

The species was described from 24♂ and 2♀ collected on Tagarsky island (river Yenisey, near Minusinsk). Afterwards, it was only mentioned as a member of Cossidae (Daniel 1955; Schoorl 1990; Yakovlev 2004), and only on the basis of the detailed original description. After a thorough analysis of Koshantschikov's description, Vladimir V. Dubatolov (Novosibirsk, Russia) assumed that the taxon could belong to Brachodidae. The same assumption was admitted by Axel Kallies (Australia).

My study of the type material shows that the taxon does in fact belong to Brachodidae and that it is conspecific with *Brachodes appendiculata* (Esper, 1783), a species known from South and Central Europe, southern Urals, northern Kazakhstan, and southern Siberia (Zagulyaev 1978).

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to S. Yu. Sinev (St. Petersburg) for his help during my work with the type material of the Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, to V. V. Dubatolov (Novosibirsk) and Axel Kallies (Australia) for their fruitful comments on the analysis of the *Stygia gerassimovii* description, to J. W. Schoorl jr. (Holland) for his help in my search for rare publications, to Thomas Witt (Germany) for his all-round support of this investigation, and to V. V. Zolotuhin (Ulyanovsk) for his helpful comments during my work.

### References

- Daniel, F. 1955. Monographie der Cossidae. I. Kritishe Beurteilung der bisher dem Genus *Stygia* Latr. zugeteilten Arten. – Mitteilungen der Münchner Entomologischen Gesellschaft E.V., 45: 159–181, pl. 1.
- Koshantschikov, W. 1923. Materialien zur Macrolepidoptera Fauna des Minussinsk Bezirkes (Siberien Ienisey Gouv.). – Ezhegodnik gosudarstvennogo museja N.M. Mart'yanova **1** (1–6): 25–27.
- Schoorl, J. W. 1990. A phylogenetic study on Cossidae (Lepidoptera: Ditrysia) based on external adult morphology. – Zoologische Verhandelingen. **263**: 295 pp.
- Yakovlev, R. V. 2004. Carpenter-moths (Lepidoptera, Cossidae) of Siberia. – Euroasian Entomological Journal **3** (2): 155–163, pl. 1. (in Russian)
- Zagulyaev, A. K. 1973. Nasekomye Cheshuekrylye, Fauna USSR **4** (4): 89 (in Russian)
- Zagulyaev, A. K. 1978. Cossidae – Drevotochzy. P. 184. – In: G. S. Medvedev (ed.), Opredelitel' nasekomykh evropeiskoi chasti SSSR **5** (4) Cheshuekrylye I. – Leningrad, Nauka. (in Russian)

Book Review

**Barry Goater, Matthias Nuss & Wolfgang Speidel. Pyraloidea I (Crambidae: Acentropinae, Evergestinae, Heliothelinae, Schoenobiinae, Scopariinae). – In: Peter Huemer & Ole Karsholt (eds.), Microlepidoptera of Europe, Volume 4. – Apollo Books, Stenstrup. 304 pp. Hardcover (ISBN 87-88757-33-1). DKK 580.00.**

This book's publication is welcomed after some delay, which allowed Volume 5 to be published ahead of volume 4. The size and binding is similar to earlier volumes in this series. It begins with an abstract detailing taxonomic changes, there is then an introductory chapter on the Pyraloidea describing the morphology of adults, their head, wings, tympanal organs and male and female genitalia. The classification of Pyraloidea at family level has long been a matter of debate, this book departs from the practice embodied e.g. in Karsholt & Razowski (1996) by using two families: Pyralidae and Crambidae to separate the superfamily. The differences are well known to taxonomists, Munroe (1972) and most authors following him retained the well known name Pyralidae for the benefit of non specialists and used the terms Crambiform and Pyraliform

to separate the two categories. Others have argued that the superfamily name is sufficient to encompass the two groups and this position is accepted here. It means that non specialists who recognised Pyralinae and Pyraustinae *s.l.* as the broad winged mesolepidoptera will have to remember to call them Pyraloids rather than Pyralids. The differences between these groups are clearly set out in a table and the subfamilies belonging to each are listed in alphabetical order, without any attempt to show their familial relationships. There follow some brief notes about collecting and the preparation of moths and their genitalia. No reason is given for the arbitrary selection of five Crambid subfamilies, but it is assumed that this is made necessary by the state of knowledge and availability of specialists in those groups. A checklist of species is given with a number assigned to each, the same number being used consistently for the species descriptions and genitalia illustrations. Sensibly, introduced species are assigned letters, rather than numbers, which would interrupt the sequence of European species. There then follows the treatment of the respective subfamilies and their species. For the Acentropinae the introduction is longer and includes a cladogram of the genera and additional morphological details. The species accounts follow including a full synonymy, brief diagnosis, description of male and female genitalia, distribution and biology. The Evergestinae have a shorter introduction, the species accounts generally contain a longer diagnosis. Species from north Africa are also included; the final two species are headed “Taxa incertae sedis” and left in their original genus. The Heliethinae contains but one species in Europe and so this subfamily does not take many pages, Schoenobiinae are treated in a similar manner to Acentropinae, with a few keys included. The Scopariinae, on account of their greater numbers, occupy about half of the book. The species accounts are concise but appear accurate. There follows a Distribution table for all species, where the occurrence in each country is tabulated. This follows the pattern of Karsholt & Razowski with some refinements, but different symbols described in the introduction are used by some authors and not others. Scopariinae species have the country’s letters in upper case only if they have been verified by the author. Parentheses for introductions are used without explanation, and brackets for extinct species are used, but not consistently. The colour plates showing the adults are made from photographs and are very clear. The Scopariinae are featured on one plate natural size, but also on subsequent plates at  $1.75 \times$  natural size. Each specimen figured has the data for that specimen detailed on the opposite page. Next the male genitalia are illustrated, the Acentropinae, Evergestinae and Schoenobiinae by fine line drawings, the remainder by photographs. Finally are the references and index. In any multi-author work of this size there are likely to be errors and inconsistencies; for example the original spelling of *andalusicum* is given in the checklist and species description, but is changed to *andalusica* in the index and illustrations, *Parapoynx stagnalis* is stated as being introduced to England, even though the author himself pointed out that this was a misidentification and gives the reference to the correction! The distribution of *Scoparia ancipitella* is stated to be Lowland to montane without it saying exactly where. Despite these minor shortcomings this volume must be warmly welcomed, and the treatment of the Scopariinae is sure to remain a masterpiece for a difficult group.

DAVID AGASSIZ

## References

- Karsholt, O. & Razowski, J. 1996. The lepidoptera of Europe, a distributional checklist. 380 pp. Stenstrup.  
Munroe, E. 1972. Pyraloidea, Pyralidae comprising subfamilies Scopariinae, Nymphulinae. – In: R. B. Dominick et al. (eds), The Moths of America north of Mexico. **13.1A**: 1–134. London.

# ZOBODAT - [www.zobodat.at](http://www.zobodat.at)

Zoologisch-Botanische Datenbank/Zoological-Botanical Database

Digitale Literatur/Digital Literature

Zeitschrift/Journal: [Nota lepidopterologica](#)

Jahr/Year: 2005

Band/Volume: [28](#)

Autor(en)/Author(s): Agassiz David J.L.

Artikel/Article: [Book Review Barry Goater, Matthias Nuss & Wolfgang Speidel. Pyraloidea I \(Crambidae: Acentropinae, Evergestinae, Heliiothelinae, Schoenobiinae, Scopariinae\). - In: Peter Huemer & Ole Karsholt \(eds.\), Microlepidoptera of Europe, Volume 4 161-162](#)