THE NAMES OF CERTAIN BUTTERFLIES OF THE EASTERN UNITED STATES

by BRYANT MATHER

Two books of great value to the student of the butterflies of the eastern United States were published in 1951: *A Field Guide to the Butterflies of North America, East of the Great Plains* by ALEXANDER B. KLOTS (Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston), and "The Butterflies of Virginia" by AUSTIN H. CLARK and LEILA F. CLARK (*Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections,* 116, no. 7, Washington). In some cases these works do not use the same names to designate the same butterflies. These differences are, in most cases, not such as to cause serious confusion; they are however annoying to one who would like to have a basis for selecting the best current usage in designating butterflies. A number of these differences were called to the attention of Mr. CLARK, Dr. KLOTS, and Mr. CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS in January 1952, and a series of communications and comments was elicited which are summarized below for the interest of others. It should be noted that, although this summary has been reviewed by those whose comments are included, and permission for its publication has been obtained, the opinions are given essentially as they were stated informally in letters and do not represent the explicit, fully documented discussions that would have been given had the contributors themselves prepared them for publication.

The differences may be considered in three groups: (1) those involving considerations of relationships and priorities to determine the "correct" name; (2) those involving the classification (*i.e.,* rank or grade) of a name, as between genera and subgenera or species and subspecies; and (3) those involving steps taken for improving or correcting the spelling. The comments given below have been sorted into these groups and are taken up in systematic order.

DIFFERENCES INVOLVING RELATIONSHIPS AND PRIORITY

(1) *Minois pegala* (Clarks, p. 32), *Cercyonis pegala* (Klots, p. 72): KLOTS used *Cercyonis* on the advice of R. L. CHERMOCK, an expert in the group; the CLARKS regard their use of *Minois* as an example of preferring "lumping"; DOS PASSOS has a letter from DE LESSE (15 January 1952) stating the belief that *Cercyonis* (type species *Papilio alope* Fab.) should be use for our Nearctic species, but DOS PASSOS feels that, since DE LESSE'S opinion is unpublished, the proper current usage would be *Minois* following the most recent check list (McDunnough, 1938).

(2) *Junonia evarete coenia* (Clarks, p. 45), *Precis lavinia coenia* (Klots, p. 108): KLOTS regards his use of *Precis* as an example of preferring "lumping" and cites HEMMING (*The Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies,* pp. 73-74) as follows: "The name *Junonia* Hb., though nomenclatorially valid, is not required, as *lavinia* Cram. is congeneric with *octavia* Cram., the type of *Precis* Hb., which has page priority." The CLARKS used *Junonia* following W. P. COMSTOCK but CLARK comments that perhaps *Precis* should have been used. DOS PASSOS regards *Precis* as probably preferable. The CLARKS again followed W. P. COMSTOCK in using *evarete* and CLARK notes that *Papilio lavinia* Cramer is preoccupied by *P. lavinia* Fabricius and that *P. evarete* is the oldest available name. DOS PASSOS notes that CORBET (1948, p. 54) uses *lavinia* and considers it conspecific with *Papilio* (*Nymphalis*) *orithya* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 473, and that as a result, the correct name would appear to be *Precis orithya evarete* (Cramer), apparently also following COMSTOCK (1942, p. 190) in discarding *Papilio lavinia* Fabricius, 1775, and using *Papilio evarete* Cramer, 1779.

(3) *Calephelis virginiensis* and *C. borealis* (Clarks, p. 69), *Lephelisca virginiensis* and *L. borealis* (Klots, p. 123): KLOTS' use of *Lephelisca* follows W. D. FIELD. CLARK states that when the genus *Calephelis* was established an oriental species was given as the type, but the authors made it perfectly clear that the genus was founded on (*C.*) *virginiensis* misidentified. He notes that an Opinion of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature states: "in the absence of indubitable proof to the contrary the species named shall be the type." He feels that the proof here is indubitable that what the authors had in mind was (*C.*) *virginiensis,* thus it becomes the type and the name *Lephelisca* has no standing. DOS PASSOS, on the other hand, after an investigation of the problem, has concluded that the correct name to use is *Nymphidia* Boisduval & Leconte (1833-1837), noting however that an application by WILBUR S. MCALPINE is pending before the International Commission to validate *Calephelis.*

(4) *Cyaniris argiolus* (Clarks, p. 73), *Lycaenopsis argiolus* (Klots, p. 169): DOS PASSOS notes that the type species of *Cyaniris* Dalman, 1816, is *argianus* Dalman, 1816 (=*Papilio semiargus* Rottenburg, 1775) and the type species of *Lycaenopsis* Felder & Felder, 1865, is *L. ananga* Felder & Felder, 1865. He notes that TUTT regarded neither of these as congeneric with *Papilio* (*Plebejus*) *argiolus* Linnaeus, 1758, p. 483, and hence proposed *Celastrina,* 1906, p. 131, for *argiolus.* DOS PASSOS concludes that it is certainly more correct is use *Celastrina* for the time being. KLOTS used *Lycaenopsis* since he regarded *Cyaniris* as inapplicable but followed others who feel that *ananga* and *argiolus* are congeneric.

(5) *Eupsyche m-album* (Clarks, p. 78), *Strymon m-album* (Klots, p. 133): KLOTS explains in his introductory comments on the Theclinae (p. 126) that he feels that it is necessary for the present to lump most of the species in one genus, in the absence of an adequate large-scale study. CLARK remarks that perhaps they should have used *Strymon,* but feels that it is a "convenient grab-bag" for a decidedly heterogeneous assemblage of hairstreaks. DOS PASSOS would prefer *Eupsyche* but feels it to be a matter of opinion.

(6) *Proteides clarus* (Clarks, p. 147), *Epargyreus clarus* (Klots, p. 206): Both the CLARKS and KLOTS explain their different choices as following BELL (!). DOS PASSOS indicates that the choice depends on whether *mercurius* (see Klots, p. 284) is congeneric with *clarus;* if so, then only one generic name is required and *Proteides* has line priority; if not, then the usage employed by KLOTS is proper.

(7) *Rhabdoides cellus* (Clarks, p. 149), *Autochton cellus* (Klots, p. 211): KLOTS follows BELL, the CLARKS use *Rhabdoides* as a matter of preference, DOS PASSOS notes that the type species of *Rhabdoides* is *Eudamus cellus* Boisduval and Leconte (?1837, pl. 73) and that the type of *Autochton* is *Autochton itylius* Hübner. The question is whether *itylius* and *cellus* are congeneric.

DIFFERENCES INVOLVING THE CLASSIFICATION OF NAMES

(1) *Zerene caesonia* (Clarks, p. 112), *Colias* (*Zerene*) *cesonia* (Klots, p. 189): CLARK regards *Zerene* as a separate genus from *Colias* on ecological and distributional grounds and feels that they are quite as distinct as some other genera in the Pieridae. KLOTS feels that *Zerene* is but a subgenus of *Colias* and refers to his discussion in *Entomologica Americana* 12:175 (1931). DOS PASSOS regards the question as a matter of opinion and suggests following MCDUNNOUGH (1938) which would give *Zerene* generic status.

(2) *Eurema jucunda* (Clarks, p. 117), *Eurema daira daira* summer form *jucunda* (Klots, p. 195): KLOTS believes that *daira,* 1819, and *jucunda,* 1833 are conspecific; he states in his book, however (p. 195): "Absolute proof of this will only be obtained by rearing a brood of one from two known parents of the other." The CLARKS found only typical *jucunda* in Virginia.

(3) *Battus philenor, Graphium marcellus* (Clarks, pp. 118, 145); *Papilio philenor, Papilio marcellus* (Klots, p. 179): KLOTS, in his book, (p. 171) refers to *Battus* and *Graphium* as subgenera, and regards the question as a matter of opinion. CLARK feels that *Battus, Graphium,* and *Papilio* are groups that differ from each

other in all stages much more than many universally accepted genera. DOS PASSOS prefers the CLARKS' usage and notes that it follows FORD'S recent revision of *Papilio*.

(4) *Atrytone alabamae* (Clarks, p. 174), *Atrytone dion alabamae* (Klots, p. 255): KLOTS considered *dion* and *alabamae* as conspecific, following LINDSEY, BELL, and WILLIAMS (1931, p. 117) who had before them only the male type and a single female of *alabamae,* both from Alabama. CLARK concludes that *alabamae* and *dion* are not conspecific after having compared a long series of *alabamae* from Virginia with the types of both *alabamae* and *dion* and considered various other factors such as time of flight and plant associations. DOS PASSOS observes that this question can only be solved by breeding but that the reasons given by Clark for his conclusion seem cogent.

DIFFERENCES INVOLVING SPELLING

(1) *Euptychia sosybius* and *Euptychia areolatus* (Clarks, pp. 38, 36), *Euptychia hermes sosybia* and *Euptychia areolata* (Klots, p. 69): In these two cases KLOTS has used *sosybia* and *areolata* so that the specific name will be of the same gender as the generic name.

(2) *Zerene caesonia* (Clarks, p. 112), *Colias (Zerene) cesonia* (Klots, p. 189): DOS PASSOS has explained that STOLL wrote the name *cesonia* in the Dutch and *sesonia* in the French text; most authors have emended *cesonia* to *caesonia* which is probably more classical Latin, but DOS PASSOS and KLOTS decided that the original spelling should be used in accordance with Article 19 of the *Règles.*

P.O. Drawer 2131, Jackson, Miss., U.S.A.

OBITUARIES

MARGUERITE S. FORSYTH

MARGUERITE SHEPARD (Mrs. LESLEY E.) FORSYTH of Florida City, Florida, died February 6, 1952, in North Haven, Connecticut, while visiting a sister. She was born August 28, 1889, in North Haven. In 1923 she and her husband and son moved to Florida. Her husband died in 1950; her son, WILLIAM H. FORSYTH 2D, is at present a resident of Miami.

Soon after arriving in Florida, Mrs FORSYTH began the collecting of Lepidoptera that was continued until poor health forced her to curtail activities in the late 1940's. Her work in southern Florida, and particularly in the upper Florida Keys, was of the greatest importance to science. The accuracy of her data and observations helped greatly to dispose of some of the deliberate falsifications which commercially minded collectors in tropical Florida had created by mislabelling tropical specimens. Her collecting during the period when so many of the famous localities in southern Florida were being wiped out by real estate developments, drainage and fires furnished many records now unobtainable.

Needless to say, Mrs. FORSYTH discovered many rarities. Two butterflies which she collected have been named after her: *Papilio polyxenes* ab. *forsythae* Wood and *Papilio cresphontes* ab. *forsythae* Gunder. She was, as