

this is a figure of the species with which we are dealing. Nobody can deny that Holland's figure represents a specimen of *Danaus plexippus*. That issue, therefore, is settled.

However, it was very soon pointed out quite conclusively by Field (*Proc. Entomol. Soc. Wash.*, 52, 234 [1950]), that Holland's figure was not of *Danaus plexippus plexippus*, but of *Danaus plexippus megalippe* Hübner (or *nigrippus* Haensch), the Central and South American subspecies. Though I cannot see that this fact is really of the slightest importance, I admit it would have been better had a figure of *D. plexippus plexippus* been quoted. For this "error" I am to blame, not Hemming, though in fairness to myself I must reaffirm that I considered, and still consider, that any good, easily accessible figure of *D. plexippus*, of any race or subspecies, would serve the Commission's purpose. Nevertheless, Field argued on the basis of his findings that "the Commission did not fix the name *plexippus* to the North American Monarch . . . but to a distinct subspecies," a statement for which I cannot find the slightest support in fact or in logic.

In order that the Commission might consider how best to remove from the minds of lepidopterists the doubts (however unjustifiable) that had arisen through the reference to Holland's figure, it was decided to consult a sample of well-known lepidopterists on this specific point, prior to rendering the necessary Opinion. The letter and draft application to the Commission subsequently sent out did unfortunately contain errors of fact, to which your correspondents properly call attention. It would have been but common courtesy to have called the Secretary's attention to these, especially as the circular was a personal inquiry from the Secretary upon which the personal views of the recipients were sought.

However, as your correspondents preferred to comment publicly and in the severest terms on these private communications, and on the prior action of the Commission, it may be well to point out some of their own errors.

i) It is false to charge the Commission with having committed in Paris "a serious error" "in haste": your correspondents are in error in reading more into this decision than is there; and to reach a decision quickly on a matter that had been before the Commission a year or more, and before the lepidopterological public some 25 years at least, cannot justifiably be called "hasty."

ii) "Hemming's campaign to replace the Law of Priority by *Nomina Conservanda*." There is no such campaign; on the other hand, there is very strong pressure upon the Commission from all parts of the world to put an end to uncertainties and unnecessary changes in generic and specific names, and I am convinced the methods now being adopted, including in particular the expansion of the *Official List*, are the best for the purpose.

iii) The "careful lectotype designation already published" does not exist. The reference is no doubt to

Corbet's paper (*Proc. Roy. Entomol. Soc. London*, B, 18, 184 [1949]). Corbet's words are, "I have no hesitation in taking the male specimen bearing the Linnean name label as the name-type of *P. plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758." This is not a lectotype designation; it is a claim to have recognized the holotype. [The authors of the article make no reference to the fact that, in spite of this, Corbet's article ends with the statement that in submitting his application to the Commission he recommends the retention of the name *plexippus* for the American Monarch butterfly.]

iv) "Hemming neglected . . . several prominent interested lepidopterists." This statement is unworthy of your correspondents. No attempt was made to send the circular to all interested lepidopterists. A random sample, whose names were supplied mainly by me, was taken. Would I have selected the authors of this article had my choice been biased? Nevertheless, I regret that other names did not occur to me at the time.

v) The Commission having reached its decision on the application of the name *plexippus*, a decision endorsed by Congress, it is not open to the Commission to "reconsider" the matter, as requested by your correspondents.

Much more could be written in criticism of your correspondents' article. But there is much wisdom in the old saying "least said soonest mended." I have no wish to add bitterness to this controversy. It requires objective cooperation, not polemics.

N. D. RILEY

Department of Entomology
British Museum (Natural History)
Cromwell Road, London

Up or Down?

E. C. ZIMMERMAN's note (*Science*, 113, 391 [1951]) on volcanism as a contributing factor in change of sea level states that the outpouring of lava on the sea bottom has been sufficient to raise sea level as much as 500 meters, "even if generous allowance is made for compensating subsidence."

It would appear to me that the "accompanying subsidence" would have been 100% *plus* the volume of new land raised *above* sea level. Thus the net result would be a slight *lowering* of sea level. If subsidence did not equal the displacement of outpouring there would have had to remain gas-filled cavities and this seems untenable.

CHAPMAN GRANT

San Diego, California

Erratum

In Table 1, on page 675 of our article entitled "An *In Vitro* Method of Screening Amoebicidal Agents Using the Phillips Culture" (*Science*, 112, 674 [1951]), the formula 7-iodo-5-sulphonic acid-8-hydroxyquinoline should read 7-5, diiodo-8-hydroxyquinoline.

G. W. RAWSON

Microbiological Laboratories
Ciba Pharmaceutical Products, Inc.
Summit, New Jersey