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 Pyrrhopgyge araxes**

*Pyrrhopgyge araxes arizonae* Godman & Salvin, 1893, *Apyrrothrix araxes arizonae* (Godman & Salvin, 1893), *Pyrrhopgyge araxes* Godman & Salvin, 1893, or *Apyrrothrix araxes 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 names can be applied to *Pyrrhopgyge araxes* (a species originally described from Mexico) 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?


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

*Pyrrhopgyge araxes* (Hewitson); Edwards, 1875: 794.


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

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

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

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

*Apyrrothrix araxes* (Hewitson); Evans, 1951: 38.

*Pyrrhopgyge araxes arizonae* Godman & Salvin; Burns & Janzen, 2001: 38, 41.


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

Although *Erycides araxes* Hewitson has most often been placed in the genus *Pyrrhopgyge*...
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 remains unresolved, although this has not impeded work on systematics 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 araxae.

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 araxae. 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 araxae. Taking these two views together, our correct action for the NABA list has to be to maintain the species name as araxae. 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 as clear (phylogenetic or cladalistic) 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 cladalistic structure. The Tol. list is also, I think, based on his work, in which the distinctiveness of the group 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 Appyrothrix araxae and Pyrrhopyge zerodorus (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 Creonympe [a monobasic genus], and these two together then form a ‘quadrichotomy’ with the single representatives for Pyrrhopyge, Myosaria + 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 not 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 Appyrothrix differs from a taxonomic 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 araxae as a species belonging to the genus Pyrrhopyge. If at a later date its generic separation was unequivocally established, then accepted, no loss of information is likely. However, in this context I have received the following very interesting and potentially highly relevant comments: [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 cyirillus, 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 (98% COI distance — for skippers means different genera usually), but are closer to Chalupyge, Melanoppyge, Jonasoppyge, etc. Also, considering how huge Pyrrhopyge sensu lato (Evans) is, it is not constructive to maintain it in such a state; it would be better to have Chalupyge, Melanoppyge etc as subgenera inside Appyrothrix, but this has not been published. Regardless, Appyrothrix is the oldest name, and I think the best supported name for the U.S. skippers is Appyrothrix araxae arizonae.”

“To these points the Chair responded: “These skippers are quite distant from typical Pyrrhopyge (98% COI distance — for skippers means different genera usually), but are closer to Chalupyge, Melanoppyge, Jonasoppyge, etc. Also, considering how huge Pyrrhopyge sensu lato (Evans) is, it is not constructive to maintain it in such a state; it would be better to have Chalupyge, Melanoppyge etc as subgenera inside Appyrothrix, but this has not been published. Regardless, Appyrothrix is the oldest name, and I think the best supported name for the U.S. skippers is Appyrothrix araxae arizonae.”

The analysis seems very helpful here, and ... [so] I vote for Appyrothrix araxae arizonae. (3) Appyrothrix araxes. I am inclined to combine this species 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 Appyrothrix is available. The type species of the genus Appyrothrix Lindsay, 1921 is the original designation. Erycides araxes Hewitson, 1867, the taxon we are dealing with. Mielke’s morphological diagnosis establishes clear distinctions between Pyrrhopyge and Appyrothrix, 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 generic 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 Appyrothrix araxes arizonae; 1 in favor of Appyrothrix 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 reopened.)

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.
**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?].


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

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

*Polygonus leo 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 manueli*, with *P. manueli* a junior subjective synonym of the nominate subspecies.

Mielke & Casagrande (2002) offered no evidence other than their assertion that *savignyi* 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 savignyi”. The question that we have to decide upon, therefore, is whether there is overwhelming evidence that *Polygonus manueli* Bell & Comstock, described from southern Brazil is the same species as *P. savignyi* (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*) were “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 *savignyi* 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 *savignyi* Latreille, 1824, it was originally stated “se trouve aux Antilles.” The types are illustrated at http://www.butterfliesofamerica.com/L/Polygonus_s.savignyi_types.htm.

Recent accounts consider these two nominal taxa conspecific, and use the senior name (*savignyi*) 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 savignyi*. So, if the Paris Museum specimen illustrated on the Butterflies of America website as the Lectotype of *savignyi* is correct, 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 “savignyi 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 (Viete, 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 Lateille skipper types in Paris. With respect to *savignyi*, 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 Viette (1952) then simply maintained *savignyi* 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 *savignyi* as a senior name for *manueli*. Viette’s (1956) report on the Lateille skipper types includes an important account of the fate of Lateille’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 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.

Thus we have two nominal species names in contention that appear to relate to a single species of *Polygonus* — *savignyi* from an uncertain origin, originally 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 *manueli*.

“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 divergence 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 or 50 samples labelled "savginy" 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 *savginy* samples are from Mexico and Central America, with one exception: a single sample from Sta Catarina (southern Brazil) — close to the locality for *manueli*. This single sample groups as sister to all of the others listed as *savginy*, with a fairly large (but currently uninterpreted) gap.

This suggests the possibility that what is currently regarded as *savginy* could be two species (or more). If so, given the doubts about the provenance of the *savginy* 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 *savginy*, 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-NC 2014-09 Antigonus erosus! On the other hand, looking at the information displayed in American Butterflies, the "Chairman’s comments" this seems to be the best temporary solution. (5) My thinking 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 *Polygous* 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 *savginy* 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 might need to 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 of the problem of the true type locality of this taxon, there is one valid type specimen, and so the name [savginy] 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 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 synonymized *manueli* and *savginy*, 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 *Polygous manueli*, 3 in favor of deferring decision (≡ 3 votes for *P. manueli*). 5 in favor of *Polygous 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 4–5. Type locality uncertain (no data); whereabouts of type material unknown, probably lost. Date of publication: Hemming, 1937: 404. *Hesperia westermann* (Hübner, 1824: 728, 791. Type locality Brazil. Type material collected by *Langsdorff*: *Systasea helias erosus* (Hübner, 1812), species 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 Fabrícius_, _Achlyodes Hübner_, _Thanaos Boisdauvial_, _Nisoniades Hübner_, _Helias Fabrícius_, 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_ is the only specific synonym of _Chaetoneura Felder & Felder_, 1862 (type species _Chaetoneura hippalus_ Felder & Felder) and _Systasea Weeks_, 1905 (type species: _Antigonus corrossus_ Mahille). 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**

Names already in use for this species:
- **Dusted Spurwing**: Glassberg (2007); Glassberg (2012).
- **Common Spurwing**: Garwood and Lehman (2004).

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. nearculus*, 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*.**

The lead author of the 2004 work 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. nearculus*, 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.

---

**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**

*Mylon pelopidas* (Fabricius, 1793), species new to list

**Scientific Names Subcommittee**

*Hesperia pelopidas* Fabricius, 1793: 350. Type locality: “Indis” [Surinam?]. Type material in Drury Collection [probably lost?]. Iconotype Jones Inones 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); Mahille, 1903: 63; Evans, 1953: 148; Mielke, 2004: 50; Mielke, 2005c: 608.

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

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


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 Mackay. Mackay’s huge insect collection is now in Sydney, Australia. Finding a specific specimen in the Mackay 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 Mackay’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 *Achlyodes 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 Fabriicius has been combined in the genus Hesperia Fabricius, 1775 (type species Papilio comma Linnaeus, 1758). Pyrgus Hübner, 1819 (type species Papilio alveolus Hübner, 1800 = Pro melana Linnaeus, 1758), Achlyodes Hübner, 1819 (type species Papilio busiris Cramer, 1779), Leucochitonea Wallengren, 1857, Papilio Linnaeus, 1758), Antigonus Hübner, 1819 (type species Urbanus erasus Hübner, 1812), Eudamidas Hübner, 1819 (type species Papilio pelopidas Fabricius, 1793 = Pro melana Linnaeus, 1758), and Mylon (type species Papilio ozema Hübner, 1819 = P. menippus Fabricius, 1775 = 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 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). Mylon Godman & Salvin, 1894 (type species Leucochitonea lassia Hewitson, 1868) 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 (distictive 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 designation 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 suit 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 Subcommitee 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**


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

Stomyles simius (Edwards); Drault (1924).

Yvertta simius (Edwards); Hemming (1935).


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 (2000).

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...
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 Edo”, 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.

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 presently highly autapomorphic, and the diagnostic 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) considered the Skipper, 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) 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 the results of Burns, the two species are separated in separate tribes. Notamblyscirtes simius is in Hesperini, in a sister relationship with Euphyes (177: BS 5). Amblyscirtes exoteria, presumably along with other Amblyscirtes species, is situated in Moths (1990), in a sister relationship with Maesicles + Remella (167: BS 8), corroborating Burns’ 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 checklist 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 this genus 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 containing 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 genital 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 Hesperinae. 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 abatement (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: “NEW YORK”. Type material in Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, Berlin.

*Panoquina* lucas (Herrich-Schäffer) Scudder, 1863; 81.

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

*Panoquina lucas* lucas (Fabricius); Robbins et al., 1996: 252; Mielek & Casagrande, 2002: 59; Mielek, 2004: 75; Mielek, 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, Lawton, Mielek, 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]). Mielek & 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 *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*. Herrich-Schäffer was similarly treated by Evans (1955: 190) and Hemmings (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 misidentifying “lucas” as the type species of *Turesis* — which is currently taken to be *Goniloba complanula* Herrich-Schäffer, 1869 (e.g. Mielek, 2004: 82; Cock, 2009). Mielek (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 *lucasi* to *sylvicola*, and *lucasi* to *lucasi*. Thus a search for “Panoquina lucasi” gave 2300 hits, “Panoquina sylvicola” 1750, “Panoquina lucasi” none, “Turesis lucasi” 14, and “Turesis lucasi” 154 [on 17th November 2012]. “Turesis complanula” resulted in 646 hits. This suggests that the replacement of both *Turesis lucasi* by *Turesis complanula*, and *Panoquina sylvicola* by *Panoquina lucasi* has been widely accepted, and that the spelling *lucasi* 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 (Actiopnerygii). 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 lucasi* (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: *lucasi* (as in the original orthography), or *lucasi*.

**Scientific Name Discussion**

The Chair commented: “The question in this case largely comes down to whether or not the type species of *Panoquina lucasi* and *sylvicola* really represent 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 lucasi 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 lucasi* (Fabricius), with *Goniloba sylvicola* as the type material in ZMUK, Copenhagen.

However, such concerns regarding *lucasi* 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 lucasi*.

The comments were received from committee members: (1) After careful reading of the English Names Subcommittee report, it appears that the name change to *Panoquina lucasi* is now agreed upon.

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

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 abitentions (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.
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