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1. D’Abrera (2001) and D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) established eight generic names in the same work (Lepidoptera, family LYCAENIDAE). They are: Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (p. 194); Balintus D’Abrera, 2001 (p. 195); Chopinia D’Abrera, 2001 (p. 196), Gulliveria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (p. 195), Lucilda D’Abrera & Bálint,
2001 (p. 194), Pedusa D’Abrera, 2001 (p. 195), Riojana D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (p. 195) and Salazaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (p. 195). For seven of the eight names, the words and characters of the original description differentiate the type species – they do not differentiate the genus – so that they do not meet the requirements of Article 13.1 of the Code. For the eighth generic name, the words of the original description differentiate the type species and possibly three other species, but do not differentiate the genus (discussed below in items 8–12).

2. As background, D’Abrera (2001) and D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) proposed these generic names while the nomenclature of the Eumaeini (Theclinae) was being systematically corrected (Robbins, 2002; Robbins & Lamas, 2002) in anticipation of the first complete checklist of Neotropical butterflies in 80 years (Lamas, 2004). This project had been underway for more than a decade, and anticipated publication at that time was early 2003. To correct the nomenclature of these newly proposed generic names quickly prior to this publication, Robbins (2002):

(1) regarded two generic names (Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 and Chopinia D’Abrera, 2001) as unavailable because they did not satisfy the conditions of Article 13.1 of the Code requiring that the publication proposing a new generic name should contain a ‘description or definition that states in words characters that are purported to differentiate the taxon’.

(2) noted that D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) had placed the type species of Eucharia Boisduval, 1870 (p. 14) in Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint without mentioning Eucharia. Since Eucharia Boisduval, 1870 was preoccupied by Eucharia Hübner, [1820] (p. 181) in the Arctiidae [Leach], [1815] (Lepidoptera) and since Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 was unavailable, Lamasina was proposed by Robbins (2002, p. 820) as a replacement name for Eucharia Boisduval, 1870 (type species Papilio ganimedes Cramer 1775, p. 64).

(3) regarded Gulliveria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 as an available name because it was proposed as a monotypic genus, and differentiating the type species could be interpreted as differentiating the genus. Since Gulliveria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 was preoccupied by Gulliveria Castelnau, 1878 (Pisces), Megathecla Robbins, 2002 (p. 820) was proposed as a replacement name for Gulliveria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001. Later that same year Bálint (2002), proposed another replacement name, Gullicaena Bálint, 2002 (p. 135).

3. The original description of Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 is indicative of seven of the original descriptions (the eighth is discussed in items 8–12). It reads ‘genus Annamaria D’Abrera & Balint gen. nov.; Type species: Thecla draudti Lathy, 1926; In NEOTROPICAL VII: 1107 treated as Evenus draudti. Likewise by other workers. However is distinguished from Evenus by shorter cell of f.w. (1/3rd of costal length), and extension of Vein 1 of h.w. into a lobed tail at tornus. Compound androconial patch on f.w. consisting of single circle within cell & quadrifurcate patch immediately outside discocellulars. Further, androconial patches on post discal & submarginal tornal areas of f.w. respectively.’ Four available specific names were included in the genus.

4. This original description was interpreted by Robbins (2002) and Robbins & Lamas (2008) as ‘In NEOTROPICAL VII:1107 [the type species was] treated as Evenus draudti. Likewise [it was so treated] by other workers. However [it] is distinguished from Evenus by shorter cell of f.w. (1/3rd of costal length), and extension of Vein 1 of h.w. into a lobed tail at tornus. [It has a] compound
androconial patch on \( \delta \) f.w. consisting of single circle within cell & quadrifurcate patch immediately outside discocellulars. Further, \( [ \text{it has} ] \) androconial patches on post discal & submarginal tornal areas of f.w. respectively."

5. The implied grammatical subject in each sentence of the original description of *Annamaria* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 is the type species, *Thecla draudti* Lathy, 1926 (p. 40). The characters given distinguish *Thecla draudti* from *Evenus* Hübner, [1819] (p. 78); they do not distinguish the other species that D’Abrera and Bálint (2001) placed in *Annamaria* (Robbins & Lamas, 2008). The words indicate that D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) purported to differentiate the type species, not the genus. The characters indicate that D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) purported to differentiate the type species, not the genus. This indication is not a ‘lapse’ due to poor taxonomy or poor command of language because the words and characters in all genera proposed by D’Abrera (2001) and D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) differentiate the type species, not the genus. This noted, there is one ambiguous case, interpreted differently by Robbins [2002], discussed in items 8–12).


9. Since Draudt (1919–1920) had placed *T. sala*, *T. maraches*, *T. peonida* and *T. salaeeides* in the *aegides* group, the words in the original description of *Salazaria* could be interpreted to distinguish just *T. sala* or to distinguish *T. sala*, *T. maraches*, *T. peonida* and *T. salaeeides*. Since Draudt (1919–1920) placed *T. photismos* and *T. thespia* in the *thespia* group, the words in the original description of *Salazaria* do not differentiate the genus as proposed by D’Abrera & Bálint (2001).

10. The characters in the original description of *Salazaria* provide no evidence to determine what D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) purported to differentiate because the characters are inaccurate. For example, ‘Vein 2’ of the hindwing is not reported to ‘extend into the tail’ in *Theclinae* (e.g. Takasaki & Shinkawa, 1998), but rather this vein terminates at the outer margin just posterior of the tail (cf. figure 3 in Robbins & Duarte 2005). The seven species that D’Abrera & Bálint (2001) placed in *Salazaria* are currently treated in four different genera (Robbins, 2004).
11. Robbins (2004) treated Salazaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 as an available name because possibly differentiating four species by words could be interpreted as differentiating the genus.

12. Bálint (2005) argued that if Salazaria were available, then Annamaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 would also be available. Robbins & Lamas (2008) responded that Bálint’s (2005) argument is incorrect, but noted that the availability of Salazaria is a matter of interpretation. In retrospect, our response was incorrect; the name Salazaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 is unavailable because the genus was not differentiated, as required under Article 13.1.

13. The names proposed by D’Abrera (2001), D’Abrera & Bálint (2001), Robbins (2002), and Bálint (2002) have been used in eight of the taxonomic and nomenclatural papers cited in this application. They have also been cited in another three articles and appear on eight websites (search done on March 18, 2008), which are listed on a separate document (held by the Secretariat).

14. The Global Butterfly Names project, initially funded by GBIF-ECAT program, plans to provide a stable worldwide scientific nomenclature of butterflies (around 18,500 species, 100,000 names) with the current classification as to genus, species, and subspecies. This project is about 70% completed, including all butterfly generic names (http://www.ucl.ac.uk/taxome/gbn/Lamas_Genera_04ii08.xls). The generic names discussed in this application are currently treated on this website following Robbins (2004).


16. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked:

1. to use its plenary power to rule that the following generic names are deemed to be available:
   (a) Balintus D’Abrera, 2001 (gender: masculine), type species by original designation Pseudolycana tityrus C. Felder & R. Felder, 1865;
   (b) Gulliveria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Thecla gigantea Hewitson, 1867, a junior homonym of Gulliveria Castelnau, 1878;
   (c) Salazaria D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation Thecla sala Hewitson, 1867;

2. to place on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
   (a) Balintus D’Abrera, 2001, as ruled in (1)(a) above;
(b) *Salazaria* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001, as ruled in (1)(c) above;
(c) *Megathecla* Robbins, 2002 (gender: feminine), as ruled in (1)(d) above;
(d) *Lamasina* Robbins, 2002 (gender: masculine), replacement name for *Eucharia* Boisduval, 1870;

(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the following names:
(a) *tityrus* C. Felder & R. Felder, 1865, as published in the binomen *Pseudolycaena tityrus*, the type species of *Balintus* D’Abrera, 2001;
(b) *sala* Hewitson, 1867, as published in the binomen *Thecla sala*, the type species of *Salazaria* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001;
(c) *gigantea* Hewitson, 1867, as published in the binomen *Thecla gigantea*, the type species of *Megathecla* Robbins, 2002;
(d) *ganimedes* Cramer, 1775, as published in the binomen *Papilio ganimedes*, the type species of *Lamasina* Robbins, 2002;

(4) to place on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology the following names:
(a) *Eucharia* Boisduval, 1870 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation *Papilio ganimedes* Cramer, 1775, a junior homonym of *Eucharia* Hübner, [1820] (Lepidoptera);
(b) *Annamaria* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Thecla draudti* Lathy, 1926, as not available from its original description;
(c) *Chopinia* D’Abrera, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Thecla mazurka* Hewitson, 1867, as not available from its original description;
(d) *Gulliveria* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001, as ruled as available in (1)(b) above, a junior homonym of *Gulliveria* Castelnau, 1878;
(e) *Lucilda* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Thecla crines* Druce, 1907, as not available from its original description;
(f) *Pedusa* D’Abrera, 2001 (gender: feminine), type species by original designation *Thecla pedusa* Hewitson, 1867, as not available from its original description;
(g) *Riojana* D’Abrera & Bálint, 2001 (gender: presumably feminine), type species by original designation *Thecla thargelia* Burmeister, 1878, as not available from its original description;
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