALI, R., PRIANO, M., 1993: Invertebrati non troglobi minacciati della fauna Italiana. In PAVAN, M. (ed.): Contributo per un „Libro rosso“ della fauna e della flora minacciate in Italia. Inst. di Entomologia dell' Univ. di Pavia, p. 183-424.
- HARMS, K.H., 1984: Rote Liste der Spinnen (Araneae). In BLAB, J. (ed.): Rote Liste der gefährdeten Tiere und Pflanzen in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Kilda Verl., Greven, p. 122-125.
- JEDLIČKA, L., BOHUŠ, M., ČAPUTA, A., FERIANCOVÁ-MASÁROVÁ, Z., KOCIÁN, L., KOŠEL, V., KOVÁČ, V., KRNO, I., ŠTEPANIČOVÁ, O., VARGA, J., 1994: Evaluation of ecosozological value of animal taxa. Zborník referátov zo seminára „Ochrana biodiverzity na Slovensku“ v Záhorskej Bystrici, Bratislava, p. 89-102. (In Slovak)
- MERRETT, P., 1991: Spiders (Araneae). In BRATTON, J. H. (ed.): British Red Data Book, 3. Invertebrates other than insects. Joint Nature Conservation, Peterborough, p. 126-217.
- RASSI, P. (ed.), 1992: Report on the Monitoring of Threatened Animals and Plants in Finland. Min. of the Environment, Helsinki, 328 pp.
- ŠKAPEČ, L. (ed.), 1992: Red book of threatened and rare species of plants and animals of Czechoslovakia, 3. Bezstavovce. Příroda, Bratislava, 152 pp. (In Czech)
- VLAŠIN, M., 1984: Earth, water, amphibians. Památky a příroda, 9, 7, p. 424-433. (In Czech)