OPINION 791

PARATYLENCHUS ELACHISTUS STEINER, 1949 (NEMATODA): REJECTION OF A NEOTYPE SPECIMEN

RULING.—(1) The specimen of Paratylenchus elachistus Steiner, 1949, designated by Tarjan, 1960, as neotype of that species, is hereby set aside.

(2) The specific name elachistus Steiner, 1949, as published in the binomen Paratylenchus elachistus, as interpreted by the lectotype designated by Tarjan & Golden, 1964, is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2174.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1615)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Dr. A. C. Tarjan and Dr. A. M. Golden in August 1963. The application was sent to the printer on 28 February 1964 and was published on 7 August 1964 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 21 : 226. The application was supported by Dr. R. H. Mulvey.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 3 May 1966 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (66)25 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 21 : 226. At the close of the prescribed Voting Period on 3 August 1966 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-three (23), received in the following order: China, Simpson, Mayr, Holthuis, Bonnet, Boschma, Brinck, Vokes, Lemche, Uchida, Jaczewski, Tortonese, Sabrosky, do Amaral, Mertens, Forest, Alvarado, Ride, Munroe, Stoll, Kraus, Evans, Binder.

Negative votes—none (0).

Voting Papers not returned—two (2): Hubbs, Obruchev.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their Voting Papers:

Prof. Ernst Mayr (10.v.66): “This proves again how dangerous it is to designate neotypes needlessly. It is very doubtful that the original neotype designation of Tarjan 1960 met the rigorous conditions of Art. 75.”

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (1.vii.66): “This case may emphasize a point: Was the neotype really ‘necessary’ (Code, 75a) in the first place?”

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following is the original reference for the name placed on the Official List by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:


The following is the original reference for the designation of a lectotype for a nominal species concerned in the present Ruling:

CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (66)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the Present Opinion No. 791.
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