

# Seed Predation Due to the Yucca-moth Symbiosis

Jon E. Keeley, Sterling C. Keeley, Cheryl C. Swift, Janet Lee

American Midland Naturalist, Volume 112, Issue 1 (Jul., 1984), 187-191.

Your use of the JSTOR database indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use. A copy of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use is available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html, by contacting JSTOR at jstor-info@umich.edu, or by calling JSTOR at (888)388-3574, (734)998-9101 or (FAX) (734)998-9113. No part of a JSTOR transmission may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except: (1) one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or (2) with prior written permission of JSTOR and the publisher of the article or other text.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

American Midland Naturalist is published by University of Notre Dame. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/notredame.html.

American Midland Naturalist ©1984 University of Notre Dame

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2001 JSTOR

## Notes and Discussion

## Seed Predation Due to the Yucca-moth Symbiosis

ABSTRACT: All species of Yucca (Agavaceae) require the pollinator services of a species of moth in the genus Tegeticula (Lepidoptera: Incurvariidae). These moths oviposit in the ovary of the plants and the larvae are entirely dependent upon Yucca seeds for food. The extent and distribution of larval seed predation was examined in nine Yucca species in the southwestern United States. The proportion of seeds destroyed by the yucca moth ranged from 3% in Y. schidigera from coastal southern California to 45% in one population of Y. angustissima from southern Utah. This sampling was done in 1979 at which time the Y. schidigera population averaged 0.6 larvae per fruit and the population of Y. angustissima averaged 9.3 larvae per fruit. A second sampling of these populations in 1982 averaged 0.5 for Y. schidigera and 5.6 for Y. angustissima. Several species showed significant differences between populations in the number of larvae per fruit. Contrary to expectation, based on the dogma that fruit production is dependent upon Tegeticula pollination (which is always followed by oviposition), a large number of fruits were found without larvae. The proportion varied greatly between populations but was as high as two thirds of all fruits in some populations. Observations suggested that these flowers had been pollinated by Tegeticula and the moths had oviposited in them but that the eggs failed to hatch.

#### Introduction

The Yucca-moth pollination interrelationship is a classical example of symbiosis. There are over 40 species of Yucca (Agavaceae) and apparently all are completely dependent upon the pollinator services of a species of moth in the genus Tegeticula (Lepidoptera:Incurvariidae). These moths in turn are entirely dependent upon Yucca seeds as food for their developing larvae.

Three species of Tegeticula are currently recognized: T. maculata specific for Yucca whipplei, T. synthetica specific for Y. brevifolia and T. yuccasella common to all the remaining Yucca species (Davis, 1967). All three moths have broadly similar behaviors (Riley, 1892; Trelease, 1983; Powell and Mackie, 1966; Aker and Udovic, 1981). Adults emerge in the spring (or early summer) in association with the flowering of the local Yucca species. Following copulation within the Yucca flower, the female gathers pollen and flies to another Yucca plant. Immediately after ovipositing in the ovary of the Yucca flower the female moth deposits part of her pollen on the stigma of the same flower. The egg hatches in a week and the larva feeds on the developing ovules. At approximately the time of fruit ripening the larva bores a hole through the ovary wall

and exists by lowering itself to the ground on a silk thread.

The extent of seed loss incurred by the Yucca plant has not previously been studied in detail. George Engelmann (who published the first account of the Yucca-moth interrelationship in 1872) stated in some unpublished notes that in one capsule he found half a dozen larvae and "all the seeds eaten" (Anonymous, 1974). Trelease (1893) noted that a female deposits no more than six eggs to an ovary "so that there is rarely more than one larva to each tier (locule) of seeds and consequently a fair percentage of seeds are allowed to come to maturity." Riley (1892), however, found as many as 21 larvae in a single fruit. Rau (1945) noted in Y. filamentosa the number of Tegeticula yuccasella larvae per fruit varied from 0-12 with an average of 4.9. He found that each larva destroyed 18-25 seeds and in some fruits all seeds were destroyed, whereas others had "hundreds of good seeds ready for dissemination." Powell and Mackie (1966) found that Yucca whipplei fruits harbored 0.4 larvae per fruit and consumed an average of 14.3% of the seeds. For Y. filifera, Davis (1967) found "one or two larvae per pod (sometimes none) and rarely over three." Wallen and Ludwig (1978) noted for Y. baccata that "of the seeds in infected fruits," 27% were consumed by yucca moth larvae, with an average of 7.5 larvae per fruit.

The purpose of this study was to gather information on the extent of seed predation by Tegeticula larvae for nine Yucca species in the southwestern U.S. and to determine whether differences in extent of predation were related to fruit or seed characteristics. The species were selected to represent most of the range of variation in the genus with respect to fruit type (baccate and capsular), growth form (acaulescent to arborescent), elevational distribution (0-2500 m), vegetational types (desert scrub, grassland, woodland) and geographical distribution (California to Texas).

#### **Methods**

Fruits were collected from populations of the nine *Yucca* species described below during early August 1979. Sample sizes were largely determined by availability of material. Less common species and ones which fruited poorly in 1979 were sampled less than others.

Fruits were opened and examined for *Tegeticula* larvae and, for a subsample, the number of seeds destroyed by a single larva was recorded. Fruit length was measured and, for a subsample the number of seeds in one of the six locules was recorded. Weights also were recorded for a sam-

ple of air-dried seeds.

In some populations of Yucca angustissima and Y. glauca the seeds had begun to disperse and so the number of larvae was estimated by recording exit holes in the fruit. This is a reliable estimate as all Tegeticula larvae leave just a single exit hole. Potentially this could overestimate the number of Tegeticula larvae since it is not known if other insects produce such holes in the Yucca fruit. Occasionally other larvae were encountered in fruits, but these were easily distinguished from the very distinctive Tegeticula larvae.

A smaller sampling of fruits was made in July 1982. At this time the species with the highest number of larvae per fruit and the species with the lowest number of larvae (from the 1979 sampling) were resampled to assess the extent of year-to-year consistency in *Yucca* moth seed predation. *Yucca angustissima* was one of the two species resampled, and at this time all fruits were collected prior to seed dispersal and thus direct observation of *Tegeticula* larvae (rather than exit

holes) was possible.

Yucca species.—Five indehiscent baccate fruited species (Yucca baccata, Y. brevifolia, Y. schidigera, Y. schottii, Y. torreyi) and four dehiscent capsular fruited species (Y. angustissima, Y. elata, Y. glauca, Y. reverchoni) were studied (names according to Webber, 1953). Populations sampled are shown in Appendix I. Yucca baccata is an acaulescent species ranging from southeastern California to SE Texas (750-2200 m) in grassland and open woodlands. Yucca brevifolia is a desert scrub tree of southeastern California, western Arizona and southern Utah (450-1800 m). Yucca schidigera, a low caulescent species commonly associated with chaparral and other scrub vegetations, ranges from coastal southern California to Arizona (0-1800 m). Only coastal populations from southern California were sampled as nearly all interior populations failed to fruit in 1979. Yucca schottii is an arborescent component of oak woodlands of southeastern Arizona and adjacent New Mexico (1200-2100 m). Yucca torreyi is a caulescent species of open scrub in New Mexico and Texas (600-1500 m).

Yucca angustissima, an acaulescent species of grasslands and open scrub vegetation is distributed from N-central Arizona to southern Utah (750-2300 m). Yucca elata is an arborescent species of desert grasslands and scrub vegetation ranging from western Arizona to central Texas (450-1800 m). Yucca glauca is an acaulescent species widely distributed in grasslands throughout the plains states (200-2200 m). Yucca reverchoni is an acaulescent plant of rocky, open, scrub

vegetation in central and southern Texas (300-1300 m).

#### RESULTS

Seed and fruit characteristics were not significantly different (P > 0.05) between populations of the same species and, therefore, are presented by species in Table 1. The species with fleshy baccate fruits had larger fruits and fewer, heavier seeds than the species with dry capsules. Seed weight varied between species by more than an order of magnitude (8-139 mg), and was positively related to fruit length (r = 0.86, p < 0.01, N = 9) with the Pearson Product Moment Correlation and negatively correlated with number of seeds per locule (r = -0.75, P < 0.01, N = 9).

The average number of *Tegeticula* larvae per fruit for the 23 populations of *Yucca* ranged from less than one to more than nine (Table 2). Four of the species had significant population differences in number of larvae per fruit. However, the number of seeds destroyed per larva did not differ between populations of the same species (data not shown). For baccate species the average number of seeds per larva ranged from 6.0-8.9 and from 14.8-19.6 in capsular species, and is undoubtedly a function of seed size; seed weight was negatively correlated with seeds destroyed per

larva (r = -0.85, P < 0.01, N = 9).

The percentage of seeds destroyed by *Tegeticula* for the 23 populations (Table 2) was estimated as the (number of larvae per fruit X seeds per larva) + (seeds per locule X 6). Clearly, the impact of *Tegeticula* is quite variable, ranging from 3-45% of the seed production. In some species, seed loss occurred from other causes such as seed abortion or other predators (not quantified here), and thus the impact of *Tegeticula* seed predation might represent a somewhat greater proportion of the seeds actually dispersed.

Even within populations the extent of damage from Tegeticula was quite variable. The distribution of larvae among fruits showed a highly significant departure from the Poisson Distribution for 19 of the 23 populations (four populations were excluded due to the small sample size). In all instances the departure from randomness was in the direction of clumped (as evident  $S^2$ ). At  $S^2$  and  $S^3$  are the departure from randomness was in the direction of clumped (as evident  $S^3$ ).

denced by the  $\frac{S^2}{\overline{X}}$  > 1). Within the same population some fruits had as many as 16 larvae

whereas others were completely free of *Tegeticula* (Table 2). In fact, in the majority of populations 33% or more of the fruits lacked larvae entirely and in some populations up to 66% of the fruits were free of *Tegeticula* (Table 2).

A 2nd-year sampling of the number of *Tegeticula* larvae was made for population ii of *Yucca angustissima*, which had the highest number of larvae per fruit, and for population ii of *Y. schidigera*, which had one of the lowest numbers of larvae per fruit.

In this second sampling the *Yucca angustissima* population remained higher than any of the previously sampled populations ( $\overline{X} = 5.6 \pm 4.4$ , n = 75) and the *Y. schidigera* population was lower ( $\overline{X} = 0.5 \pm 1.5$ , n = 75) than other previously sampled populations.

### Discussion

In light of the dogma surrounding the Yucca-moth symbiosis, the observation of large numbers of fruits with viable seeds (as shown by germination experiments) but without a Yucca moth larva is surprising. Hypotheses that could account for such a large proportion of fruits lacking larvae include: (1) These fruits resulted from self-pollination or pollination by agents other than Tegeticula; (2) Tegeticula pollinated these fruits but failed to oviposit in them, or (3) Tegeticula pollinated and oviposited in them but the egg or young larva died.

The possibility of self-pollination or pollination by agents other than Tegeticula has been examined for various Yucca species (for review, see Wimber, 1958; Powell and Mackey, 1966; Davis, 1967). In summary, most species are self-compatible to some degree and a few species apparently have a very limited capacity for self-pollination, though this seems to be quantitatively insignificant. Other insects are known to visit Yucca flowers, but none have been observed to act as pollinators. The general consensus in the literature seems to be "that the great majority of yuccas would never bear fruit if it were not for the deliberate act of pollination performed by the Tegeticula moths" (Davis, 1967). If this is true, then the absence of larvae in a fruit is most likely due to either the failure of Tegeticula to oviposit successfully or produce viable larvae as suggested by hypotheses 2 and 3. Observations made on Y. schidigera fruits in 1982 suggest that indeed egg and/or larval viability may be the major reason for fruits lacking larvae. This is based on the fact that in many yuccas the female yucca moth often causes a noticeable constriction of the fruit due to tissue damage at the site of oviposition (Riley, 1892; Trelease, 1893; Webber, 1953). Examination of mature Y. schidigera fruits lacking larvae revealed that all had a prominent constriction associated with scar tissue extending across the ovary wall. Microscopic examination of a

Table 1. - Seed and fruit characteristics for the nine Yucca species

	Seed weight (mg)	Fruit length (mm)	Seeds/locule
	$\overline{X} \pm sd(n)$	$\overline{X} \pm \text{SD}(n)$	$\overline{X} \pm sd(n)$
Baccata species			
Y. baccata	$93^a \pm 21 (54)$	$89^a \pm 32 (39)$	$23^{ab} \pm 7 (4)$
Y. brevifolia	$99^{a} \pm 21 \ (100)$	$69^b \pm 9 (155)$	$26^{\circ} \pm 3 (31)$
Y. schidigera	$139 \pm 38 (100)$	$87^{\circ} \pm 16 (161)$	$20^{b} \pm 4 (35)$
Y. schottii	$28 \pm 11 (100)$	$65^{b} \pm 18 (145)$	$23^{ab} \pm 8 (106)$
Y. torreyi	$117 \pm 32 (100)$	$73 \pm 19 (299)$	$20^b \pm 6 (55)'$
Capsular species			
Y. angustissima	$23 \pm 6 (100)$	$56 \pm 11 (226)$	$51^{\circ} \pm 8 (16)$
Y. elata	$17^b \pm 6 (100)$	$49 \pm 12 (454)$	$50^{\circ} \pm 9 (89)$
Y. glauca	$16^{b} \pm 4 (100)$	$52 \pm 8 (80)$	$53^{\circ} \pm 11 \ (17)$
Y. reverchoni	$8 \pm 3 (100)$	$34 \pm 6 (182)$	$34 \pm 8 (39)$
P	< 0.01	< 0.01	< 0.01

Species with the same superscript are not significantly different (P>0.05 with Fisher's LSD)

subsample showed the presence of the very distinctive *Tegeticula* egg where the oviposition scar terminated on the inside of the ovary wall. Thus, these fruits were apparently pollinated by *Tegeticula* and oviposited in but the egg did not hatch

Tegeticula and oviposited in but the egg did not hatch.

The fact that some populations of Yucca have many fruits free of Tegeticula larvae and other populations have few fruits lacking larvae may be related to a number of reasons. Perhaps populations of Tegeticula in some regions have lower egg viability than populations in other regions or possibly a certain level of egg viability is common throughout the range of Tegeticula and thus the proportion of fruits lacking larvae is a function of moth density. On the other hand, some Yucca populations may be capable of inhibiting the hatching of Tegeticula eggs and thus "regulating" Tegeticula densities in their population.

Table 2.- Tegeticula larvae per fruit and estimated percentage of seeds destroyed for populations of the nine Yucca species. The range of number of Tegeticula larvae per fruit and percentage of fruits without larvae are given for each population

	Population	$\overline{X} \pm sd$ (n)	Percentage of seeds destroyed	Range of larvae/fruit	Percentage of fruits without larvae
Baccata species					
Y. baccata	i	$2.1 \pm 2.8(15)^{cd}$	10	0-7	27
	ii	$2.5 \pm 4.4(24)^{cde}$	12	0-16	58
Y. brevifolia		$1.4 \pm 1.5(155)^{\circ}$	7	0-6	39
Y. schidigera	i	$0.6 \pm 0.9(80)^{a}$	3	0-4	65
J	ii	$0.6 \pm 0.9(81)^a$	3	0-4	64
Y. schottii	i	$0.7 \pm 1.1(83)^{ab}$	3 3 5	0-5	64
	ii	$1.6 \pm 1.6(62)^{\circ}$	10	0-5	31
Y. torreyi	i	$1.1 \pm 1.8(49)^{abc}$		0-7	49
	ii	$0.8 \pm 1.4(74)^{ab}$	6	0-7	68
	iii	$0.6 \pm 1.0(57)^a$	4	0-3	68
	iv	$1.6 \pm 1.7(119)^{c}$	11	0-8	42
Capsular species					
Y. angustissima	i	$3.2 \pm 2.4(51)^{ed}$	15	0-11	6
	ii	$9.3 \pm 4.4(48)$	45	3-17	0
	iii	$4.8 \pm 4.4(131)$	23	0-15	11
Y. $elata$	i	$3.4 \pm 2.8(118)^e$	22	0-12	10
	ii	$1.1 \pm 1.4(80)^{6c}$	7	0-9	48
	iii	$2.2 \pm 1.4(26)^{cd}$	14	0-11	35
	iv	$1.5 \pm 1.3(119)^{c}$	10	0-4	29
	v	$1.2 \pm 1.8(25)^{\acute{b}c}$	8	0-3	36
	vi	$1.8 \pm 2.7(88)^c$	12	0-16	49
Y. glauca		$1.4 \pm 1.9(80)^{\circ}$	7	0-8	50
Y. reverchoni	i	$2.2 \pm 2.0(47)^{cd}$	18	0-7	30
	ii	$1.5 \pm 1.7(135)^{c}$	12	0-7	39

Species with the same superscript are not significantly different (P>0.05 with Fisher's LSD)

### LITERATURE CITED

- AKER, C. L. AND D. UDOVIC. 1981. Oviposition and pollination behaviour of the *Yucca* moth, *Tegeticula maculata* (Lepidoptera:Prodoxidae), and its relation to the reproductive biology of *Yucca whipplei* (Agavaeae). *Oecologia*, **49**:96-101.
- Anonymous. 1974. George Engelmann's notes on the pollination of Yucca. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard., 61:907.
- Davis, D. R. 1967. A revision of the moths of the subfamily Prodoxinae (Lepidoptera: Incurvariidae). U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. No. 255. Smithsonian Institution of Washington, D.C.

POWELL, J. A. AND R. A. MACKIE. 1966. Biological interrelationships of moths and Yucca whipplei (Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae, Blastobasidae, Prodoxidae). Univ. Calif. Publ.

Entomol., 42:1-59.

RAU, P. 1945. The Yucca plant, Yucca filamentosa, and the yucca moth, Tegeticula (Pronuba)

yuccasella Riley: an ecologico-behavior study. Ann. Mo. Bot. Gard., 32:373-394.

RILEY, C. V. 1892. The yucca moth and Yucca pollination. Rep. Mo. Bot. Gard., 3:99-158.

TRELEASE, W. 1893. Further studies of yuccas and their pollination. Ibid., 4:181-226.

Wallen, D. R. and J. A. Ludwig. 1978. Energy dynamics of vegetative and reproductive growth in spanish bayonet (Yucca baccata Torr.). Southwest. Nat., 23:409-422.

WEBBER, J. M. 1953. Yuccas of the Southwest. U.S. Dep. Agric. Agric. Monogr. No. 17. Washington, D.C. 94 p.

WIMBER, D. R. 1958. Pollination of Yucca whipplei. M.A. Thesis, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California. 77 p.

APPENDIX 1. - Location of Yucca populations used in this study

Baccata species	P	Population
Y. baccata	i.	
	ii.	10 km W of Payson, Gila Co., Arizona
$Y.\ brevifolia$		5 km W of Lancaster, Los Angeles Co., California
Y. schidigera	i.	
	ii.	
Y. $schottii$	i.	East boundary of Chiricahua National Monument, Cochise Co.,
		Arizona
	ii.	Portal, Cochise Co., Arizona
Y. $torreyi$	i.	
	ii.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	iii.	
	iv.	30 km E of Marathon, Brewster Co., Texas
Capsular species		
Y. angustissima	i.	5 km W of Hurricane, Washington Co., Utah
	ii.	Southeastern boundary of Zion National Park, Kane Co., Utah
	iii.	30 km S of Page, Coconino Co., Arizona
Y. elata	i.	
	ii.	
	iii.	35 km NE of Globe, Gila Co., Arizona
	iv.	Oracle Junction, Pinal Co., Arizona
	v.	Wilcox, Cochise Co., Arizona
	vi.	Paradise, Cochise Co., Arizona
Y. glauca		75 km W of Clinton, Roger Mills Co., Oklahoma
Y. reverchoni	i.	15 km W of Eldorado, Schleicher Co., Texas
	ii.	50 km S of Vernon, Wilbarger Co., Texas

Jon E. Keeley<sup>1</sup>, Sterling C. Keeley<sup>2</sup>, Cheryl C. Swift<sup>1</sup> and Janet Lee<sup>3</sup>, <sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Occidental College, Los Angeles, Calif. 90041; <sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, Whittier College, Whittier, Calif. 90608, and 3Department of Botany, University of California, Riverside 92521. Submitted 3 January 1983; accepted 2 December 1983.