

## NOTES AND NEWS

## Recent Letters

Dear Mr. Godfrey:

Dr. Lee D. Miller's review of "Butterflies of the World" by H. L. Lewis in the "Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society" (Vol. 28, No. 2, 31 May 1974, p. 178-179) was a review of a professional. As an amateur, the book has been of tremendous value to me. Granted there may be some errors, but if professionals look close enough, they will find some errors in every book, just as Dr. Miller has in every book review he has made.

Since there are hundreds of amateurs like myself who are members of The Lepidopterists' Society, they too should be considered. Although there may be some technical errors in the book, the author should not be criticized. I challenge Dr. Miller's comments "Perhaps one expects too much from a book that purports to be what this one does, but it simply is not a good book." That may be Dr. Miller's opinion, but I think it is an excellent book and I highly recommend it for all amateurs. I might add that of all the many books in my library, this one gives the most complete information on more worldwide species in one volume, and should be a valuable help to amateurs and professionals alike.

There are too few modern books on Lepidoptera published today. Authors should be encouraged instead of discouraged. There is every evidence that author Lewis put forth much time and research, and I congratulate him and the publishers for a job well done.

RAY W. BRACHER

The Editor:

Lee D. Miller's forthright review of H. L. Lewis' "Butterflies of the World" prompts me to comment. He remarks, "This book is fairly good and accurate for the Old World and quite poor and out of date for the New." I would say he is as rusty on the southern fauna as I on the palearctic after fifty years residence south of the line.

Asked by a junior colleague to resolve f.37 on plate 187, which purports to show *Motasingha atralba*, I was induced to undertake a quick check of the Indo-Australian plates and text, and ended with three foolscap pages of corrections. I think the Old World portion of the book is as "poor and out of date" as the New World portion.

During 1942-43 A. S. Corbet and G. Talbot, both working on the British Museum material, with the advantage of having the Boisduval, C. and R. Felder, Moore, Butler and other types together for comparison, gave us for the first time a comprehensive revision of *Euploea*. Admittedly this is a difficult genus. The author [Lewis] of this book, claiming to have worked in the same institution, ignores their publication. Plate 154, f.15 named *E. darchia* is subsp. *hopfferi* C. & F. Felder from Aru, and is very different from typical *darchia* Macleay described from Darwin, Australia. In fact Lewis does not even mention Australia as a locality for the species. F.16 on the same plate is *E. deheeri* Doherty from Sumbawa; it is a subspecies of *E. modesta* Butler from Burma-Thailand. So here Lewis is neither consistent nor correct. He uses the species name for f.15 (*darchia* for what is subsp. *hopfferi*) and the race name for f.16 (*deheeri* for what is *modesta* subsp.) having previously on the same plate, (f.5) used *arisbe*, a race name, for the subspecies of *darchia* from Timor!

Proven synonyms have been revived as though the work of other authors had never been published. Plate 154, f.18, *E. diana* is a synonym of *E. algea horsfieldi* C. & R. Felder; f.23 *E. duponcheli* is *E. algea* Godart from Amboina; pl. 155, f.10,

*E. moorei* Butler (but not Felder) is *E. modesta ainoae* Bryk, to cite but a few examples. Also on the latter plate, f.24 *Idea blanchardii* Marchal from Celebes is completely omitted from the text.

Among the Pieridae, *Catopsilia crocale* with black antenna is regarded by most writers as only a form of *C. pomona* with pink antenna. The figures on pl. 159 are correctly named, the names in the text, p. 274, are wrong. The figs. 1-4 are for pl. 161, and those for pl. 161 are for pl. 159. On the same plate, f.15 is certainly not *Delias nigrina* from Australia. It looks like *D. funerea buruana* Rothschild from Buru. F.16 is *D. henningia* Eschscholtz from the Philippines, and f.17 is *D. harpalycé* Donovan from Australia.

More serious are such errors among the Satyridae as the reference of species to the wrong genus: pl. 165, figs. 7, 14, 15, 17 are all lumped under *Geitoneura* Butler, a generic name which I believe, on a quick check, has never previously been used for these species. *Hobartia* and *tasmanica* are species of *Argynnina* Butler, *kershawi* and *lathoniella* belong to *Oreixenica* Waterhouse and Lyell, a practice followed in Europe and Australia at least since the publication of Waterhouse and Lyell's "Butterflies of Australia" in 1914. One could go on and on because the Lycaenidae and Hesperidae could be similarly criticized (I have mentioned *M. atralba*, this surely is a grotesque figure, defying description or identification) but space forbids.

The pity of all this misplaced effort, as Miller says, is that the book is bought by keen young students who will rarely see these mistakes, and, as I have so often found, are then discouraged when they find they have been misled by errors in identification, nomenclature, etc. as in this work.

A phrase of H. M. Tomlinson's written about another book many years ago comes to mind ". . . a book over which the cymbals have been banged too loudly."

L. E. COUCHMAN

Dear Sir,

I enclose a short note arising from an article that appeared in the last issue [no. 4, vol. 28] of your Journal.

Checking Dr. van Someren's list of food-plants of East African Rhopalocera against my own records, I noticed against *C. cynthia* (about halfway down p. 320) is printed "Guttiferae: *Garcinia* sp. (unconfirmed Sevastopulo)." There is definitely some muddle here as I have never bred *cynthia* myself nor have I any records of its food-plant. In my counter list (food-plants and the species that feed on them) I have recorded *C. eudoxus* as having been said to eat *Garcinia*. The proofreading of this paper is most appalling, there is hardly a page without one or more spelling errors, but whether the *cynthia* entry is due to bad proofreading or an error on Dr. van Someren's part I cannot say.

D. G. SEVASTOPOLO

I am very grateful for all the assistance provided by the members of the Editorial Committee of the Journal during my first year as editor. J. C. Downey and M. Toliver also assisted in special ways. The cooperation of the Executive Council and T. D. Sargent in facilitating the transition of the editorial duties is appreciated. Special recognition is due to Katherine S. Doktor-Sargent for contributing her excellent drawing of the early instar *Catocala relictá* Walker, cover illustration of Volume 29. L. LeMere, Technical Illustrator, Illinois Natural History Survey, helped in many ways with the illustrations that accompanied the submitted manuscripts. I thank my wife, Judy, for her patience and aiding with the proofreading.

GEORGE L. GODFREY