Second Interim Report of the NABA Names Committee

Scientific Names Subcommittee: Michael Braby, Marc Epstein, Jeffrey Glassberg (ex officio), Peter W. Hall, Yu-Feng Hsu, Torben Larsen, David Lohman, Naomi Pierce, Malcolm Scoble, John Tennent, Dick Vane-Wright (Chair/Secretary), Angel Viloria, Shen-Horn Yen

English Names Subcommittee: Alana Edwards, Jeffrey Glassberg (Chair/Secretary), Fred Heath, Jim Springer, Julie West

This is the second report of the reconstituted NABA Names Committee. For more information about the Committee, including aims, principles and procedures, please visit www.naba.org/ftp/NABA_names_committee_2012.pdf

NABA-NC 2014-04 *Pyrrhopyge araxes*

***Pyrrhopyge araxes arizonae* Godman & Salvin, 1893, *Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae* (Godman & Salvin, 1893), *Pyrrhopyge arizonae* Godman & Salvin, 1893, or *Apyrrothrix arizonae* (Godman & Salvin, 1893): potential change of scientific name**

Scientific Names Subcommittee

This case presents two problems with respect to the current NABA checklist: In which genus should the taxon currently listed as *Pyrrhopyge araxes* be included? And should the North American populations currently included under *P. araxes* (a species originally described from Mexico) be regarded as a separate species — or not?

Erycides araxes Hewitson, 1867: 2. Type locality: Mexico. Type material in the Natural History Museum, London (BMNH). [http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/ih02/BMNH20120713_DSC8437_i.htm; accessed 1.xii.2012]

Myscelus araxes (Hewitson); Herrich-Schäffer, 1868: 176.

Pyrrhopyge araxes (Hewitson); Edwards, 1875: 794.

Pyrrhopyga [sic] *cyrillus* Plötz, 1879: 529. Type locality: Mexico (Oaxaca). Type material in Museum for Naturkunde, Berlin (ZMHU). [http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/L/ih/cyrillus-Pyrrhopyga-syntype-recto-ZMHU_i.htm; accessed 1.xii.2012]

Pyrrhopyge race *arizonae* Godman & Salvin, 1893: 253. Type locality: USA, Arizona, near Fort Grant. Type material in the Natural History Museum, London (BMNH). [http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/ih02/BMNH20120713_DSC8436_i.htm; accessed 1.xii.2012]

Eudamus araxes (Hewitson); Wright, 1905: 255.

Pyrrhopyge araxes arizonae Godman & Salvin; Dyar, 1905: 111; Evans, 1951: 38.

Apyrrothrix araxes (Hewitson); Lindsey, 1921: 16.

Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae (Godman & Salvin); Lindsey, 1921: 16.

Pyrrhopyge araxes araxes (Hewitson); Evans, 1951: 38.

Pyrrhopyge arizonae Godman & Salvin; Burns & Janzen, 2001: 38, 41.

Apyrrothrix araxes (Hewitson); Mielke, 2002: 222; Opler & Warren, 2002: 4; Mielke, 2004: 26; Mielke, 2005a: 51.

Apyrrothrix arizonae (Godman & Salvin); Mielke, 2002: 222; Mielke, 2004: 26; Mielke, 2005a: 52.

Although *Erycides araxes* Hewitson has most often been placed in the genus *Pyrrhopyge* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Papilio bixae* Linnaeus, 1758), Lindsey (1921) erected the genus *Apyrrothrix* (type species *Erycides araxes* Hewitson, 1867) to receive it, on account of "the difference in habitus and the form of the secondaries". Although Lindsey has until recently not been widely followed in this separation, Mielke (2005a) was able to list well over a dozen citations for the combination *Apyrrothrix araxes*. Mielke (2002), in separating *Pyrrhopyge* into a number of genera, formally resurrected *Apyrrothrix*, with *A. araxes* (Hewitson) and *A. arizonae* (Godman & Salvin) as the only included species. Of the 27 genera of Pyrrhopygina recognized by Mielke (2002), almost half (13) are currently treated as monobasic, and another 2 (including *Apyrrothrix*) have only 2 species.

Three other generic names have been used in combination with *araxes* and *arizonae*: *Erycides* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Papilio pigmalion* Cramer, 1779), *Myscelus* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Papilio nobilis* Cramer, 1777), and *Eudamus* Swainson, 1831 (type species *Papilio proteus* Linnaeus, 1758). Of these, *Erycides* is considered to be a subjective synonym of the currently recognized genus *Phocides* Hübner, 1819, *Myscelus* is in use for another recognized genus, and *Eudamus* is an objective synonym of *Urbanus* Hübner, 1807. Thus none of these names can be applied to *araxes* or *arizonae* in the context of the currently accepted generic classification of the American Hesperiidae. The decision lies between *Pyrrhopyge* and *Apyrrothrix*.

With respect to species names, both *Erycides araxes* Hewitson, 1867, and *Pyrrhopyga cyrillus* Plötz, 1879, were based on material from Mexico — and the latter has long been recognized as a subjective synonym of the former. Following its introduction by Godman & Salvin (1893) as a "distinct race" of *P. araxes* from Arizona, *Pyrrhopyge arizonae* was formally treated as a subspecies by Dyar (1905) and Barnes & McDunnough (1917: 17). Since then *arizonae* continued to be treated almost universally as a subspecies of *araxes* until Burns & Janzen (2001) proposed that it should be given full species status, based on comparing the male genitalia of material from Arizona with specimens from the vicinity of Mexico City. But according to Opler & Warren (2002), the genitalia of populations from intermediate areas

Dull Firetip's English and scientific names remain unchanged, *Pyrrhopyge araxes*.

Top: Sept. 7, 2012. Parker Canyon Lake, Cochise Co., AZ.

Bottom: Aug. 19, 2005. Etla-Guacamayas Rd., OAX, Mexico.

exhibit intermediate characters to those cited by Burns & Janzen (2001), and point out that other geographic variants are known. Caterino et al. (2003) made an earlier committee ruling against species status for *arizonae*. However, Mielke (2005a), citing Burns & Janzen (2001), treated *araxae* and *arizonae* as separate. Currently the situation seems unresolved, although the Butterflies of America website (Warren et al., 2012), based on Opler & Warren (2004) and Pelham (2008), and in opposition to Burns & Janzen (2001), still treats *arizonae* as a subspecies of *araxes*.

Scientific Name Discussion

Following release of the first draft case to the committee, a member commented: The NABA Names Committee (Caterino et al., 2003) has already considered Burns' paper (Burns & Janzen, 2001) where he treated the U.S. populations as *arizonae*, and decided to retain *araxes*. Unless there is new published information that provides data arguing for a split, the Committee should not reconsider the same issue. Otherwise, it's an endless loop. I think that we should stick to the genus question on this one.

The Chair responded: "At first sight this seems a difficult case. However, that difficulty only arises if one thinks in the 'normal' taxonomic way of trying to assess options. For the NABA list, stability is the goal, and is to be maintained unless there is very convincing evidence that a change is needed, and that that evidence has been published or otherwise made available. With respect to the species status of "arizonae", as now pointed out, this was already rejected by the NABA committee in 2003 (Caterino et al., 2003).

"Currently the Butterflies of America website still regards *arizonae* as a subspecies of *araxes*. Taking these two views together, our correct action for the NABA list has to be to maintain the species name as *araxes*. Should separate species status of *arizonae* ever be unequivocally established, given the allopatry involved, no loss of information is likely.

"The generic separation is, however, a challenge. The extensive splitting of genera within the Pyrrhopygini proposed by Olaf Mielke, a widely acknowledged authority on Neotropical skippers, results in a scheme of 27 genera, with an average of *ca* 5 species per genus (dropping to fewer than 4 per genus if *Pyrrhopyge* itself is excluded). This classification does not appear to be well corroborated or founded insofar as clear (phylogenetic or cladistic) arguments for these divisions have not, so far as I can tell, been presented. Mielke's work (2002) appears to me to be based on typology more than phylogeny. If not, then he has not published his argumentation.

"If we go to the Tree of Life (http://tolweb.org/Pyrrhopygina/94268) we see that the 27 genera recognized by Mielke (2004) are simply listed under Pyrrhopygina (downgraded from tribal status by Warren et al., 2008), *without any phylogenetic or cladistic structure*. The ToL list is evidently based on Mielke's work, interpreted in the light of Warren et al. (2008). The latter included molecular data for 7 of the *ca* 130 species of Pyrrhopygina currently recognized, representing 7 of the 27 genera, including *Apyrrothrix araxes* and *Pyrrhopyge zenodorus* (formerly treated as a subspecies of *P. phidias*, but now widely accepted as a separate species). In their cladogram (Warren et al., 2008: p. 6), *araxes* groups with *Creonpyge* (a monobasic genus), and these two together then form a 'quadrichotomy' with the single representatives for *Pyrrhopyge*, *Mysoria* + *Sarbia*, and *Elbella* + *Parelbella*. In my view this does not provide any convincing evidence for separate generic status of any of the included 'genera'; it does provide some evidence consistent with the view that the 27 nominal genera listed as constituting the Pyrrhopygina likely do form a monophyletic group (family level groupings being the object of interest for the Warren et al. 2008 paper).

"Unless more published evidence comes to hand demonstrating unequivocally that *Apyrrhothrix* differs at generic level from the *ca* 40 species currently included in *Pyrrhopyge* (type species *Papilio bixae* L., currently treated as a synonym or subspecies of *P. phidias* L.), in my view for the purposes of the NABA list, we should continue to place *araxes* as a species belonging to the genus *Pyrrhopyge*. If at a later date its generic separateness were fully documented and then accepted, no loss of information is likely. However, in this context I have received the following very interesting and potentially highly relevant comment:

"[This taxon represents] … an interesting complex of several phenotypes that can be grouped into 5 or 6 groups by genitalia and COI sequences, three of these have names: araxes, arizonae and cyrillus, but others are not yet named. I suspect that these eventually will be treated as species. I think Burns is correct, and he usually is! Only one of them enters U.S. However, they all diverged rather recently (~0.5mya), and there is no solid documentation published about this complex being split into several distinct species.

These skippers are quite distant from typical *Pyrrhopyge* (8% COI distance — for skippers means different genera usually), but are closer to *Chalypyge*, *Melanopyge*, *Jonaspyge*, etc. Also, considering how huge *Pyrrhopyge* sensu lato (Evans) is, it is not constructive to maintain it as such. In my taste I would have *Chalypyge*, *Melanopyge*, etc as subgenera inside *Apyrrothrix*, but this has not been published. Regardless, *Apyrrothrix* is the oldest name, and I think the best supported name for the U.S. skipper is *Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae*."

To these points the Chair responded: "These are exactly the sorts of data and interpretation we need (leaving aside the issue of how large should a genus be — in the Indo-Australian region we are still pretty happy with e.g. *Euploea* (*ca* 60), *Delias* (200 +) and *Arhopala* (200 ++), for example). However, our problem here is rather fundamental to the mode of NABA working — the cases we consider not only ought to have been 'out there' for at least 5 years (as in the present case) — but, more importantly, the data and argumentation we can use to decide have to be in the public domain. This normally means published, or in some reputable online database. Are these relationships … based on more than COI, and are the data and interpretations publicly accessible? I am not sure, but it would appear not. If in BOLD, the data still need interpretation. … [T] his information would not appear admissible for the present and, in that case, I would still favour retaining *Pyrrhopyge araxes* for the purposes of the current NABA list."

Three comments were received from committee members: (1) I agree that it would be too early to make changes, although the recent information on the potential species complex suggests changes may be made in future. As for the genus, the predisposition for lepidopterists (butterfly taxonomists in particular) to create numerous genera is simply devaluing the category (as is the case with birds). (2) [The] analysis seems very helpful here, and … [so] I vote for *Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae*. (3) *Apyrrothrix araxes*. I am inclined for this combination because it is plausible to consider a strong case for a good generic entity separate from *Pyrrhopyge*. These are some of my reasons: The generic name *Apyrrothrix* is available. The type species of the genus *Apyrrothrix* Lindsay, 1921 is (by original designation) *Erycides araxes* Hewitson, 1867, the taxon we are dealing with. Mielke's morphological diagnosis establishes clear distinctions between *Pyrrhopyge* and *Apyrrothrix*, not only in male genitalic structures, but also in several other non-traditional characters for butterflies (as frontoclypeus, abdominal terga, etc.). This nomenclatural combination has been at least justified by morphological studies since Lindsay erected the genus. Mielke's revision seems sufficient to me, and is now 13 years published. I give total credibility to [the] information on genetic distance between generic entities here in discussion (included in the document "Chairman's comments").

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 8 in favor of *Pyrrhopyge araxes*, 2 in favor of *Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae*; 1 in favor of *Apyrrothrix araxes*; 1 abstention (non-return).

Pyrrhopyge araxes is to be maintained on the NABA checklist. (As in all cases, if convincing new data are published indicative that one or more changes are required, the case can be re-opened.)

English Names Subcommittee

Given that Dull Firetip is the official NABA English name for this species, and that there is no change in the scientific name of the species, the English Names Subcommittee saw no reason to change the English name.

English Name Decision

Votes cast for maintaining Dull Firetip: 5. Votes cast for changing this name: 0.

Dull Firetip is maintained as the NABA name for *Pyrrhopyge araxes*.

NABA-NC 2014-05 *Polygonus manueli*

***Polygonus manueli* Bell & Comstock, 1948, versus *Polygonus savigny* (Latreille, 1824): potential change of scientific name**

Scientific Names Subcommittee

Hesperia savigny Latreille, 1824: 716, 741. Type locality: "Antilles" [West Indies?]. Lectotype (designated by Mielke & Casagrande, 2002: 40) in Musée National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.

Polygonus manueli Bell & Comstock, 1948: 4, fig. 1. Type locality: Nova Bremen [=Dahlbergia], Santa Catarina, Brazil, in American Museum of Natural History, New York.

Polygonus manueli Bell & Comstock; Evans, 1952: 55, pl. 14.

[*Polygonus leo savigny* (Latreille); Evans, 1952: 54. Misidentification.]

Polygonus savigny (Latreille); Mielke & Casagrande, 2002: 40; Mielke, 2004: 75; Mielke, 2005b: 318.

The scientific name for Manuel's Skipper has been considered for years to be *Polygonus manueli* Bell & Comstock, 1948 (type locality Santa Catarina, Brazil), and this is how it is listed in the NABA checklist (2nd edition). However, Mielke & Casagrande (2002: 40) stated that they had examined a syntype of *Hesperia savigny* Latreille, 1824, designated it as the lectotype for this name, and considered it to represent the same species as the holotype *P. manueli*. If so, based on priority, the scientific name of Manuel's Skipper would become *Polygonus savigny*, with *P. manueli* a junior subjective synonym of the nominate subspecies.

Mielke & Casagrande (2002) offered no evidence other than their assertion that *savigny* and *manueli* pertain to the same species. Fortunately type materials for both taxa are well illustrated by Warren et al. (2012).

All recent major sources appear to have accepted the proposed synonymy. Probably reflecting this, searching using Google gives 1360 hits for "Polygonus manueli" but 1830 for "Polygonus savigny". The question that we have to decide upon, therefore, is whether there is overwhelming evidence that *Poylgonus manueli* Bell & Comstock, described from

Jan Dauphin

Manuel's Skipper's English and scientific names remain unchanged, *Polygonus manueli*.

Oct. 13, 2014. Mission, Hidalgo Co., TX.

southern Brazil is the same species as *P. savigny* (Latreille) described from the "Antilles", or not. Were the answer to be "no", then given the very strong similarity of the type specimens of the two nominal species, which of them occurs in southern Texas could be a further issue to be resolved.

According to Evans (1952), the two species included in *Polygonus* (the other being *leo* (Gmelin, 1790)) are "very similar" — but as the Hammock Skipper (*P. leo*) is also included on the NABA list, this similarity is evidently not a problem. Thus if it is agreed that *savigny* and *manueli* are not the same species, then the implication would be that a third species of *Polygonus* would have to be recognized. Mielke (2005b) catalogued just two species in *Polygonus*, both polytypic.

Scientific Name Discussion

The Chair commented *in extenso*: "The type material of *manueli* Bell & Comstock, 1948, is from southern Brazil; regarding *savigny* Latreille, 1824, it was originally stated "se trouve aux Antilles." The types are illustrated at http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/L/polygonus_s_savigny_types.htm.

"Recent accounts consider these two nominal taxa conspecific, and use the senior name (*savigny*) for a species of *Polygonus* that supposedly extends from southern USA all the way south to Argentina. Only two subspecies are currently recognized, the second being *punctus* Bell & Comstock (Lesser Antilles only).

"The genus *Polygonus* currently contains only two recognized species — the one in question here, and *P. leo*. Both are widespread in Central and South America, both can occur in the southern states of the USA — but only *leo* appears known from the Greater Antilles (Cuba, Hispaniola, Jamaica — as confirmed e.g., by the major works of Schwartz, 1989, on Hispaniola, and Brown & Heineman, 1972, on Jamaica), extending to the Bahamas, Porto Rico and western Lesser Antilles. As indicated above, there is a subspecies of the former from the Lesser Antilles — which presumably therefore excludes islands in this area as well as the Greater Antilles as candidates for the true type locality of *Hesperia savigny*. So, if the Paris Museum specimen illustrated on the Butterflies of America website as the Lectotype of *savigny* is authentic, then the published type locality is false (very common at that time). If false, its most likely origin would be Surinam or southern Brazil — although by the 1820s other sources in Latin America were beginning to become available.

"The "*savigny* Lectotype" is shown as having three labels, none original to Latreille: a printed MNHN "type" label, a MNHN stock label saying "American Collection", and a determination label added in 1956 by late MNHN staff member Pierre Viette. This relates to a paper he published in the same year (Viette, 1956). Taking Viette's paper, and earlier publications by Riley (1926) and Evans (1952) into account, we can now see how the current situation came about.

"In the 1920s Norman Riley, assisted by F. Le Cerf, studied numerous Latreille skipper types in Paris. With respect to *savigny*, he simply listed this Latreille name (Riley, 1926: 233) as a synonym of *Acolastus amyntas* (Fabricius, 1775) — very likely confirmed in his mind by the illustrations in 'Seitz', which depict *manueli* as *amyntas* (see Evans, 1952: 54,55). *Acolastus* Scudder is a junior objective synonym of *Polygonus. Papilo amyntas* is a primary homonym, explicitly replaced by *Papilio leo* Gmelin, 1790 (see Vane-Wright, 1975). Evans (1952: 53) says of *Polygonus* "A genus with no near ally and containing *2 very similar species*" [emphasis added]. At the time Riley made his identification, only a single species of *Polygonus* would have been recognized — *Polygonus manueli* not being described until 1948. Thus it is very plausible that Riley failed to appreciate that two species were involved, and thus assigned the Latreille type to *amyntas* (now *leo*). On this authority Evans (1952) then simply maintained *savigny* as a name pertaining to *leo* (using it, not unreasonably given the provenance stated by Latreille, for the subspecies of *leo* found in Cuba and some other Antillean islands).

"Evans did not study the type material in Paris personally; had he done so, he would almost certainly have recognized *savigny* as a senior name for *manueli*. Viette's (1956) report on the Latreille skipper types includes an important account of the fate of Latreille's collection, and how some of the skipper types came to be in Paris, others in London. On this basis he recognized a number of problems with Riley's (1926) paper. However, crucially for our purposes here, he was clearly satisfied that the Paris specimen considered by Riley to be the type of *Hesperia savigny* was valid and, as can be seen from the images on the Butterflies of America website, he added additional labels to ensure correct recognition in future. On this basis I think we have to accept that this specimen represents the valid primary type of *H. savigny*, and it has the same phenotype as the species named by Bell & Comstock in 1948 as *Polygonus manueli*.

"Thus we have two nominal species names in contention that appear to relate to a single species of *Polygonus* — *savigny* from an uncertain origin, *manueli* from southern Brazil — and we are concerned to determine which of these names to apply to specimens with the same phenotype that have been found in the United States. Thus it would appear critical to have further evidence that *Polygonus* does include only two species, *leo* and another, and that material from the U.S. can be assigned to both.

"There are some *Polygonus* barcode data in the BOLD system (http://www.boldsystems.org/index.php/Taxbrowser_Taxonpage?taxid=17533). A basic analysis kindly performed for me by David Lees reveals division of the data into two major clades. The first (some 43 records) includes

all but one sample of "leo" including material from Cuba and Florida, but also one labelled *manueli manueli* from Mexico. Looking at the images, there are 3 labelled as *manueli* — the undersides are not shown, but I think these are misidentified *leo*, as the barcode data would suggest.

The second major clade comprises all *ca* 50 samples labelled "savigny" plus one labelled "leo Mexico". The latter is probably a misidentification too (maybe labels or tags were somehow switched on the misfits, one each from Mexico). All the *savigny* samples are from Mexico and Central America, with one exception: a single sample from Sta Catarina (southern Brazil) — close to the true type locality for *manueli*. This single sample groups as sister to all of the others listed as *savigny*, with a fairly large (but currently uninterpreted) gap.

This suggests the possibility that what is currently regarded as *savigny* could be two species (or more). If so, given the doubts about the provenance of the *savingy* type, conceivably both names could apply to the southern Brazil "species". Were that to be the case, the name to apply to U.S. populations at species level would probably be *punctus*! On the other hand, if we were happy to accept that the BOLD data support only two species, *leo* and another, then the oldest name for the latter would indeed seem to be *savigny*, with *manueli* a junior subjective synonym at species level.

"If we cannot find more published or publicly accessible data now, given all these uncertainties, one could argue that for NABA the existing usage of *manueli* be continued at present, but kept under review. No loss of data would be involved whatever the final outcome, *if it is assumed there are only two species of* Polygonus *in North America*. Having said that, based on the existing taxonomic system, the primary type of *savigny* and the type material of *manueli* clearly belong to the same currently accepted morphospecies. But we are still left with the problem, where did the primary type of *savigny* actually come from?"

The committee received the following comment: [This is] a tough one, because my opinion mostly relies on unpublished data that I can't ignore. Anyway, *manueli* is a Brazilian species, so it should not be used for [the] butterfly [that enters North America]. However, it is a name junior to *savigny* in any case, and *Polygonus savigny* should be used for now, in agreement with everything recently published.

To this the Chair responded: It is interesting that [the respondent] says "for now". That is exactly what I would say if I were writing a research paper. But the consensus list for NABA reflects a fundamentally different approach/requirement. Having said that, we can speculate that [the] "unpublished data that he can't ignore" [indicates] evidence that *manueli* is a Brazilian species separate from the similar *Polygonus* found in USA. So … in this case, continuing to use *manueli* would in fact be misleading [misidentifications are pernicious; synonyms are not] — made in my view even tougher by the uncertainty over the provenance of the *savigny* type — which very plausibly could also be southern Brazil. I think we should therefore consider revisiting this one before making any decision.

The following five comments were subsequently received from Committee members: (1) With the proviso that the case should be revisited, as per Chairman's comments. (2) Agree with waiting for now (it sounds as though we will get better resolution after [the respondent] has published his data). (3) No change from present usage until more research is done. (4) Regardless the problem of the true type locality of this taxon, there is one valid type specimen, and so the name [*savignyi*] is stabilized and available. The other name *manueli* should be retained as a junior synonym. As evident from the information displayed in the "Chairman's comments" this seems to be the best temporary solution. (5) My thinking is that since we have information that there is a credible possibility that that there may be yet another species in this group, with it being unclear which would be the species entering the U.S., and since we have already waited 14 years subsequent to the publication of the Mielke and Casagrande paper that synomized *manueli* and *savigny*, that we should wait another year or so and then revisit the question. There is no urgency here.

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 3 in favor of *Polygonus manueli*, 3 in favor of deferring decision (≡ 3 votes for *P. manueli*), 5 in favor of *Polygonus savigny*, 1 abstention (non-return).

Polygonus manueli is to be maintained on the NABA checklist.

English Names Subcommittee

Given that Manuel's Skipper is the official NABA English name for this species, and that there is no change in the scientific name of the species, the English Names Subcommittee saw no reason to change the English name.

English Name Decision

Votes cast for maintaining Manuel's Skipper: 5.
Votes cast for changing this name: 0.

Manuel's Skipper is maintained as the NABA name for *Polygonus manueli*.

NABA-NC 2014-09 *Antigonus erosus*

***Antigonus erosus* (Hübner, 1812), species new to the list**

Scientific Names Subcommittee

Urbanus vetus Erosus Hübner, 1812: pl. [153], figs 1–4. Type locality uncertain (no data); whereabouts of type material unknown, probably lost. Date of publication: Hemming, 1937: 404.

Hesperia westermann Latreille, 1824: 728, 791. Type locality Brazil. Type material collected by *Langsdorff*. Syntype in BMNH (image at: http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/L/ih/westermannLatr_i.htm). Original synonymy by Kirby, 1877: 836 [as *westermanni*, sic].

Achlyodes erosus (Hübner); Westwood, 1852: 524.

Thanaos westermanni [sic] (Latreille); Butler, 1870c: 97.

Nisoniades westermanni [sic] (Latreille); Kirby, 1871: 630.

Helias erosus (Hübner); Kirby, 1879: 239.

Systasea erosa [sic]; Godman & Salvin, 1895: 411.

Antigonus erosus (Hübner); Evans, 1953: 157; Mielke, 2004: 43; Mielke, 2005c: 442; Glassberg, 2012: 307 (fig.).

A specimen identified as *Antigonus erosus* (Hübner) was observed at Shary Road, Mission, Hidalgo County, Texas, on 17 October 2004 (Knudson et al., 2004). This was the only record of this species from North America (Glassberg, 2012) until a female was found at the National Butterfly Center on May 17, 2015 (see pg 33, Hot Seens, this issue of *American Butterflies*).

Antigonus erosus is not regarded as polytypic. The only other species-group name associated with this species is *Hesperia westermann* Latreille, consistently treated as a synonym since Kirby (1877).

Seven generic names other than *Antigonus* Hübner, 1819 (type species: *Urbanus erosus*), have been combined with *erosus* and/or *westermann*: *Urbanus* Hübner, *Hesperia* Fabricius, *Achlyodes* Hübner, *Thanaos* Boisduval, *Nisoniades* Hübner, *Helias* Fabricius, and *Systasea* Edwards. All of these names with one exception are in use for generic groupings other than the group of species currently included in *Antigonus*; the exception being *Thanaos*, considered to be an objective synonym of *Erynnis* Schrank. *Antigonus* has two junior subjective synonyms: *Chaetoneura* Felder & Felder, 1862 (type species *Chaetoneura hippalus* Felder & Felder) and *Systaspes* Weeks, 1905 (type species: *Antigonus corrosus* Mabille). Therefore, given the present classification of the Hesperiidae and the fact that *erosus* is the type species of *Antigonus*, *Antigonus* is currently the only generic name amongst those that have been combined with *erosus* that can be applied to it.

Scientific Name Discussion

The Chair commented: I cannot see any reason not to accept *Antigonus erosus* as the name for this species, on addition to the NABA list. I shall be voting for its adoption.

The committee received the following comment: the name for this skipper would depend on the neotype designation, but at the moment it is not possible to suggest anything but *Antigonus erosus*.

One comment was received from a committee member: The case is well documented in the NABA draft … It seems to me clear that the name should be applied without problem.

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 10 in favor of *Antigonus erosus*, 1 abstention (non-return).

Antigonus erosus is adopted by NABA as the scientific name for the *Antigonus* first recorded from Texas by Knudson et al. (2004).

English Names Subcommittee

English names already in use for this species:
Dusted Spurwing: Glassberg (2007); Glassberg (2012).
Common Spurwing: Garwood and Lehman (2004).
Powdered Grey Spurwing: Hoskins (2015).

The name Dusted Spurwing is in somewhat greater usage than is Common Spurwing, including being the only name used in any U.S. field guide. The lead author of the 2004 work now uses Dusted Spurwing at her website. There are currently nine species of spurwings — previously adopted on the NABA Checklist as the group name for the genus *Antigonus* — and only two of them, this species and *A. nearchus*, have widespread (= common) distributions. The dusted gray color of the males is unique and thus the name Dusted Spurwing might be a valuable field identification aid.

English Name Discussion

One example of Committee members' comments "Common doesn't tell me anything. Dusted does and I feel describes the butterfly well."

English Name Decision

Votes cast for species name: 5 cast for Dusted, 0 cast for Common, 0 cast for Powdered Grey.

Dusted Spurwing is adopted as the NABA name for *Antigonus erosus*.

***Antigonus erosus* is added to the NABA Checklist and its English name becomes Dusted Spurwing.**

Aug. 9, 2014. Frontera Corrazol, Chiapas, Mexico.

NABA-NC 2014-11 *Mylon pelopidas* (Fabricius, 1793), species new to list

Scientific Names Subcommittee

Hesperia pelopidas Fabricius, 1793: 350. Type locality: "Indiis" [Surinam?]. Type material in Drury Collection [probably lost?]. Iconotype: Jones Icones 6: pl. 27, fig.2 (upper and undersides).

Pyrgus pelopidas (Fabricius); Butler, 1870a: 280.

Achlyodes ozema Butler, 1870b: 515. Type locality: Nicaragua, Honduras, Brazil [BMNH].

Leucochitonea pelopidas (Fabricius); Kirby, 1871: 617.

Antigonus ozema (Butler); Plötz, 1884: 28.

Eudamidas ozema (Butler); Godman & Salvin, 1895: 386.

Mylon pelopidas (Fabricius); Mabille, 1903: 63; Evans, 1953: 148; Mielke, 2004: 50; Mielke, 2005c: 608.

Mylon ozema ab. *brunnea* Mabille & Boullet, 1917: 55. Type-locality: Mexico, Brazil [MNHN, Paris].

***Mylon pelopidas* is added to the NABA Checklist and its English name becomes Pale Mylon.**

July 25, 2015. Parque Agua Blanca, Tabasco, Mexico.

Hitherto known only from Mexico south to Paraguay, *Mylon pelopidas* has now been recorded from North America based on a single male encountered at Sycamore Canyon, Santa Cruz County, Arizona, 12th September 2005, by Kim Davis and Mike Stangeland (Davis et al., 2005). The identification was confirmed by dissection and evaluation of the genitalia, in particular by reference to the account of Austin (2000), noting that, of the six species of *Mylon* included by Austin in the *pelopidas* species group, "*pelopidas* has the most distinctive male genitalia, with, long, slender harpes" (Davis et al., 2005: 103). Apparently the male genitalia of this species are so distinct they can be assessed in the field, even without the use of a hand-lens (Davis et al., 2005: 106). This species has been accepted as North American by Glassberg (2012: 325).

There are, potentially, three taxonomic issues affecting the name of this species. In the absence of authentic type material, and given the great exo-phenotypic similarity between *pelopidas* and the five other members of the *pelopidas* group (Austin, 2000; Davis et al., 2005) — at least two of which are also known from Mexico — can we be certain that the binomen *Hesperia pelopidas* Fabricius (type locality uncertain, most likely Surinam) really refers to this species? Should that eventually prove not to be the case, is there an available junior name that we can be sure does apply? Thirdly, six generic names other than *Mylon* have been applied to this butterfly — so can we be sure that *Mylon* is the correct, or at least best generic name to use?

Fabricius (1793) based and named this species, at least in part, on unpublished images made by William Jones from one or more specimens in the Dru Drury collection. Drury's collection was sold by auction after his death in 1804, and some of his specimens thereby passed to Alexander Macleay. Macleay's huge insect collection is now in Sydney, Australia. Finding a specific specimen in the Macleay Collection is a major task (Chair, pers. obs.); to date, very few type specimens relating to Drury have been located there. There is no report that the type material of *Hesperia pelopidas* has been found in Sydney — and indeed *H. pelopidas* may never have come into Macleay's possession anyway. Few if any other depositories for authentic Drury material are known.

The two William Jones images do not help in this regard — other than confirming that the name probably does apply to a member of what is now treated as the *Mylon pelopidas* species group (Austin, 2000). Certainly the images show a skipper that is "dingy gray-brown overall" (Glassberg, 2012: 325), but it would be impossible to make a critical identification on the basis of the Jones' paintings (Chair, pers. obs.). Arguably this may be a case where designation of a neotype could be justified. If so, a specimen from amongst the syntypic material of *Achlyodea ozema* should be considered, so long as any such specimen conforms to the current concept of *pelopidas*, and is also available for designation as the lectotype of *ozema*. In that way *ozema* would become an objective synonym of *pelopidas*, reducing the risk of further uncertainty.

If, for some reason (such as discovery of the type material), it were decided that the name *Hesperia pelopidas* Fabricius could not apply to the taxon currently known as *Mylon pelopidas*, the species name *Achlyodes ozema* would appear to be the most likely substitute. According to Godman & Salvin (1895), Holland (1927) and Hayward (1933), butterflies

identified as *Eudamidas ozema* have genitalia of the same form as the species now known as *M. pelopidas*. However, it needs to be checked to ensure that at least some of the type material of *A. ozema* does actually conform to this current diagnosis. Moreover, should it prove that the original syntypic series is mixed then, if feasible, a lectotype selection should be made that best serves the interests of stability.

With respect to generic names, other than *Mylon* Godman & Salvin, 1894 (type species *Leucochitonea lassia* Hewitson, 1868), the taxon currently named *pelopidas* Fabricius has been combined in the genera *Hesperia* Fabricius, 1793 (type species *Papilio comma* Linnaeus, 1758), *Pyrgus* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Papilio alveolus* Hübner, 1800 = *P. malvae* Linnaeus, 1758), *Achlyodes* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Papilio busirus* Cramer, 1779), *Leucochitonea* Wallengern, 1857 (types species *Leucochitonea levubu* Wallengren, 1857), *Antigonus* Hübner, 1819 (type species *Urbanus erosus* Hübner, 1812), and *Eudamidas* Godman & Salvin, 1895 (type species *Papilio melander* Cramer, 1780 = *P. menippus* Fabricius, 1776 = *P. maimon* Fabricius, 1775).

Of these genera, *Hesperia* belongs to the Hesperiinae, whereas all the rest including *Mylon* belong to the subfamily Pyrginae. *Leucochitonea* is currently regarded as a small, exclusively African genus (Ackery et al., 1995). *Pyrgus, Achlyodes* and *Antigonus* are all in use for separate, valid genera, with all three represented in the New World (Mielke, 2005c). Finally, *Eudamidas* is currently regarded as a junior subjective synonym of *Mylon* (Evans, 1953; Mielke, 2005c).

Within *Mylon*, *M. lassia* is in use as the senior name for a recognized species, while *melander* Cramer is regarded as a junior subjective synonym of another species, *M. maimon* (Fabricius, 1775). Austin (2000) divided *Mylon* into three species assemblages based on differences in wing pattern and genital morphology: the *lassia*, *menippus* [= *maimon*] and *pelopidas* species groups. The generic name *Mylon* s.s. applies to the first of these, and the junior *Eudamidas* to the second; the *pelopidas* species group does not include any species-group taxon that is the type of an available generic name. Were the genus *Mylon* subsequently split into two genera, it is conceivable that *pelopidas* would be included in *Eudamidas*; if split into three, it is likely that to accommodate *pelopidas* would require erection of a new genus. However, in current classifications (e.g. Mielke, 2005c; Warren et al., 2008, 2009), *Mylon* is the only name applied to *pelopidas*.

Scientific Name Discussion

The Chair commented: "This case is not quite 'cut and dried'. Application of *Mylon* is not certain were the current group of species assigned to *Mylon* split into two or more separate groups. Is the monophyly of *Mylon* as currently circumscribed well founded? Should we do more to ascertain that? Likewise, the species name is at some risk from the (in my view very unlikely) discovery of the original type material. Given that uncertainty, is any function served by designating a Neotype (as discussed in the current case notes)?

"Having said that, I do not see any other name on the horizon, so to speak, and think it unlikely this will change in the near future. The name is in use in Glassberg's *Swift Guide* (2012). So on balance I currently propose to vote for the adoption of *Mylon pelopidas* for the species encountered in the U.S. by Davis and Strangeland (Davis et al., 2005)."

The committee received a comment: stating that the name would depend on the neotype designation, and the specimen selected should probably be from Suriname, and at that point the name for the U.S. butterfly would likely be *ozema*. However, if published information is considered, today's name is *Mylon pelopidas*.

Two comments were received from committee members: (1) Designation of a neotype has its attractions. However, unlikely as the discovery of the type material might be, there is an outside chance of its discovery. As long as the specimen on which the North American record of *M. pelopidas* is clearly vouchered and labelled, then it would not really be NABA's role to designate a neotype (not that this has been proposed). (2) *Mylon pelopidas.* I totally rely on the criteria used to identify this taxon recorded once from Arizona (distinctive male genitalia included). Very long story and, as in many cases, we should keep adopting this name until another study demonstrates the opposite.

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 9 in favor of *Mylon pelopidas*, 1 in favor of *Mylon ozema*, 1 abstention (non-return).

Mylon pelopidas is adopted by NABA as the scientific name for the *Antigonus* recorded from Texas by Knudson et al. (2004).

English Names Subcommittee

English Names already in use for this species:
Dingy Mylon: Glassberg (2007); Glassberg (2012),
Pale Mylon: Warren et. al.
Pallid Mylon: Hoskins (2015).

Dingy Mylon and Pale Mylon returned approximately the same number of web hits, Pallid Mylon, less than one-tenth as many.

English Name Discussion

One Committee member said "Fifteen species are currently placed in the genus *Mylon*. To my eyes, at least three or four of these are paler than *M. pelopidas*." Another Committee member commented "I don't like the term dingy as a decription for butterflies. Would you want to be called dingy?" A third Committee member contributed "I'm not a big fan of either Pale or Dingy. Pale because of the confusion highlighted above. Dingy since for the Mylons, the word dingy doesn't seem to quit fit for *pelopidas*. I know we should try to be conservative and pick one of the current names but what about Ashy Mylon? "

English Name Decision

Votes cast for group name: 5 cast for Mylon, 0 cast for skipper, 0 cast for any other name.
Votes cast for species name, 1st ballot: 2 cast for Pale, 2 cast for Dingy, 1 cast for Ashy. If a ballot of the English Names Committee results in a tie between two names, the procedures of the English Names Subcommittee call for a run-off ballot that includes only the top two vote-getting names. In this case, only Run-off ballot: 3 cast for Pale, 2 cast for Dingy.

Pale Mylon is adopted as the NABA name for *Mylon pelopidas*.

NABA-NC 2014-13
Amblyscirtes simius

***Amblyscirtes simius* Edwards, 1881, versus *Notamblyscirtes simius* (Edwards, 1881): potential change of scientific name**

Scientific Names Subcommittee

Amblyscirtes simius Edwards, 1881: 6. Type locality: USA, Colorado, Custer County, Oak Creek Canyon. Type material in Carnegie Museum of Natural History. [http://butterfliesofamerica.com/notamblyscirtes_simius.htm; accessed 16.xi.2012]

Chaerephon simius (Edwards); Barnes & McDunnough (1916).

Stomyles simius (Edwards); Draudt (1924).

Yvretta simius (Edwards); Hemming (1935).

Amblyscirtes simius Edwards; Freeman (1943).

?genus *simius* (Edwards); Burns (1990).

Not-"*Amblyscirtes*" *simius* (Edwards); Scott (1992: 146); Pelham (2008).

Notamblyscirtes Scott, 2006: 70. Type species: *Amblyscirtes simius* Edwards, 1881, by original designation.

Notamblyscirtes simius (Edwards); Scott (2006); Pelham (2008).

In the current NABA checklist (2nd edition), the Simius Roadside-Skipper is one of over 20 species of North American hesperiids included in the genus *Amblyscirtes* Scudder, 1872 (type species: *Hesperia vialis* Edwards, 1862). All of these species, with the exception of *simius*, have male genitalia with a very similar 'ground-plan'. As noted by Evans (1955), MacNeil (1975), Stanford (1981) and Scott (1986, 1992, 2006), and discussed in detail by Burns (1990), the male genitalia of *simius* are in many respects radically different. In discussing these differences, and certain other characters (including the female genitalia, which also differ), Burns (1990) was emphatic that *simius* was not a member of *Amblyscirtes* — but declined to erect a new genus for it, as he considered it might eventually be placed as a peripheral isolate of one of the numerous Neotropical skipper genera.

Scott (1992) referred to this species as Not-"*Amblyscirtes*" *simius*, giving rise to uncertainty as to whether or not he had intended to erect a new genus, *Notamblyscirtes*, for this species. Scott (2006) referred to this uncertainty, stating that this genus was "inadvertently but validly

The species *simius* Edwards 1881, is removed from the genus Amblyscirtes and placed in the genus Notamblyscirtes. Accordingly, the English name is changed from Simius Roadside-Skipper to Simius Skipper.

June 5, 1997. Penrose, Fremont Co., CO.

named" by him in 1992 but, because of the ambiguity, he then named the genus again in a manner fully acceptable under the ICZN Code. Pelham (2008) rejected the 1992 'naming', but accepted the 2006 version as the current correct name for the genus of this skipper. Examination of Scott (1992) indicates that Pelham was correct — the relevant section (starting p. 146) is headed by the words "Not-"*Amblyscirtes*" *simius* Edw.", but thereafter in his text Scott refers only to ""*Amblyscirtes*" *simius*" or even just "*A. simius*", he does not designate a type species, and in discussing the characters considered to separate *simius* from "true *Amblyscirtes*", he refers back to Burns (1990), and then adds "[Burns] could not find the proper genus for *simius*."

For the purposes of the third edition of the NABA checklist, two questions arise. First, is the evidence on which the assertion that *Amblyscirtes simius* Edwards cannot be accepted as a member of the genus *Amblyscirtes* compelling? The principal insight on this question still appears to derive from Burns (1990). If the evidence is not compelling, then *simius* should continue to be included in *Amblyscirtes*, the genus in which it was originally described over 100 years ago.

If, however, the evidence for separation of *simius* from *Amblyscirtes* is considered compelling, then which generic name should be applied? On the evidence of the literary synonym presented above, at first sight there would appear to be at least five contenders: *Chaerephon* Godman, 1900 (type species *Pamphila citrus* Mabille, 1889); *Stomyles* Scudder, 1872 (type species *Pyrgus textor* Geyer, 1827–1831); *Yvretta* Hemming, 1935 (type species *Pamphila citrus* Mabille, 1889); Not-'*Amblyscirtes*' Scott, 1992 (type species *Amblyscirtes* Edwards, 1881); and *Notamblyscirtes* Scott, 2006 (type species *Amblyscirtes* Edwards, 1881). However, of these *Chaerephon* is an invalid junior homonym, replaced by *Yvretta*, the type species of which, *Pamphila citrus*, is considered by Burns (1994) to be a member of the genus *Polites* Scudder, 1872 (type species *Hesperia peckius* Kirby, 1837) — a quite different group of species included under *Polites* in the current NABA checklist. The type species of *Stomyles* is considered to be a junior synonym of *Hesperia aesculapius* Fabricius, 1793, included on the NABA checklist as the Lace-winged Roadside-Skipper, *Amblyscirtes aesculapius*. Thus the only contenders, if *simius* is to be placed in a separate genus from *Amblyscirtes*, are Not-'*Amblyscirtes*' and *Notamblyscirtes*. Scott (2006) suggests that, subject to automatic correction, *Notamblyscirtes* Scott, 1992, is valid, whereas as noted above, Pelham (2008) is emphatic that it is not, and that the correct authority and date for this generic name must be Scott, 2006. In conclusion, following Pelham (2008) and the arguments presented above, if *simius* were to be placed in a separate genus from *Amblyscirtes*, then its correct scientific name in the NABA checklist would be *Notamblyscirtes simius* (Edwards, 1881), on recombination with *Notamblyscirtes* Scott, 2006.

There remains, however, the possibility that *simius* does belong to some named but as yet un-associated Neotropical genus, as suggested by Burns (1990) and not contradicted by Scott (1992). In which case, a final question arises — is it better to retain *simius* in *Amblyscirtes*, even if we do not believe it belongs there, rather than accept its transfer to *Notamblyscirtes*, for fear that the latter, monobasic genus will eventually be synonymized with another genus established before 1992?

Finally, it may be worthy of note that the combination "*Notamblyscirtes simius*" generates almost 1000 'hits' using Google — suggestive that it has been widely accepted. However, "*Amblyscirtes simius*" generates more than twenty times that number.

Scientific Name Discussion

The Chair commented: "A rather perplexing issue on the face of it. Apart from aversion to the horrible name *Notamblyscirtes*, surely originally an accident?, on the face of it, it does look as if *simius* lies well outside the group of taxa clustered around the type species of *Amblyscirtes*. However, molecular evidence is pinpointing cases where highly autapomorphic species are sometimes in fact internal to groups of species (genera) that lack the outstanding features but are otherwise very similar to each other. In this case, however, the available molecular evidence, not cited in the draft due to an oversight on my part, appears unequivocal. Warren et al. (2008: 18/19) state the following:

Burns (1990) commented on the hesperiine genus *Amblyscirtes* … He also noted that one species, *simius*, did not belong in *Amblyscirtes*, based on male genitalia that ''differ radically'' from other species in the genus. However, over concern that *simius* may be related to a Neotropical genus unfamiliar to him, Burns treated *simius* as incertae sedis, and did not suggest to which of Evans's groups of hesperiine genera it may belong. Scott (2006) subsequently proposed the generic name *Notamblyscirtes* for *simius*. In addition to *N. simius*, we sampled one *Amblyscirtes* species, *A. exoteria*, whose presence in *Amblyscirtes* has not been disputed (e.g. Burns, 1990). According to our results, the two species are situated in separate tribes. *Notamblyscirtes simius* is in Hesperiini, in a sister relationship with *Euphyes* (177: BS 5). *Amblyscirtes exoteria*, presumably along with other *Amblyscirtes* species, is situated in Moncini, in a sister relationship with *Mnasicles* + *Remella* (167: BS 8), corroborating Burns' (1990) conclusion.

"If we accept the evidence of Warren et al. (2008), and their corroboration of Burns (1990) opinion, then it seems compelling that the species *simius* should be removed from *Amblyscirtes*. The question could now become, is *simius* just an odd species of *Euphyes*? As *Euphyes* must be very familiar to Burns, I can only imagine that this putative relationship is not evident from genital morphology. For the purposes of the NABA checklilst we cannot undertake wholesale revisions. Given the opinion of Burns (backed by Scott) and the results of Warren et al., I think it would be biologically misleading to continue to list *simius* within *Amblyscirtes*. So I currently intend to vote for the change to *Notamblyscirtes simius* — the authorship and date of *Notamblyscirtes* being Scott, 2006."

The committee received a comment opining that this [butterfly] should not remain in *Amblyscirtes*, because the species belongs to a different tribe, and thus, by definition, cannot be in the same genus. and that this species is somewhat similar to *Euphyes*, but stands out from anything else in a library of DNA sequences.

Three comments were received from committee members: (1) I'd reached this conclusion reluctantly before reading the chairman's comments. It would, in my view, have been better to have followed Burns and left well alone until more extensive comparisons had been made with contending genera. However, given that a new name has been applied it is difficult not to accept it, given that the view of all commentators is that *simius* does not belong to *Amblyscirtes*. (2) I understand that Scott deliberately called it *Notamblyscirtes* so I prefer the 2006 version. (3) There seems to be consensus in the peculiarity of the genitalic morphology of this taxon, which excludes it from *Amblyscirtes*. I respect Burns opinion and criteria very much. He is an outstanding morphologist and a renowned expert in Hesperiidae. I am conservative and I would not validate Not-*Amblyscirtes* Scott 1992, because formally the name cannot be available in the circumstances described in the NABA draft case. Should this species belong in another genus already available, it needs formal demonstration and publication. For the moment I would adopt *Notamblyscirtes simius*.

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 9 in favor of *Notamblyscirtes simius*, 1 in favor of *Amblyscirtes simius,* 1 abstention (non-return).

The skipper previously included on the NABA checklist as *Amblyscirtes simius* should

henceforth be called *Notamblyscirtes simius*.

English Names Subcommittee

English Names already in use for this species:
Simius Roadside-Skipper: Cassie et al. (2001)

It would appear that, given the removal of Simius Roadside-Skipper from the genus of roadside-skippers, the English Names Committee has three options: 1, leave this species as Simius Roadside-Skipper; 2, change the name to Simius Skipper; 3, take the opportunity of this name change to create a more meaningful English name.

Comments

One Committee member said "Because *simius* appears to be not closely related to *Amblyscirtes*, my own inclination would be to not keep the current name, Simius Roadside-Skipper." Another offered "Simius Skipper is the most conservative name change although I'd like to hear of any other insightful proposed new names."

The skipper previously included on the NABA checklist as Simius Roadside-Skipper, *Amblyscirtes simius*, should henceforth be called Simius Skipper, *Notamblyscirtes simius*.

NABA-NC 2014-14
Panoquina sylvicola

***Panoquina sylvicola* (Herrich-Schäffer, 1865) versus *Panoquina lucas* (Fabricius, 1793): potential change of scientific name**

Scientific Names Subcommittee

Hesperia lucas Fabricius, 1793: 339. Type locality: "S. America Islands" [West Indies]. Type material in ZMUK, Copenhagen.

Goniloba sylvicola Herrich-Schäffer, 1865: 55. Type locality: Cuba. Type material in Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin.

Prenes sylvicola (Herrich-Schäffer); Scudder, 1863: 81.

Panoquina sylvicola (Herrich-Schäffer); Watson, 1937: 7.

Panoquina lucas lucas (Fabricius); Robbins et al., 1996: 252; Mielke & Casagrande, 2002: 59; Mielke, 2004: 75; Mielke, 2005d: 1137.

The species name for the Purple-washed Skipper has been considered for many years to be *Panoquina sylvicola* (Herrich-Schäffer, 1865), and this is how it is listed in the NABA checklist (2nd edition). However, Robbins, Lamas, Mielke, Harvey & Casagrande (1996: 252) explicitly stated that, in their opinion, *sylvicola* (type locality Cuba) is a junior synonym of *Hesperia lucas* Fabricius, 1793 (type locality [West Indies]). Mielke & Casagrande (2002) later reported that they had examined a syntype of *lucas*, which they designated as lectotype, and that this did represent the same species as a syntype of *Goniloba sylvicola* Herrich-Schäffer, 1865 — which specimen they designated lectotype for that nominal species. If so, based on priority, the scientific name of the Purple-washed Skipper would become *Panoquina lucas*, with *G. sylvicola* a junior subjective synonym of the nominate subspecies. Illustrations of both lectotypes appear to demonstrate that this is the case.

[Note: Butler (1870a: 262, pl. 3, fig. 4d) would appear to have been ultimately responsible for the identification of *Hesperia lucas* with the butterfly cited by Godman (1901: 616, pl. 104, figs 22, 23) as the type species of his new genus *Turesis*. *H. lucas* was similarly treated by Evans (1955: 190) and Hemming (1967: 451) as the type species of *Turesis* Godman, 1901. If the synonymy of *lucas* with *sylvicola* is upheld then, in order to preserve stability, it would be necessary to designate the oldest available name synonymous with Godman's misidentified "*H. lucas*" as the type species of *Turesis* — which is currently taken to be *Goniloba complanula* Herrich-Schäffer, 1869 (e.g. Mielke, 2004: 82; Cock, 2009). Mielke (2005d: 1328) explicitly cites *G. complanula* as the type species of *Turesis*. *T. complanula* is a relatively uncommon neotropical skipper, unknown from North America.]

Hemming (1967: 451) insisted that the un-latinized modern [sic] patronymic *lucas* "is subject to automatic correction to the Latinized genitive "*lucasi*" under Article 31(a) of the Code and is here so corrected." However, this is not a mandatory change under present code (ICZN, 1999: Article 32.5). In general, contemporary lepidopterists (except in continental Europe) prefer original orthography wherever possible.

Current usage, at least as revealed by use of "Google", appears to favour *lucas* to *sylvicola*, and *lucas* to *lucasi.* Thus a search for "Panoquina lucas" gave 2300 hits, "Panoquina sylvicola" 1750, "Panoquina lucasi" none, "Turesis lucasi" 14, and "Turesis lucas" 154 [on 17th November 2012]. "Turesis complanula" resulted in 646 hits. This suggests that the replacement of both *Turesis lucas* by *Turesis complanula,* and *Panoquina sylvicola* by *Panoquina lucas* has been widely accepted, and that the spelling *lucas* is in common use whereas *lucasi* is not.

In passing, it is noted that Hemming (1934: 38) introduced the generic name *Panoquina* as a necessary replacement for *Prenes* Scudder (1872: 81), preoccupied by *Prenes* Gistl, 1848 (Actinopterygii). The generic name is not at issue.

Four questions thus arise. Is the evidence compelling that *Hesperia lucas* Fabricius, 1793, is a senior synonym of *Goniloba sylvicola* Herrich-Schäffer, 1865? If not, then the scientific name of the Purple-washed Skipper in the NABA checklist should remain *Panoquina sylvicola* (Herrich-Schäffer, 1865). On the other hand, even if *lucas* and *sylvicola* are accepted as the same, should *Panoquina lucas* (Fabricius, 1793) be accepted as the scientific name of the Purple-washed Skipper? If the answer to the second question is yes, then it is still necessary to determine the correct form of the species epithet: *lucas* (as in the original orthography), or *lucasi*.

The English name of Purple-washed Skipper remains the same but the scientific name is changed from *Panoquina sylvicola* to *Panoquina lucas*.

June 5, 2013. National Butterfly Center, Hidalgo Co., TX.

Scientific Name Discussion

The Chair commented: "The question in this case largely comes down to whether or not the type specimens of *lucas* and *sylvicola* really belong to the same species. To my inexperienced eye the photographs show butterflies with the diagnostic features given in Glassberg's (2012) *Swift Guide* — even though the Fabrician type has lost the purple sheen of the underside — or is a female, in which case it should be plain brown. Is the forewing of the *lucas* type less extended than one would expect**?** Or is this another sexual dimorphism difference?

"If these specimens are considered to pertain to the same species, and if they are accepted as genuine primary types (I think they are), then it seems to me there is no good reason not to accept the change of the scientific name for the Purple-washed Skipper to *Panoquina lucas* (Fabricius), with *Goniloba sylvicola* Herrich-Schäffer accepted as a junior subjective synonym. But if in your opinion they do not represent the same species, then you might wish to vote that *sylvicola* be retained. In this case I think there would be some expectation that you give an alternative identification for *Hesperia lucas* — including the possibility that the type represents an extinct species. For example, the species represented by the type material of *Jemadia aethiops* (Gmelin) — an invalid homonym — is matched by a number of 18thC specimens, but is not precisely the same as anything that I have seen collected since (Vane-Wright 1975; Vane-Wright & Hughes 2005). I suspect *aethiops* Gmelin may represent an extinct species."

However, such concerns regarding *lucas* F. are largely dispelled by the following comment received: [The] morphology and COI sequences of island and inland forms are similar, and original orthography is preferred by butterfly people, so the name is *Panoquina lucas*.

Two comments were received from committee members: (1) After careful reading

of the case and comments I see a good case of synonymy where the principle of priority has to be applied as well as the original spelling of the specific epithet. (2) I wish to abstain from this one. Too many unknowns.

Scientific Name Decision

Votes cast: 8 in favor of *Panoquina lucas*, none in favor of *Panoquina sylvicola*, 3 abstentions (1 deliberate; 1 accidentally spoiled vote; 1 non-return).

The skipper previously included on the NABA checklist as *Panoquina sylvicola* should henceforth be called *Panoquina lucas*.

English Names Subcommittee

Purple-washed Skipper has heretofore been the NABA English name for this species. Notwithstanding the change in the scientific name of the species from *sylvicola* to *lucas* the English Names Subcommittee saw no reason to change the English name.

English Name Decision

Votes cast for maintaining Purple-washed Skipper: 5. Votes cast for changing this name: 0.

The skipper previously included on the NABA checklist as Purple-washed Skipper, *Panoquina sylvicola*, should henceforth be called Purple-washed Skipper, *Panoquina lucas*.

Acknowledgement

The committee is grateful for extensive comments received from Nick Grishin. During the period over when this report was prepared, we regret to announce that committee member Dr Torben Larsen passed away. For a brief obituary please see page 46 of this issue of *American Butterflies*.

References

Ackery, P.R., Smith, C.R. & Vane-Wright, R.I. 1995. *Carcasson's African Butterflies. An annotated catalogue of the Papilionoidea and Hesperioidea of the Afrotropical Region.* CSIRO, East Melbourne, Australia.

Austin, G.T. 2000. Hesperiidae of Rondônia, Brazil: "*Antigonus*" genus group (Pyrginae), with taxonomic comments and descriptions of new species from Brazil and Guatemala. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* **54**(1): 1–28.

Barnes, W. & McDunnough, J.H. 1916. Notes on North American diurnal Lepidoptera. *Contributions to the Natural History of the Lepidoptera of North America* **3**(2): 51–156, 8 pls.

Barnes, W. & McDunnough, J.H. 1917. *Check List of the Lepidoptera of Boreal America.* Herald Press, Decatur, Illinois.

Bell, E.L. & Comstock, W.P. 1948. A new genus and some new species and subspecies of American Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera, Rhopalocera). *American Museum Novitates* (1379): 23 pp.

Brown, F.M. & Heineman, B. 1972. *Jamaica and its Butterflies.* E.W. Classey, London.

Burns, J.M. 1990. *Amblyscirtes*: problems with species, species groups, the limits of the genus and genus groups beyond—a look at what is wrong with the skipper classification of Evans (Hesperiidae). *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* **44**(1): 11–27.

Burns, J.M. 1994. Split skippers: Mexican genus *Poanopsis* goes in the *origines* group—and *Tvretta* forms the *rhesus* group—of *Polites* (Hesperiidae). *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* **48**(1): 24–45.

Burns, J.M. & Janzen, D.H. 2001. Biodiversity of Pyrrhopyginae skipper butterflies (Hesperiidae) in the Area de Conservación Guanacaste, Costa Rica. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* **55**: 15–43.

Butler, A.G. 1870a. *Catalogue of Diurnal Lepidoptera Described by Fabricius in the Collection of the British Museum*. British Museum, London.

Butler, A.G. 1870b. Descriptions of some new diurnal Lepidoptera, chiefly Hesperiidae. *Transactions of the Entomological Society of London* **1870**(4): 485–520.

Butler, A.G. 1870c. The genera of Hesperidae in the collection of the British Museum. *Entomologist's monthly Magazine* **7**: 55–58, 92–99.

Cassie, B., Glassberg, J., Swengel, A. and Tudor, G. 2001. *North American Butterfly Association (NABA) Checklist & English Names of North American Butterflies* (2nd edn.). NABA, Morristown, New Jersey.

Caterino, M., Glassberg, J. & Heraty, J. 2003. Report of the NABA Names Committee. *American Butterflies* **11**(2): 24–27.

Cock, M.J.W. 2009. The skipper butterflies (Hesperiidae) of Trinidad Part 16, Hesperiinae, Genera Group J, *Vettius – Naevolus*. *Living World, Journal of Trinidad and Tobago Field Naturalists' Club* **2009**: 11–31. [online at: http://ttfnc.org/livworld/lw2009/2009p11cock.pdf, accessed 17.xi.2012]

Davis, K., Stangeland M. Warren, A.D. 2005. *Mylon pelopidas*: a new record for Arizona and the United States. *News of the Lepidopterists' Society* **47**(4): 103–104, 106, 110.

Draudt, M.W.K. 1921–1924. B. Grypocera, breitköpfige Tagfalter. *In* Seitz, A. (ed.), *Gross-Schmetterlinge der Erde* **5**: 836–1011, 31 pls. Alfred Kernen, Stuttgart.

Dyar, H.G. 1905. A review of the Hesperiidae of the United States. *Journal of the New York Entomological Society* **13**(3): 111–141.

Edwards, W.H. 1875. Report upon the collections of diurnal Lepidoptera made in portions of Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, and Arizona during the years 1871, 1872, 1873, and 1874, with notes upon all species known to inhabit Colorado, by Theodore L. Mead, and a list of all species collected, by W.H. Edwards. In Wheeler, G.M. & Humphreys, A.A., *Report upon Geographical and Geological Explorations and Surveys* **5** (Zoology): 737–794, 6 pls.

Edwards, W.H. 1881. Descriptions of new species of diurnal Lepidoptera found within the United States. *Transactions of the American Entomological Society* **9**: 1–8.

Evans, 1951. *A Catalogue of the American Hesperiidae. Part I. Introduction and Group A. Pyrrhopyginae.* British Museum, London.

Evans, W.H. 1952. *A Catalogue of the American Hesperiidae. Part II. (Groups B, C, D) Pyrginae. Section I.* British Museum, London.

Evans, W.H. 1953. *A Catalogue of the American Hesperiidae. Part III.* (Groups E, F, G) *Pyrginae. Section 2.* British Museum, London.

Evans, W.H. 1955. *A Catalogue of the American Hesperiidae. Part IV. (Groups H to P) Hesperiinae and Megathyminae.* British Museum, London.

Fabricius, J.C. 1793. *Entomologia Systematica* volume 3(1). Hafniae.

Freeman, H.A. 1943. New Hesperioidea, with notes on some others from the United States (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera). *Entomological News* **54**: 72–77.

Garwood, K. and Lehman, R. 2004. Butterflies: Northeastern Mexico. Self-published. Weslaco, Texas.

Glassberg, J. 2007. *A Swift Guide to the Butterflies of Mexico and Central America.* Sunstreak Books, Morristown, New Jersey.

Glassberg, J. 2012. *A Swift Guide to Butterflies of North America*. Sunstreak Books, Morristown, New Jersey.

Godman, F.D. & Salvin, O. 1893–1894. *Biologia Centrali-Americana. Insecta. Lepidoptera-Rhopalocera* 2 [part]: 241–360, pls 73–81. Dulau & Co., B. Quaritch, London.

Godman, F.D. & Salvin, O. 1895. *Biologia Centrali-Americana. Insecta. Lepidoptera-Rhopalocera* 2 (121): 385–400, pl. 85; (125): 401–416, pl. 87. Dulau & Co., B. Quaritch, London.

Godman, F.D. 1901. *Biologia Centrali-Americana. Insecta. Lepidoptera-Rhopalocera* 2 [part]: 589–782, pls 101–112. Dulau & Co., B. Quaritch, London.

Hemming, F. 1935. Notes on seventeen genera of Rhopalocera. *Stylops* **4**: 1–3.

Hemming, F. 1937. *Hübner* (volume 1). Royal Entomological Society of London, London.

Hemming, F. 1967. The generic names of the butterflies and their type-species (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera). *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History), Entomology*, Suppl (9)**:** 509 pp.

Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. 1865. Die Schmetterlingsfauna der Insel Cuba. *Correspondenz-Blatt des zoologisch-mineralogischen Vereines in Regensburg* **19**(3/4): 52–60.

Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. 1868. Prodromus systematis lepidopterorum. Versuch einer systematischen Anordnung der Schmetterlinge [part]. *Correspondenz-Blatt des zoologisch-mineralogischen Vereines in Regensburg* **22**(11): 172–176.

Herrich-Schäffer, G.A.W. 1869. Prodromus systematis lepidopterorum. Versuch einer systematischen Anordnung der Schmetterlinge [part]. *Correspondenz-Blatt des zoologisch-mineralogischen Vereines in Regensburg* **23**(4): 56–64; (5): 67–77; (9): 130–141; (11): 163–172; (12): 184–204.

Hewitson, W.C. 1867. *Descriptions of One Hundred New Species of Hesperidae*. John Van Voorst, London.

Holland, W.J. 1927. The Lepidoptera named by George A. Ehrmann. *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* **17**(2): 299–364, pls 25–30.

Hoskins, A. 2015. www.learnaboutbutterflies.com

Hübner, J. 1812. *Sammlung exotischer Schmetterlinge* volume 1: pl. [153]. Jacob Hübner, Augsburg.

Kirby, W.F. 1871. *A Synonymic Catalogue of Diurnal Lepidoptera*. John van Voorst, London.

Kirby, W.F. 1877. *A Synonymic Catalogue of Diurnal Lepidoptera. Supplement.* John van Voorst, London.

Kirby, W.F. 1879. *Catalogue of the collection of diurnal Lepidoptera formed by the late William Chapman Hewitson of Oatlands, Walton-on-Thames; and bequeathed by him to the British Museum.* John Van Voorst, London.

Knudson, E.C., Bordelon, C., Jr. & Warren, A.D. 2004. *Antigonus erosus* Hübner (Hesperiidae, Pyrginae), a new US record from South Texas. *News of the Lepidopterists' Society* **46**(4): 111–113.

Latreille, P.A. 1824. *In* Latreille, P.A. & Godart, J.B., *Encyclopédie Méthodique. Histoire naturelle. Entomologie*. **9**(2): 706, 707, 711–793. veuve Agasse, Paris.

Lindsey, A.W. 1921. The Hesperioidea of America north of Mexico. *University of Iowa Studies in Natural History* **9**[4]: 114 pp, 2 pls.

Mabille, P. 1903. Lepidoptera Rhopalocera. Fam. Hesperidae [sic]. *Genera Insectorum* (17a): 1–78.

Mabille, P. & Boullet, E. 1917b. Description d'hespérides nouveaux (Lep.). *Bulletin de la Société entomologique de France* **1917**(1): 54–60.

MacNeil, C.D. 1975. Family Hesperiidae. *In* Howe, W.H. (ed.), *The Butterflies of North America*, pp. 423–578. Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2002. Pyrrhopyginae: gêneros novos e revalidados (Lepidoptera, Hesperiidae). *Revista Brasilera de Zoologia*, Curitiba **19**(1): 217–228.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2004. Hesperioidea. 95. Hesperiidae. *In* Lamas, G. (ed), *Atlas of Neotropical Lepidoptera. Checklist: Part 4A. Hesperioidea – Papilionoidea*, pp. 25–86. Association for Tropical Lepidoptera / Scientific Publishers, Gainesville.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2005a. *Catalogue of the American Hesperioidea: Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera). Volume 1. Complementary and Supplementary Parts to the Checklist of the Neotropical Region. Hesperioidea: Hesperiidae: Pyrrhopyginae.* Sociedade Brasileira de Zoologia, Paraná, Brazil.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2005b. *Catalogue of the American Hesperioidea: Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera). Volume 2. Pyrginae 1: Eudamini*. Sociedade Brasileira de Zoologia, Paraná, Brazil.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2005c. *Catalogue of the American Hesperioidea: Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera). Volume 3. Pyrginae 2: Pyrgini*. Sociedade Brasileira de Zoologia, Paraná, Brazil.

Mielke, O.H.H. 2005d. *Catalogue of the American Hesperioidea: Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera). Volume 5. Hesperiinae 2: Megaleas – Zenis*. Sociedade Brasileira de Zoologia, Paraná, Brazil.

Mielke, O.H.H. & Casagrande, M.M. 2002. Notas taxonômicas em Hesperiidae neotropicais, com descrições de novos taxa (Lepidoptera). *Revista Brasileira de Zoologia* Curitiba **19**(Suppl. 1): 27–76.

Opler, P.A. & Warren, A.D. 2002. *Butterflies of North America. 2. Scientific Names List for Butterfly Species of North America, north of Mexico* [as updated January 20, 2004]. Contributions of the C. P. Gillette Museum of Arthropod Diversity, Colorado State University. 83 pp.

Pelham, J.P. 2008. Catalogue of the butterflies of the United States and Canada. *Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera* **40**: xiv + 658 pp.

Plötz, C. 1879. Die Hesperiinen-Gattung *Pyrrhopyga* und ihre Arten. *Stettiner Entomologische Zeitung* **40**(10/12): 520–538.

Plötz, C. 1884. Die Hesperiinen-Gruppe der Achlyoden. *Jahrbücher des nassauischen Vereins für Naturkunde* **37**: 1–55.

Riley, N.D. 1926. On the identity of certain Hesperiidae (Lep.) described by Latreille. *Transactions of the Royal Entomological Society of London* **74**: 231–241)

Robbins, R.K., Lamas, G., Mielke, O.H.H., Harvey, D.J. & Casagrande, M.M.. 1996. Taxonomic composition and ecological structure of the species-rich butterf1y community at Pakitza, Parque Nacional dei Manu, Perú. *In* Wilson, D.E. & Sandoval, A. (eds). *Manu. The biodiversity of Southeastern Peru. La biodiversidad dei Sureste del Perú*, pp. 217–252. Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC.

Schwartz, A. 1989. *The Butterflies of Hispaniola*. University of Florida Press, Gainesville.

Scott, J.A. 1986. *The Butterflies of North America*. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

Scott, J.A. 1992. Hostplant records for butterflies and skippers (mostly from Colorado) 1959–1991, with new life histories and notes on oviposition, immatures, and ecology. *Papilio* (New Series) (6): 171 pp.

Scott, J.A. 2006. *Notamblyscirtes* J. Scott, new genus within Hesperiidae, Hesperiinae. *In* Scott, J.A. (ed.), Taxonomic studies and new taxa of North American butterflies. *Papilio* (New Series) (12): 70.

Scudder, S.H. 1872. A systematic revision of some of the American butterflies, with brief notes on those known to occur in Essex County, Massachusetts. *Report. Peabody Academy of Sciences* 4: 24–83.

Stanford, R.E. 1981. Superfamily Hesperioidea Latreille, 1802 (skippers). *In* Ferris, C.D. & Brown, F.M. (eds), *Butterflies of the Rocky Mountain States*, pp. 67–108, 117–144. University of Oklahoma Press, Norman, Oklahoma.

Vane-Wright, R.I. 1975. The butterflies named by J.F. Gmelin (Lepidoptera: Rhopalocera), *Bulletin of the British Museum (Natural History*) Entomology **32**(2): 17–64, 6 pls.

Vane-Wright, R.I. & Hughes, H.W.D. 2005. *The Seymer Legacy. Henry Seymer and Henry Seymer Jnr of Dorset, and their entomological paintings, with a catalogue of* Butterflies and Plants (*1755–1783*). Forrest Text, Tresaith, Ceredigion, Wales.

Viette, P. 1956. Note sur quelques types de Latreille. *Lambillionea* **56**(11/12): 88–92

Warren, A.D., Ogawa, J.R. & Brower, A.V.Z. 2008. Phylogenetic relationships of subfamilies and circumscription of tribes in the family Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera: Hesperioidea). *Cladistics* **24**: 1–35.

Warren A.D., Ogawa, J.R. & Brower, A.V.Z. 2009. Revised classification of the family Hesperiidae (Lepidoptera: Hesperioidea) based on combined molecular and morphological data. *Systematic Entomology* **34**: 467–523.

Warren, A.D., Davis, K.J., Grishin, N.V., Pelham J.P. & Stangeland E.M. 2012. *Interactive Listing of American Butterflies*. Online resource accessed 1.xii.2012 at: http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/

Watson, F.E. 1937. New Hesperiidae from the Antilles (Lepidoptera; Rhopalocera). *American Museum Novitates* (906): 1–10.

Westwood, J.O. 1850–1852. *In* Doubleday, E. & Westwood, J.O., *The Genera of Diurnal Lepidoptera,* volume 2. Longman, Brown, Green & Longmans, London.

Wright, W.G. 1905. *The Butterflies of the West Coast of the United States.* Whitaker & Ray, San Francisco.

Suggested citation

NABA Names Committee. 2016. Second Interim Report of the NABA Names Committee *American Butterflies* **23**(3/4): 26-45.

All photos this article by Jeffrey Glassberg, except as indicated.