

**Book Review: “Butterflies of Australia. Their Identification, Biology and Distribution” by Michael F. Braby.** [CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood (2000). Two A4-sized hardcover volumes (1008 pp); 70 colour plates. ISBN 0643065911. RRP Aust. \$195].

by Kelvyn L. Dunn

Former Contract Consultant: Species’ distributions; 15 Yackatooon Road, Upper Beaconsfield, Victoria 3808, Australia; E-mail: kelvyn\_dunn@yahoo.com

Dunn, K.L. (2004). Book Review: “Butterflies of Australia. Their Identification, Biology and Distribution” by Michael F. Braby. CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood (2000). *Calodema*, 2: 37-48.

### **Introduction**

Butterfly ‘twitching’ has not obsessed our ranks as it has many bird watchers in Australia, with ambitions to see every bird kind within a given period. I have encountered at least 315 of the 397 butterfly species within the Australian faunal subregion, and still look forward to seeing and photographing live, those intriguing Torres Strait forms magnificently illustrated in this work. This impressive twin tome may captivate some in their strive to see all political Australia’s 414 species, and for others invigorate them to ‘get back out there’ observing and discovering life’s secrets. In an era of conservation, the beautiful plates can substitute for a collection for some, but many specimens from remote areas are still needed to define local forms and delineate subspecies’ distributions. And, other species still await recognition. Several reviews or discussions of this work have already appeared (e.g. Hancock, 2001; Lees, 2001; Samson, 2001; Atkins, 2002; Hawkeswood, 2003), each voicing unique opinions, dependent on the reviewer’s focus speciality. My review avoids reiteration and is best read in conjunction with the earlier ones for completeness. The abbreviations ‘DD91’ and ‘CW81’ are used for Dunn & Dunn (1991) and Common & Waterhouse (1981) respectively.

### **Work team**

Braby’s book has solidified on the CSIRO technical contributions of E.D (Ted) Edwards, and Murray Upton. In addition, ten Regional Advisory Panellists “improved the quality and accuracy of the text”; 39 people “read and improved” one or more species accounts in which they had specialist field experience; five others read drafts of the preface and introductory sections - not carefully enough though! 14 specialist botanists provided expertise on identification and nomenclature. Two experts produced the outstanding photographic plates. And, I assisted as a Contract Consultant on species distributions, and later critiqued the manuscript for CSIRO Publishing after its submission.

### **Book layout**

Fortressed on a century of classic works, Braby (2000) is the Goliath of knowledge of butterflies of the Australian faunal subregion (1008 pp - and fairly small print). Precision referencing in the species accounts is the norm. Numerous citations of earlier primary writers, including the 19th Century naturalist, Gervase Mathew, sadly forgotten by most recent authors - despite biological contributions ahead of his time, are refreshing. Indeed, this work is very 'Australian'. It is corner-stoned in the systematics of Waterhouse & Lyell (1914), founded on the life histories of Waterhouse (1932), built on the adult behavioral observations of McCubbin (1971), and rooted in the physiological accounts of Common & Waterhouse (1972 & 1981). The illustrations rival Bernard D'Abrera's photographic multi-masterpieces, it is cored in the recent biogeographical distributions and influenced by the holistic taxonomic philosophy of Dunn & Dunn (1991), and standardised with the common sense, epithet spellings of Nielsen *et al.*, (1996) ignoring anachronistic gender modifications. Collectively it glorifies them all as an encyclopaedic piece - a baseline, and habitat-focussed reference for Australian species for the 21st Century.

The volumes are hard bound, but I have plastic-covered mine because they were already loosing the black coating at regular abrasion sites. **Volume 1** includes the Introduction covering history, classification, morphology, biogeographic components and conservation. This is followed by a second chapter on butterfly collection and study, including immature stages, photography and contact societies (in some cases providing useful web addresses). The third chapter comprises a species checklist, and subsequent butterfly Family chapters systematically review the Australian subregional fauna. **Volume 2** focuses on species accounts for the remaining two large families. Two appendices review island groups within Australian political boundaries: Christmas, Cocos-Keeling, Macquarie, Lord Howe, Norfolk, and the eastern and northern Torres Strait groups. A further two deal with species opined of conservation concern, and list protected fauna by State. Appendices five and six comprise a list of larval hosts from over 100 families, alphabetically arranged, with records traced to primary accounts, and a list of attendant ants (non-referenced). An index, glossary and extensive Reference list (c.1000 entries) including most of the cited publications used in the species accounts (some are missing) completes the work.

With such a voluminous text it was necessary to compress the layout in the species accounts. Paragraphs are not separated by a spacer line or indented, giving the text a historic 'newspaper look' in places, and the small font size and fine lettering makes extended reading tiring. The nine-page glossary covers basic and rather traditional taxonomic terms, mimicking that of CW81 and appears dated as a result. The historic term 'geographic race' (rarely if ever mentioned in the body text) is defined, but the contemporary term, 'local form' (used frequently in species accounts) is absent. Citations of 'erroneous information' from earlier sources mentioned in species accounts would have been better in an appendix of 'dubious records'; a format utilised in Layberry, Hall & Lafontaine's 1998 tome, 'The butterflies of Canada'.

## Species accounts

The species accounts are concise, yet provide exhaustive coverage of literature accumulated over the previous century or more. Genera begin with a shadowed textbox of systematics. Numerically scaled monochrome illustrations of adults introduce species, and review of literature is categorised under nine sections. Species are cross-referenced to color plates (see rear of Volume 1), which usually include both wing surfaces of preserved specimens of each sex, and often examples of seasonal forms or prominent subspecies (Atkins, 2002 has already noted the omission of a female of *Papilio ulysses*). Essential for future taxonomic reference, collection details are provided for 64 of the 70 plates. The latter comprise a limited selection of juvenile stages and live adults. In-text citation of figures, for example, fig. 32 (cited p.670) could have been cross-referenced to p.618 to ease finding.

A range-fill map accompanies each species with subspecies distinguished, and areas of extinction and irregular or seasonal occurrence indicated. Although an improvement on the generalised, and sometimes speculative maps in CW81, one North American reviewer (Lees, 2001) commented that they remain retrogressive compared with plotted distributions. One or two 'flight charts' are placed at the top of each map, but regions covered are often broad, poorly reflecting the temporal, latitudinal variation within some States. Where comparison is possible (for species of limited distribution) they agree well with those in DD91 and occasionally fill in some month gaps (e.g. *Pithecopis dionisius*), but for most wide-ranging species they remain of limited use. As an example, in *Ogyris amaryllis* the two temporal charts define only minor parts of the species huge continental distribution; by contrast the precise regional grid-based delineation in DD91 is superior, and these remain definitive for most species, even though over a decade old.

Weak evidence is occasionally used to justify statements, or the cited papers purported to support some conclusions do not. In the text-box for *Ypthima* the sources CW81 and "Braby 1995a" are used to claim the *Y. pusilla* record is "considered to be erroneous" (p.478). This is a new statement - neither makes this assertion. Common & Waterhouse (1981, p.371) merely remarked "...collectors should look for further specimens to determine if it is really established in Australia", inferring an accidental introduction. Braby "1995a" reports "Common and Waterhouse (1981) and Dunn and Dunn (1991) have expressed doubts regarding the authenticity and reliability of the specimen" (1995 p.53). Nonetheless, the new conclusion of error is reasonable, given the absence of confirmation in the last two decades. Another example (p.765): "The locality 'Burra Range...QLD' (Common and Waterhouse 1981), based on a specimen collected by A.F. Atkins, is erroneous and refers to *C. geminus* (Braby 1994b)." The latter paper does not mention any known specimen or attribution to Atkins, and CW81 do not provide a reference - in fact, Braby "1994b" has origins in DD91 (p.395). The statement is new and source incorrectly attributed.

## Taxonomy

*Ornithoptera richmondia* is recognised as a morphospecies despite evidence of a lack of evolved reproductive isolating mechanisms (ERIM), enabling fertility with *O. priamus euphorion*. This contradicts the taxonomic, decision-making framework established in the Introduction: "...where such information [lack of ERIM] is available the biological [genetic] species concept is used in preference" (p.24). Although resolution of birdwing taxonomy remains difficult, according to Hancock (2001, p.26), the current arrangement "defies both logic and phylogenetic reasoning given the new hybridisation data Braby has presented."

Hindwing venation is important in separating *Elodina claudia* from *E. perditia*. A small inset line-drawing would have enhanced these species' accounts, as the veins on the color-photographed adults remain too small for fine examination, nor do any bar lines indicate the venational area of interest on the monochrome adults.

Pleasingly, the work does a cleaner sweep than Dunn & Dunn (1991) removing more dubious subspecies. These cobwebbed relicts of pioneering taxonomy have accumulated from efforts of glory hunters and immortality seekers, over-enthusiastic describers operating under unrealistic evolutionary paradigms, and a residue of synonymic dust, settled over the last two centuries from inadequate examination of other, already-named entities. The new framework makes a lot more sense to those with an Australia-Pacific outlook or knowledge of comparative geographic variation in other lepidopteran families (moths). Of course, the closer one peers, the greater one's familiarity, and the more differences one notes! But, holism, that is 'the whole picture' rather than splintering reductionism, is the ultimate paradigm in a global world of taxonomic common sense. Taxonomy should not be influenced by butterfly collector whims for more named forms to leisurely collect - a lesson learnt from the UK, where almost every form has a name of sorts.

## Expressional, grammatical and typographical errors

The text is almost free of typographical errors - a testimony to the enormous efforts spent by the review team who improved sectional drafts and species accounts, regularly circulated over its circa six-year gestation period. "Sun shine" should be 'sunshine' seen once or twice, and "further" is used rather than 'farther' for physically measurable degrees of separation. Hesperidae is incorrectly spelt (p.939). A left bracket missing on a reference citation (p.271), a double-word replication of 'it' (p.506), and a line justification fault creating a lengthy space on page 678 remain of minor aesthetic concern. The year of collection of an illustrated *Jalmenus evagoras* female in the ANIC should be 1984, not "1989" (p.449), and incorrect page numbers are provided in the reference list for 'Haines 1980' (p.936) and 'Mayo 1987' (p.942). On page 640, three page-reference numbers are omitted - instead designated by a hash (#). A philosophical or expressional language issue is the repeated use of the direct, rather than indirect, article for hosts. "The food plant in TAS does not seem to have been recorded." (p.819). Such usage begs the question of assumed monophagy.

### Attribution: referencing formats

Given encyclopaedic coverage, it is impossible to cite all authors for their multitudinous array of facts, no matter how ethical or desirable this might be. Good coverage of citation is the general rule, with credit to primary discoverers and/or significant works in most cases, but one commentator (Hawkeswood, 2003) has expressed concern over the honesty and fairness in the referencing system. In my opinion, the physiology sections are inadequately referenced, compared to the species accounts, and appear recycled and hence outdated.

Moreover, in the species accounts some works are lazily cited as if derived from ‘personal communications’ - facts potentially less reliable than a published statement. This ‘name-only’ format deceives concerning the amount of ‘new’ information presented, and will make tracking some published information tedious. The locality ‘Coffs Harbour’ (p.233) is new and correctly indicates personal communication, yet the same ‘name-only’ format is used for published information: ‘Albury near the border of Victoria’ (p.231) was published (Dunn, 1997), and another example ‘Red Hill’ (p.258) appeared decades ago (Holmes, 1966). Some details of adult behavior of *Trapezites symmopus* were derived from my 1993 paper on this species, but the reference is seriously minimised in name-only format, and my 1993 report on *Toxidia rietmanni*, is similarly marginalised. Likewise, name-only format references ‘Mataranka’ (p.475) published in DD91 and also ‘Carnarvon’ (p.765) plotted in DD91. The ‘pale form’ of *Geitoneura klugii* in WA having been earlier treated in DD91 as a provisional new species is inappropriately referenced by name-only format (p.504), but curiously citation returns to DD91 on page 505. Transitional variation in *Jalmenus evagoras* at Maryborough QLD, reported in DD91, has been attributed to another as unpublished (p.725). A larval host plant (*Acacia decurrens*) published by me (Dunn 1998) is similarly treated and attributed (p.733), but correctly cited in the food plant list (although no matching reference exists in the book’s list). On page 725, in a lengthy list of hosts (accompanied by many citations) only mine and one others’ records are in name-only format. Mine were derived from Dunn (1984) and (1997); Rose’s may be new. Contrastingly in the same section, three (3) citations of Braby’s own papers were selected to support a single host record! Although a minor irritant in the holistic framework, these are not isolated cases, but numerous throughout the text and comparatively marginalise the works of at least six authors. The selection process remains unclear and seems illogical. Many non-refereed papers in societal news bulletins are listed in the References so the publication status was not the decisive criterion.

No work is ever free of error, even with an army of workers, and in some places references have been accidentally omitted. On page 231, the locality of ‘Dingley’ is not listed in either of the two supportive references, but comes from Dunn (1998, p.3). Another writer has pointed out a citation of his accidentally omitted (see Hawkeswood, 2003). At other times the original primary source has been missed. The record for ‘Isis River’ (p.477), now credited to “Braby 1995a” was first reported in DD91 and involved my examination of three independent collections. And, the opinion that the record of *G. klugii* from ‘Cairns’ was an “accidental

introduction” is similarly credited to “Braby 1995a” - albeit originating from p.536 of DD91. In addition, for *Elodina queenslandica* the location of ‘Mary River near Maryborough’ (p.316) is cited to a 1996 multi-authored publication omitting an earlier publication (Dunn, 1995). The ‘omitted’ 1995 paper is then utilised in the very next paragraph, but this time marginalised “... near Maryborough the two species occur in different habitats (K.L. Dunn; Moss *et al.* 1996).”

### **Multiple errors in cross-referencing or CSIRO management concerns?**

Even more curious - sprinkled through the text are regular citations to papers of mine not listed in the reference list. Some examples, mostly from Volume 1 include “Dunn 1990a” (p.93), “1993b” (p.133, 890), “1993d” (p.898), “1993e” (p.232), “1994a” (p.232), “1995a” (p.232), “1995b” (pp.233, 388, 759, 838), “1995c” (p.295), “1995d” (pp.141, 221, 275, 695, 890, 898), “1997a” (p.205), and “1998a” (p.892). In addition, a “Dunn 1995” citation mentioning a western locality record of *Toxidia peron* in Victoria (originating from Dunn, 1995a, p.26) is a different paper to the singleton listed in the references for that year. So also is the citation of my paper on page 903 concerning a larval host of *Papilio aegeus* (originating from Dunn, 1995, p.86).

Under the sub-header ‘**Major references**’ three of my papers are listed in the species account for *Cephrenes trichopepla*, but only one matches exactly the References in Volume 2. For this species, the papers they intend are fortunately the ones listed, but are not coded as “1993e” or “1995a”. In the Reference list (p.931) ‘Dunn 1980’ is connected to the entry for ‘Dumigan 1945’, due to loss of a carriage return, but in the text (*Hypochrysops delicia* p.669) the information (‘Reid’s Lookout’) is minimised as inferred unpublished (despite full citation in CW81 and reiteration in DD91). Recognition of the erroneous ‘Melville Caves’ locality (p.699) is attributable to DD91, but appears as a ‘new’ judgement.

These many attribution errors concerning my own papers either reflect the reliability of the referencing overall, or perhaps later unethical manipulation to minimise one or more author’s works? Disturbingly, I was told concerning my 1999 critique, “I think some of them are licking their wounds, the others sharpening their knives... And in their zeal, they struck out some of the original references to your work...[and] they rejected quite a lot of the extra Dunn & Dunn 1991 refs...” (two informant’s e-mails of 6 & 24/3/2000). Thus, the Reference list shows some numerical author bias, minimising one or more well-known writers and seemingly maximising one or more others. Not surprisingly, Hawkeswood (2003, p.2) has criticised, “Braby has 47 references listed under his own name in the reference list at the end of Volume 2 and nobody else has anywhere near that number listed.” Evident loss of these references will irritate readers who can’t find the cited papers - papers originally present in the critiqued manuscript.

## Distributions

Within Australia, distributions reflect current knowledge to 1998 inclusive (and in places 1999), but the published presence of at least one species (*Toxidia doubledayi*) on Fraser Island (Dunn, 1988) is not shaded on the map figure. Isolated western Tasmanian records of *Zizina labradus* at Lake Burbury (Dunn, 1998a, p.38) and *Heteronympha merope* at Rosebery (Dunn, 1998b, plotted on fig.3), were overlooked. The range-fill distribution of *H. paradelpha* near Melbourne is offset a little to the north. It still occurs in Heany Park in Rowville, and a female vagrant was collected at Arthurs Seat on the Mornington Peninsula in 1974 (plotted in DD91) - a season of remarkable vagrancies (Quick, 1974). The Grampians population of *H. cordace* is included in subspecies *wilsoni* (p.520) but the map figure (p.519) shade-category and numeral allocation is contradictory, and Samson (2001) has previously pointed out the confused map-figure key for subspecies of *Tisiphone abeona* (p.523). Two *Acrodipsas* species in the NT therein known only from Burrells Trig, show incongruent and inaccurate range-fill for this location (compare maps on pp.634 & 639), and a shade-spot at 'Cape York' is inaccurately offset to the right (p.653). For *Anthene seltuttus* on western Cape York Peninsula, Hancock and Monteith (2004) have highlighted the map-site omission of Mitchell River Settlement near Kowanyama, plotted previously in DD91. The 'Prince Regent River WA' records of at least *Ocybadistes hypomeloma* (p.202) and *Candalides gilberti* (p.758) are secondary-sourced to CW81, but these undoubtedly came from Bailey & Richards (1975). Consequentially, important WA records for *Telicota colon* (p.221), *Famegana alsulus* (p.839), *Jamides phaseli* (p.823) and others known from this Kimberley locality since the 1970's, are conspicuous by their absence on their respective range-fill maps. Many 'Drysdale River WA' records (Common & Upton, 1977) were also overlooked, with one or more others attributed to a secondary source (e.g. *O. flavovittata* p.203). Absence of this northern Kimberley site is obvious on several maps including those of *Cephrenes trichopepla* (p.232), *Eurema laeta* (p.300), *Melanitis leda* (p.468), and particularly *Ypthima arctoa* (p.478); the last species is indicated as absent from WA.

Beyond Australia, distributions seem comparatively dated in places. The Philippines is correctly listed for the recently expanded SE Asian distribution of *Papilio demoleus*, but Borneo is omitted, an island colonised since the work of Tsukada & Nishiyama (1982) - I know of three reports (Otsuka, 1988; Dunn, 1999; and recently Matsumoto, 2002). The well known, presence of *Melanitis leda* on Vanuatu was overlooked; Samson (1983) listed eleven islands within Vanuatu and I too have seen adults in Tanna and Efate. For *Catopsilia pomona*, I was surprised to see Fiji absent from its world distribution summary - I have made repeated observations at Nadi and Suva, but I don't know of any papers reporting this country, so given the benefit of the doubt, these observations may be otherwise unpublished information. Collectively, all these small factual oversights are typical of all major works and remain insignificant.

### **Evidence of plagiarism or multiple authorship?**

Plagiarism - the use of another's work as one's own - is of ethical concern for academics and publishers, and outside the scope of most users' interests, but an area not discussed by other reviewers. During my critique of the submitted manuscript in 1999 I was alarmed to find extensive textual plagiarism, a fact confirmed later by external examiners overseas. Although some sections have been rewritten, there still remains serious plagiarism within the Introduction (Chapter 1), particularly in the Morphology section, also in parts of Chapter 2, and in the Glossary of the published version (2000). Indeed, some passages pointed out in my critique to CSIRO Publishing (e.g. start of third paragraph on p.31) are still seriously plagiaristic! And, in the glossary recycled definitions for 'gene' (25 words), 'metamorphosis' (24 words), and 'labial palps' remain verbatim and uncited from CW81, with a number of others having been only slightly modified (e.g. 'polymorphism', 'ovipositor', 'apodeme' etc.).

Literature recycling involves phrases and sentences lifted from CW81 and inserted directly into new sentences, or recombined with other phrases originally from CW81 to make new sentences, often with no paraphrasing. Because this is seriously unethical academic behavior, I provide several examples as evidence. Compare the close similarity of the start of the paragraph in Chapter 2 under the header '**Adults**' (p.31) with the opening sentences of '**Collecting Adults**' in CW81 (pp.609-610). After the second plagiarised sentence (ending with "secured"), the next sentence in CW81 has seemingly been 'omitted', but has just moved to p.32 under the header '**Nets**', with one word ("within") removed, another added ("thus") and 30 left unchanged!

In places several sentences and passages varying from at least 14 to over 50 consecutive words are verbatim or contain just a single changed word! Under the header '**Female Genitalia**' (p.15, line 8) the sentence comprising 33 words starting at, "A duct, called the ductus bursae...is deposited during mating" remains almost identical, even in punctuation (see CW81, p.17, line 11), but there was one adjustment: Braby singularised "sperms" to "sperm" for grammatical agreement! Examine the short, third paragraph on page 7; this is very similar to CW81 (p.6, para.2 headed 'Thorax'), but omits a sentence, and contains minor phrase-order manipulation and some trivial word rearrangements. Likewise, sentences 2 & 3 in paragraph 4 (p.7) mimic CW81 pages 6-7 ('Abdomen' section, sentences 2 & 3). Moreover, whole sentences are copied out unaltered in places. Under the header '**Egg**' (p.6, line 7) is a sentence of thirty (30) words taken verbatim from CW81 (p.5, para.1, line 9). "In Lycaenidae, the sculpturing is usually...right angles or obliquely." Braby punctuates using two commas, but no quotation marks or reference citations accompany any of these extracts - this is 'text editing' not paraphrasing! Two writers not credited own this intellectual property.

The second paragraph on page 15 revealed more textual misappropriation. A 32-word sentence reading, "In a few groups of butterflies...as a sphragis (Fig. 7)" is again almost verbatim from CW81 (p.18, line 4) except for punctuation (two added commas), an indirect

article exchanged, with translocation of “a substance” four words forward in that same sentence. No different words have been added to CW81’s original script, other than “Fig. 7” of course for agreement. (The same figure is numbered six in CW81, but permission for figure usage is correctly cited to CW81 throughout). In addition, on page 7, the second paragraph below the illustration of the larva commencing with “The head is...” should be compared with CW81 (page 6, para.1). Thirty (30) words are repeated in almost identical order to CW81, with three additions. Again no citations are given anywhere for this recycled text.

Now refer to the **Thorax** section (p.10) and the paragraph dealing with ‘Legs’. As well as seven words of the trailing phrase in the previous sentence (line 7) but omitting two words from CW81 (p.13, lines 6-7), “without claws”, the next two sentences of the continued paragraph are more or less verbatim from CW81. “... completely fused to form an elongate segment. The fore tibia in the Hesperiidæ... to clean the antennae and proboscis.” One section is slightly refined, “the fore tibia” was originally “tibia of the foreleg” - a negligible editorial change. A six-word phrase of CW81 (line 8) is then omitted, and the passage continues verbatim, except in the following sentence, which involves a noun substitution - “Proboscis” has replaced “haustellum”. This involves 41 words taken directly from CW81, and appears in a passage of supposed ‘new’ text involving only 43 words (the identical figure details were not included in this word count).

Under ‘**Male genitalia**’ (p.14) there is even more plagiarism - this paragraph like others, contains no referenced material, and in so doing masquerades as original script. The whole paragraph is disgraceful literature. Discussion with several University lecturers and Professors in Australia has confirmed this degree of phrase and sentence copying as serious plagiarism. (A senior lecturer at La Trobe University (Melbourne) specified copying “more than 20 consecutive words” as unacceptable, and a lecturer at Monash University (Melbourne) sternly remarked, that “any Honours Student who submits one sentence verbatim and similarly uncited, would be failed immediately”). The offending paragraph is quoted in full (Appendix). Readers can judge for themselves the similarity and its ethicality. Words originally used by CW81, which have been merely substituted, or have verb-endings or grammar modified, have been inserted in square brackets [...]. The latter part of the paragraph commencing at “projecting” (word underlined in Appendix for rapid reference) contains a section of 95 words from CW81 to which 15 have been added or substituted. Seven of these 15 words comprise two verbal base-form modifications (to or from the Progressive State), four Relative Pronoun substitutions, and one articular grammatical change; less than 14% of that section is modified and then only about 7% by addition of new text.

This same embarrassing paragraph contains 245 words (excluding the figure reference). Of these, 187 words (over 76% of the paragraph) (excluding my inserts in square brackets [...]), are lifted mostly in lengthy sequences from CW81. Fifty-eight (58) words used as connectors, pronouns or combined in short phrases (less than 24% of the total paragraph) have been added to construct the ‘new’ text. In western philosophy, such limited modification to another’s work is inadequate, shameful, and dishonest writing; the first section contains 52

words verbatim (with only one noun substitution, “structures”) - unethical given the stated sole authorship on the book’s cover. Collectively, this is truisitic evidence that we are dealing with a book of multiple authorship, and I believe one or more other workers should have been included as co-authors of this twin tome. Indeed perhaps the whole review panel should have been joint authors, in addition of course to Ian Common and Doug Waterhouse whose authorship has been exposed. Overseas works are not fearful in attributing multiple authorship when involved. The British Millennium butterfly atlas (Asher *et al.*, 2001) recognises six authors and Corbet & Pendlebury’s 1992 revision of the ‘Butterflies of the Malay Peninsula’ includes Bernard D’Abrera on the cover for the plates. Ethically, perhaps ‘CSIRO’ might have been a more appropriate collective authorship for these team-authored volumes.

### Should you buy this book?

Even though academically unethical in places, an encyclopaedic work of this scale, with detailed reviews of about 400 species compiled by an accomplished observer, and indeed, one of Australia’s leading butterfly experts, is certainly value at the recommended price. The general reader is unlikely to compare textual recycling or technicalities of attribution, but instead, hopefully will learn more about the Australian fauna, and identify species in home gardens or National Parks and State Reserves, and perhaps in time add to knowledge. Readability is well pitched at the tertiary educated non-specialist, and butterfly enthusiasts should be delighted with its superb plates, and will enjoy and use the volumes regularly. For the expert, it is an indispensable piece for one’s library of world faunas. The ‘Braby team’ is to be congratulated for an extensive review of thousands of butterfly facts previously scattered across a vast literature - an entomological monument to the efforts of all involved. Although of concern to me the factual and inferred shortcomings remain small given the work’s broad coverage. The plagiarism charge is minimised when a ‘team approach’ to authorship (perhaps with Braby as editor) is formally acknowledged, and on that basis I can recommend this Whitley Medal-winning book to all butterfly enthusiasts worldwide. It is hoped the planned field edition will not contain the same concerns.

### Appendix

Paragraph quoted from Braby 2000 (p.14) - a plagiarised passage showing original text of CW81 (p.16) in italicised standard font. Modifications by Braby are in **Bold, enlarged Arial**, for contrast. Single replaced words of CW81 inserted in square brackets [...] for completeness.

*“The external genitalia in the male butterfly (**Fig. 6A**) are formed by the ninth and tenth segments of the abdomen. The ninth segment forms a sclerotised ring, consisting of a dorsal tegumen and a ventral vinculum to which various **structures** [organs] are attached. Projecting forwards midventrally into the abdomen from the vinculum there is often **a structure** [an apodeme] known as the*

*saccus*, to which muscles are attached. Attached posteriorly to the tegumen is the uncus, which consists of a single, sometimes [or] paired, down-curved middorsal, often hairy, projection and the gnathos which, when present, may be a medially fused [single] or paired [central] structure as in many Hesperiidæ, or a pair of long separate hooks known as brachia as in the Lycaenidæ. The anus is situated below the uncus and above or distal to the gnathos. Joined below to the vinculum and projecting posteriorly [backwards there] is a pair of lateral claspers or valvae, moveable lobes that sometimes bear internal projections, ridges or spines, that [and] are generally clothed with hairs and scales. The aedeagus is a centrally positioned sclerotised tube through which the eversible penis or vesica passes, and which projects backwards through the [a] transverse membrane or diaphragma between the bases of the valvae. When everted, the vesica often bears on its outer surface one or more strongly sclerotised spines or cornuti. In the diaphragma, the membranous or sclerotised structures that support[-ing] the aedeagus are known as the futura superior and futura inferior; part of the latter often forms[-ing] a ventral plate or juxta.” (Braby 2000 p.14) .

#### Postscript

“Researchers have legal and ethical responsibilities in regard to the use of the work of others, enough to make it important for them to be accurate and honest in acknowledging them. The consequences of poor referencing can be extreme. Apart from legal entanglements with issues of copyright, researchers may be accused of literary theft if they fail in this aspect of writing. For these reasons scrupulous honesty is the norm in duly acknowledging others’ work by attributing the rightful sources.” (Hamilton & Clare 2004, p.11).

#### Major References

- Asher, J., Warren, M., Fox, R., Harding, P., Jeffcoate, G., Jeffcoate, S. (2001). *The millennium atlas of butterflies in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Atkins, A. (2002). Book Review. Butterflies of Australia: their identification, biology and distribution. *Victorian Naturalist*, 119(5): 244-245.
- Bailey, W.J. & Richards, K.T. (1975). A report on the insect fauna of the Prince Regent River Reserve, north-west Kimberley, Western Australia. In Miles, J.M. & Burbidge, A.A. (eds). *A biological survey of the Prince Regent River Reserve, Western Australia in August 1974*. *Western Australian Wildlife Research Bulletin*, 3: 101-112.
- Braby, M.F. (1994). Range extensions and distribution records for some butterflies in north-eastern Queensland - Part III. *Queensland Naturalist*, 32: 121-129.
- Braby, M.F. (1995). The distribution status and habitat associations of the satyrine (Lepidoptera: Nymphalidae) fauna of northeastern Australia. *Journal of the Australian Entomological Society*, 34: 51-61.
- Common, I.F.B. & Upton, M.S. (1977). A report on insects collected in the Drysdale River National Park North Kimberley, Western Australia. In Kabay, E.D. & Burbidge, A. (eds). *A Biological Survey of the Drysdale River National Park North Kimberley, Western Australia in August 1975*. *Western Australian Wildlife Research Bulletin*, 6: 121-131.
- Common, I.F.B. & Waterhouse, D.F. (1972). *Butterflies of Australia*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney.
- Common, I.F.B. & Waterhouse, D.F. (1981). *Butterflies of Australia*. (Second Edition). Angus & Robertson, Sydney.
- Corbet, A.S. & Pendlebury, H.M. (1992). *The Butterflies of the Malay Peninsula*. 4th edition

## Calodema Volume 2 (2004)

- revised by J.N. Eliot. Malayan Nature Society, Kuala Lumpur.
- Dunn, K.L. (1984). *Acacia diffusa* Lindl - a new larval foodplant for *Jalmenus evagoras evagoras* (Donovan) (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae). *Victorian Entomologist*, 14(1): 8.
- Dunn, K.L. (1988). New distribution records for butterflies in southern Queensland. *Victorian Entomologist*, 18(6): 107.
- Dunn, K.L. (1995). Biological notes on some eastern Australian butterflies. *Victorian Entomologist*, 25(5): 85-92.
- Dunn, K.L. (1995a). New distribution records for some eastern Australian butterflies with comments on subspecies taxonomy. *Victorian Entomologist*, 25(2): 26-30.
- Dunn, K.L. (1997). Biological notes on some eastern Australian butterflies. Part II. *Victorian Entomologist*, 27(6): 114-118.
- Dunn, K.L. (1998). Biological notes on some eastern Australian butterflies. Part III. *Victorian Entomologist*, 28(1): 3-7.
- Dunn, K.L. (1998a). Butterfly watching in Tasmania - Part I. *Victorian Entomologist*, 28(2): 33-39.
- Dunn, K.L. (1998b). Butterfly watching in Tasmania - Part III. *Victorian Entomologist*, 28(5): 93-99.
- Dunn, K.L. (1999). Butterfly observations in Southeast Asia including two potentially new records for Borneo. *Victorian Entomologist*, 29(6): 114-116.
- Dunn, K.L. & Dunn, L.E. (1991). *Review of Australian Butterflies: distribution, life history and taxonomy. Parts 1-4*. Published by the authors, Melbourne.
- Hamilton, H. & Clare, J. (2004). Reviewing the literature: making 'the literature' work for you. *Collegian*, 11(1): 8-11.
- Hancock, D.L. (2001). Book Review: Butterflies of Australia. Their identification, biology and distribution. *Australian Entomologist*, 28(1): 25-26.
- Hancock, D.L. & Monteith, G.B. (2004). Some records of butterflies (Lepidoptera) from western Cape York Peninsula, Queensland. *Australian Entomologist*, 31(1): 21-24.
- Hawkeswood, T.J. (2003). Comments on the entry for *Jalmenus daemeli* Semper (1879) (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae) in Braby (2000) *Butterflies of Australia*. *Spilopyra*, 8: 1-4.
- Holmes, D.R. (1966). A visitor come to stay. *Wings & Stings*, No.2: 22-23.
- Layberry, R.A., Hall, P.W. & Lafontaine, J.D. (1998). *The butterflies of Canada*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Lees, D. (2001). [Book Review:] Butterflies of Australia: their identification, biology and distribution, by Michael F. Braby. *Systematic Entomology*, 26: 126-127.
- Matsumoto, K. (2002). *Papilio demoleus* (Papilionidae) in Borneo and Bali. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society*, 56(2). [Journal contents retrieved from: <http://alpha.furman.edu/~snyder/snyder/lep/j-56-2.htm>].
- McCubbin, C. (1971). *Australian Butterflies*. Nelson, Melbourne.
- Nielsen, E.S., Edwards, E.D. & Rangsi, T.V. (eds.) (1996). *Checklist of the Lepidoptera of Australia. Monographs on Australian Lepidoptera, 4: 1-529*. CSIRO Publishing, East Melbourne.
- Otsuka, K. (1988). *Butterflies of Borneo Vol. 1*. Tobishima Corp., Tokyo.
- Quick, W.N.B. (1974). Some abnormal insect records for the summers of 1972-3, 1973-4. *Victorian Entomologist*, 4: 66-71.
- Samson, C. (1983). Butterflies (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera) of Vanuatu. *Naika (Journal of the Vanuatu Natural Science Society)*, 10: 2-6.
- Samson, P. (2001). Book Review: Butterflies of Australia: Their identification, biology and distribution. *Australian Journal of Entomology*, 40: 202-204.
- Tsukada, E. & Nishiyama, Y. (1982). *Butterflies of the South East Asian Islands. Vol. 1. Papilionidae*. Palpac, Tokyo.
- Waterhouse, G.A. (1932). *What Butterfly is That?* Angus & Robertson, Sydney.
- Waterhouse, G.A. & Lyell, G. (1914). *The Butterflies of Australia*. Angus & Robertson, Sydney.