

synonymy as forms or mentioned in brief footnotes. The treatment of the *Eurema* species is highly questionable. All the Theclinae except for *Calycopis* are placed in the catchall genus "*Thecla*". I doubt whether his treatment of *Calycopis* is accurate, and he apparently arbitrarily retains "*Thecla beon*". He uses *Everes tulliola* for *Zizula cyna*, and *Hermiargus fileus* for *H. hanno* ssp. He also retains the palearctic genus *Scolitantides* for a number of species.

A careful critique of this work would bring out dozens of needed nomenclatural changes. One such interesting case is what Hayward calls *Anaea "cratias"*. This actually is an erroneous correction originally made by William P. Comstock in his generic revision for the much used "*crateis*". The correct specific name as published by Hewitson is *cratais*. Another long-standing error is the use of *Euptychia biocellata* Godman 1905, for *Euptychia imbrialis* (Weeks) 1901, due to an error in dating Weeks' taxa (1911 instead of 1901).

Because a complete synonymy is given on the family, subfamily, generic and subspecific levels, it seems strange to this reviewer to note the lack of synonymy at the specific level when the nominate subspecies is not part of the Argentine fauna.

Another serious error should be noted. As the author mentions in a footnote on page 12, many species based on Evans' "Santiago del Estero" in Bolivia have been included. Hayward somehow ignored the fact that there is a Santiago del Estera (sometimes "Estero") in the eastern part of the Bolivian department of Santa Cruz, near the Brazilian border. He, therefore, relegated these species to the Argentine province of Santiago del Estero.

The work is replete with typographical errors and omissions. The majority of these probably would have been corrected if Hayward had lived to see the work through the printing stage. These errors and omissions detract seriously from the scientific accuracy of the work. It is hopeful that the Instituto Miguel Lillo will publish a correction booklet.

Despite its many weaknesses this catalog is a must for the few active collectors in Argentina. For those who want to know what flies in Argentina it is the most up-to-date and accurate help available. It is amazing what Hayward accomplished, working nearly alone, devoid of easy access to the majority of the type specimens and to much of the literature.

ROBERT C. EISELE, *Pichanal, Salta, Argentina.*

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE CATALOGS, LISTS, FAUNAL AND OTHER PAPERS ON THE BUTTERFLIES OF NORTH AMERICA NORTH OF MEXICO ARRANGED BY STATE AND PROVINCE (LEPIDOPTERA: RHOPALOCERA), by William D. Field et al. Smithsonian Contributions to Zoology, no. 157. 104 p. For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. Price: \$1.70 U.S.

This ambitious undertaking, said to have involved a great many years, is a veritable gold-mine of source papers, long overdue. It collects under one cover an astonishing wealth of references to ecological and zoogeographical information, often from obscure journals, although the authors confess that to prepare a definitive bibliography would take the rest of their lives. References to behavior, migration, life histories, foodplants, taxonomic notes, aberrations, local and regional lists, and distributional notes are included. A "Supplemental Bibliography" lists papers that embrace a number of states. In the words of its authors, "Bibliography is the handmaiden of all research. It is our hope that this bibliography will stimulate much future work on the fauna of North America."

OAKLEY SHIELDS, *Department of Entomology, University of California, Davis, California 95616.*