

https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/

#### The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature.

London, International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature. https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/bibliography/51603

#### v.22:pt.1-6 (1965-1966:Apr.-Jan.):

https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44464

Article/Chapter Title: Leprota Melichar, 1912 (Insecta, Homoptera); proposed designation of a type-species under the plenary powers

Author(s): Fennah, R. G.

Subject(s): Hemiptera, Fulgoromorpha, Dictyopharidae, planthoppers

Page(s): Page 222, Page 223

Holding Institution: Natural History Museum Library, London Sponsored by: Natural History Museum Library, London

Generated 21 September 2018 4:18 PM https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/pdf4/083281700044464

This page intentionally left blank.

# **OPINION 751**

# LEPROTA MELICHAR, 1912 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA): DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Leprota* Melichar, 1912, made prior to the present Ruling are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Leprota melichari* Fennah, 1963, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(2) The generic name Leprota Melichar, 1912 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, Leprota melichari Fennah, 1963, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology

with the Name Number 1691.

(3) The specific name *melichari* Fennah, 1963, as published in the binomen *Leprota melichari* (type-species of *Leprota* Melichar, 1912) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2101.

# HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1530)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Mr. R. G. Fennah in April 1962. Mr. Fennah's application was sent to the printer on 21 May 1962 and was published on 12 July 1963 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 20: 303–304. 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 other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21: 184). No comments were received.

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 26 March 1965 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (65)11 either for or against the proposal set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 20: 304. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 26 June 1965 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-four (24), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Vokes, Mayr, Obruchev, Alvarado, Boschma, Simpson, Jaczewski, do Amaral, Brinck, Riley, Sabrosky, Munroe, Tortonese, Uchida, Evans,

Forest, Bonnet, Stoll, Binder, Mertens, Kraus, Ride.

Negative votes—one (1): Lemche.

Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Hubbs.

Commissioner Miller returned a late negative vote, making the following comment: "This is such a minor case, not involving troublesome confusion that I think the rules should prevail and the Commission not be put in a position of making a special ruling." Other Commissioners, in returning their votes, commented as follows:

Dr. Henning Lemche (28.iv.65): "This very rarely mentioned genus cannot afford protection through the use of the plenary powers. The simple solution is to follow the rules and to give a new name to the genus, leaving Leprota as a synonym under Saigona."

Mr. C. W. Sabrosky (24.v.65): "I note, however, that L. melichari Fennah is not a 'new name' strictly speaking, because D. fulgoroides Walker is not preoccupied. See Glossary of the Code. It requires for availability a description or a reference to one. Obviously Melichar's description is 'available' for use, from the information in the application as a whole, but this should be referred to more definitely than Mr. Fennah has done in the sentence 'For Leprota fulgoroides Melichar (nec Walker) the new name Leprota melichari is here proposed.' Melichar might have published other papers and included other specimens, not necessarily conspecific or even congeneric. Note also that the Fennah method of proposal leaves L. melichari without a type.

"In item (1) of the proposal, some better wording should be devised for cases such as this. There being still only one species in the genus, and one designation possible, the present wording does not sound appropriate. Further, there is no reference to the misidentified type-species."

## ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on the Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

Leprota Melichar, 1912, Abh. k.-k. zool. bot. Ges. Wien 7:33, 91, pl. 111, figs. 14, 15

melichari, Leprota, Fennah, 1963, Bull. zool. Nomencl. 20: 303

## CERTIFICATE

We certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (65)11 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, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 751.

G. OWEN EVANS

Secretary

W. E. CHINA

Assistant Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London 8 August 1965