

might differ genetically from their typical counterparts in terms of background resting preferences.

In summary, while this book may fall somewhat short of expectation with regard to scholarship and synthesis, it is on the whole an ambitious and admirable project. Herein are compiled the results of two decades of substantial and varied investigations by the author and his associates on the phenomenon of melanism in the British Isles. As a single source of these many results, this book will have a permanent value.

THEODORE D. SARGENT, *Department of Zoology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002.*

BUTTERFLIES OF THE WORLD, by H. L. Lewis. 1973. Harrap Books, London; and Follett, Chicago. xvi + 312 p.; 208 pls. Price: about \$30.00 (U.S.).

No book could begin to live up to the pretentious title of this one, though in some respects *Butterflies of the World* makes a good attempt. There are recognizable figures of many (definitely *not* even most) of the world's species, and the figures alone would make the volume worth far more than its purchase price *if* all of the species were correctly identified.

Regrettably such is not the case. I have the feeling that Brig. Lewis prepared the text and the legends for the figures based on one idea of how the insects on each plate would be numbered, but that someone else did the final numbering. Those plates with even columns and rows of figures do not show transpositions, only those with irregularly placed specimens. Nevertheless, the presence of such easily avoided errors suggests careless proofreading and is inexcusable. A partial listing of the plates affected by transpositions of numbers includes plates 19, 60, 63, 64 and 118; there are others. Such errors greatly diminish the accuracy and usefulness of the book.

Errors of fact are even less excusable. *Anartia amalthea* (L.), figured on Plate 13 and listed from "N. and C. America," is in fact a South American butterfly that has not been recorded from either North or Central America, though Seitz lists it without documentation from Central America. *Troides aeacus* (C. & R. Felder) from the Indo-Australian region is figured on Plate 24 as *Eurytides xanticles* (Bates) from the American tropics: even utilization of a rudimentary knowledge of Lepidoptera could have prevented this mistake. The genus *Anetia* has been variously considered a danaid (correctly) or simply a nymphalid, but not a heliconiid as figured on Plate 43; and the danaid genus *Ituna* is included on Plate 44 as a heliconiid. *Tellervo*, the only Indo-Australian ithomiid, is shown on Plate 156 as a danaid.

Lewis states (p. xii), ". . . the names given in the book are those commonly in use, and to be found in the latest works of scholarship. . . ." Unfortunately, the "latest work of scholarship" published in the Western Hemisphere seems to be Klots' 1951 *Field Guide*! At the same time Forster's Bolivian satyrid work is partially, but not critically, accepted, resulting in *Altopedaliodes tena* (Hewitson) being figured as that on Plate 54 and as *Pedaliodes tena* (Hewitson) on Plate 63. Some nomenclatorial questions that were thought to be solved have been rescrumbled, such as the distinction between *Euphyes* and *Atrytone* (Plate 21) and the replacement of the preoccupied *Plestia* by *Zestusa* (Plate 22).

There is a small Corrigenda sheet accompanying our copy of this book: unfortunately it should be much larger! The number of inadvertent synonyms created is very large (e.g., *Mitoura spinetorum* for *M. spinetorum* on Plate 20), and a full errata sheet should be forthcoming to rectify these errors. Since this book is

being merchandised by many booksellers throughout the English-speaking world it will be bought by many budding lepidopterists, ones who will never see a review that points up some of the errors in it. For the future accuracy of records provided by these people, an errata sheet (really a pamphlet) is not only desirable, but a must.

This book is fairly good and accurate for the Old World and quite poor and out-of-date for the New. Perhaps one expects too much from a book that purports to be what this one does, but it simply is not a good book. I personally feel that Lewis was fighting a deadline and sacrificed final accuracy for a publication date. We would all be happier had he not! Nevertheless, if one takes the determinations with the proverbial "grain of salt," the figures make the book useful, for there are the best available representations of many poorly-known species contained within it. Further, one can get a general idea of what to expect in an area, even if he dare not rely on the names.

LEE D. MILLER, *Allyn Museum of Entomology, 3701 Bay Shore Road, Sarasota, Florida 33580.*

HEWITSON ON BUTTERFLIES, 1867-1877, with a Preface by Dr. L. G. Higgins. 1972. E. W. Classey Ltd., Hampton, Middlesex, England, iv + 242 p. (including cover pages). Price: \$12.50 (U.S.). Distributed exclusively in the United States by Entomological Reprint Specialists, P. O. Box 77224, Dockweiler Station, Los Angeles, California 90007.

This volume contains reprints of four privately published works by William Chapman Hewitson: "Descriptions of one hundred new species of Hesperidae" (1867-1868), "Descriptions of some new species of Lycaenidae" (1868), "Equatorial Lepidoptera collected by Mr. Buckley" (1869-1877) and "Bolivian butterflies collected by Mr. Buckley" (1874). In these remarkable papers Hewitson described ten new genera and no fewer than 403 new species of butterflies, all of which he intended to figure in either his *Illustrations of . . . Exotic Butterflies* (1852-1872) or *Illustrations of Diurnal Lepidoptera* (1863-1878). Regrettably Hewitson could figure only about half of the species described in these four pamphlet sets.

L. G. Higgins' Preface gives a brief, but interesting account of Hewitson's life and the histories of these important works; the works themselves give an insight into Hewitson. Hewitson was a wealthy enough man to afford the publication of his own papers and a proud one, as demonstrated by his comments justifying the publication of "Descriptions of some new species of Lycaenidae":

"Were I aware that any entomologist was engaged in a monograph of any particular group of butterflies, I should consider that I merely performed an act of common courtesy in avoiding said group until he had done with it. An entomologist, knowing that I am and have been for some time engaged in a monograph of the Lycaenidae, has, fortunately for me, given me notice that he is about to describe all those species in his possession. It is therefore in self-defence alone that I have been driven, greatly against my wish, to publish the following descriptions of species . . ."

Most systematists can identify with Hewitson in this complaint!

While it was Hewitson's fondest wish that he could figure all of the species described by him, he was unable to complete the task. Inasmuch as the types are preserved in the British Museum (Natural History), though some have not been identified with certainty, this volume could have been made an exceedingly valuable contribution by the inclusion of even black-and-white photographs of the