Protected taxonomic status and lectotype designation for *Holochila albosericea* Miskin, 1891 (Lepidoptera: Lycaenidae)

**Michael F. Braby** 1,2

1Division of Ecology and Evolution, Research School of Biology, RN Robertson Building, 46 Sullivans Creek Road, The Australian National University, Acton, ACT 2601, Australia

2Australian National Insect Collection, GPO Box 1700, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

**Abstract.** The well-known Australian lycaenid butterfly, *Candalides albosericea* (Miskin, 1891), is a junior subjective synonym of *Holochila caeruleolactea* T.P. Lucas, 1891, which has not been used as a valid name after 1899. To protect the stability of the younger, but widely used name, the older and virtually unknown *Holochila caeruleolactea* (i.e., the senior subjective synonym) is suppressed under Article 23.9.2 of the Fourth Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. By this action, *Holochila albosericea* Miskin, 1891 becomes a nomen protectum and *Holochila caeruleolactea* T.P. Lucas, 1891 a nomen oblitum. Lectotypes are designated for *Holochila albosericea* Miskin, 1891 and *Holochila caeruleolactea* T.P. Lucas, 1891, respectively.

**Introduction**

The lycaenid butterfly currently known as *Candalides albosericea* (Miskin, 1891) was described by Miskin (1891) under the name *Holochila albosericea* Miskin, 1891, with ‘Expedition Range, QLD’ as the type locality (Miskin, 1891; Hancock, 1995). Miskin (1891) described both sexes, but only two syntypes (both males) are currently known to be extant in the Queensland Museum (Hancock, 1995). However, Miskin (1891) did not refer to a unique type specimen, so the specimens he examined are syntypes; a lectotype has not been designated.

In the same year, Lucas (1891) described *Holochila caeruleolactea* T.P. Lucas, 1891, from near Duaringa, Queensland (Lucas, 1891; Tindale, 1923; Edwards et al., 2001). According to Tindale (1923), the syntypes (both sexes) are in the South Australian Museum. Again, Lucas did not refer to a type, and a lectotype has not been designated.

It has become apparent that the nomenclature of *Candalides albosericea* (Miskin, 1891) has not been resolved. Since both names refer to the same species and were introduced in the same year, it is necessary to determine which name has priority. Waterhouse (1903a: 183), in his review of the taxonomy and nomenclature of *Candalides albosericea*, observed that: “*Holochila caeruleolactea*, described by Dr. Lucas in a newspaper in Brisbane during 1891, is probably this species, but newspaper descriptions cannot be allowed to stand”. Waterhouse’s comment is not correct (see below), and Lucas’ species remains available under Articles 8 and 9 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999). Waterhouse never referred to the name again, not even in his seminal catalogue (Waterhouse, 1903b) or monograph (Waterhouse & Lyell, 1914).