

OPINION 1091

GELOIUS DECORSEI BOLIVAR, 1905 (INSECTA, ORTHOPTERA): DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE.

RULING. (1) Under the plenary powers the neotype designation by Kevan, Akbar & Singh, 1964, for the nominal species *Geloius decorsei* Bolivar, 1905, is set aside and the male specimen designated by Wintrebert, 1972, is hereby ratified as neotype in its place.

(2) The specific name *decorsei* Bolivar, 1905, as published in the binomen *Geloius decorsei*, and as defined by the neotype ratified under the plenary powers in (1) above, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2164.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2046

The present application was submitted to the Office of the Commission by Prof. D.K.McE. Kevan (*McGill University, Quebec, Canada*) on 3 May 1973, was sent to the printer on 24 October 1973, and published on 28 June 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 30: 200-202. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the prescribed serials (Constitution Art. 12b) and to nine entomological serials. The application was supported by Prof. V.R. Vickery (1975, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 32: 23) and Dr. K.H.L. Key (: 23). It was criticised by Professor E. Mayr (: 21) who was answered by the applicant (: 22).

The following comment was circulated to members of the Commission with their Voting Papers. Dr. H. Lemche suggested that the formal proposals ought to read:

"(1) under the plenary powers to set aside the neotype designation by Kevan, Akbar and Singh, 1964, for the nominal species *Geloius decorsei* Bolivar, 1905; and

"(2) having done so, to accept as neotype the male specimen designated by Wintrebert, 1972;

"(3) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology the specific name *decorsei* Bolivar, 1905, as published in the binomen *Geloius decorsei*, and as defined by the neotype referred to in (2) above."

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 22 September 1976 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (76)27 on the proposals as set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* vol. 30: 202. At the close of the Voting Period on 22 December 1976, the state of the voting was as follows:-

Affirmative votes - twenty-two (22), received in the following order: Melville, Eisenmann, Holthuis, Vokes, Willink, Lemche, Brinck, Rohdendorf, Tortonese, Habe, Ride, Mroczkowski, Binder, Corliss, Sabrosky, Starobogatov, Dupuis, Welch, Bayer, Nye, Kraus, Bernardi.

Negative vote - none (0).

A late affirmative vote was received from Dr. Alvarado. A Voting Paper was not received from Mr. Heppell.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their Voting Papers:

Dr. Eisenmann: It seems to me that the Lemche modification best expresses the formalities required.

Dr. Sabrosky: I have great sympathy with the views of Mayr and of Vickery regarding the hasty designation of neotypes. It was particularly unfortunate, in view of the difficulty of distinguishing females in the genus *Pseudogeloius*, that a female was designated as neotype.

Dr. Dupuis: Je suis assez porté à partager la sévérité générale et la conclusion particulière de Mayr (vol. 32: 21); il n'ya pas lieu d'user des pleins pouvoirs pour constater l'invalidité du néotype de 1964.

Cependant, pour éviter toute ambiguïté future, une action claire, superflue en droit, me paraît utile en pratique.

Je vote donc la proposition dans son libellé par Lemche.

Prof. Kraus: I fully agree with the criticisms expressed by Mayr (vol. 32: 21) but it seems preferable to accept the proposal in order to have a definite solution.

Prof. Bernardi: Je crois qu'il est essentiel que le néotype représente avec le plus de certitude possible la même entité que celle de la description originale. Ici, cela ne peut être réalisé qu'avec le "néotype de Paris", il faut donc éliminer le "néotype de Berlin".

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference for the name placed on an Official List by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:
decorsei, *Geloius*, Bolívar, 1905, *Boln R. esp. Hist. nat.* vol. 5: 286.

The following is the reference to the designation of a neotype, accepted in the present Opinion, for a nominal species:
for *Geloius decorsei* Bolívar, 1905, the neotype designated by Wintrebert, 1972, *Annis Mus. r. Afr. cent.* (Zool.) vol. 198: 64.

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (76)27 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1091.

R.V. MELVILLE
Secretary

I.W.B. NYE
Assistant Secretary
International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
9 March 1977.



International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1977. "Opinion 1091."
The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature 34, 50–52.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44476>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/32836>

Holding Institution

Natural History Museum Library, London

Sponsored by

Natural History Museum Library, London

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: In copyright. Digitized with the permission of the rights holder.

Rights Holder: International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Rights: <https://biodiversitylibrary.org/permissions>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.