OPINION 1018

POLANISA WALKER, 1875 (INSECTA, HYMENOPTERA): SUPPRESSED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers the generic name Polanisa Walker, 1875, is hereby suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy.

(2) The generic name Polanisa Walker, 1875 (as suppressed in (1) above) is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2046.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1829)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Dr. J. T. Wiebes in October 1967. Dr. Wiebes' application was sent to the printer on 4 October 1967 and was published on 7 December 1967 in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 23: 319–320. 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 other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; Bull. zool. Nomencl. 21: 184) and to seven entomological serials.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 28 August 1969 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (69)46 either for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nomencl. 24: 320. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 28 November 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:


Negative votes—four (4): Simpson, Binder, Sabrosky, Kraus.

Voting papers not returned—one (1): Munroe.

Doctors Eisenmann and Lemche abstained from voting.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning votes:

Prof. E. Mayr (9.ix.69): “It would seem unwise to change the name of an economically important insect (even though the application says deplorably little about the availability of Polanisa). Nor would it make sense to place a generic name on the Official List, only to abandon it when an unused senior synonym is found”.

Prof. G. G. Simpson (16.ix.19): “The vote “against” follows my opinion that action should not be taken on the proposal as presented. It is partly erroneous, if other parts are taken at face value and hence in any case contradictory, and it is partly inadequate”.

Dr. H. Lemche (4.x.69): “This case cannot be voted on in this manner. I have NOT opposed the application, but the circumstances that have led to them”.

Dr. Lemche had previously written a protest on the procedure introduced by the applicant (10.ii.68), but the objection was not published.

Dr. E. Eisenmann (17.x.69): “Before I vote on this I should like to see Dr. Lemche’s comment in opposition (apparently not published) or at least have a summary of his reason for opposing”.

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (23.xi.69): “Wiebes’ lectotype designation creates a problem that did not previously exist. Modern authors in general seemed content to leave Polanisa a nomen dubium. Incidentally, in paragraph 6, is the “BM81-107” (lectotype label) correct? If so, it means an 1881 accession. Would this material have been before Walker in 1871 and 1875?”

Dr. O. Kraus (24.xi.69): “In my opinion the Commission cannot act on the basis of the present application, which deals with a case of subjective synonymy. The correct proposal should have been that preference should be given to the name Philotrypesis by those authors, who regard it a synonym of Polanisa”.

As there were several adverse comments on the case the publication of the Opinion was delayed in order to answer the points raised in these comments. A summary of the correspondence appears below:

Some Commissioners felt that the applicant deliberately created a problem for the Commission by designating a lectotype for Polanisa lutea; if that action had not been taken then Polanisa would have remained a nomen dubium. In fact a lectotype was designated because Walker’s type material was found. Therefore, the identity of Polanisa Walker, 1875, type-species by monotypy, P. lutea is quite clear and no longer in obscurity. The two courses of action that were open were either to accept Polanisa Walker, 1875 as a senior synonym of Philotrypesis Förster, 1878, or to have Polanisa suppressed. Those previous authors who were acquainted with, or guessed at the identity of Polanisa preferred to ignore the case rather than have the name removed.

The Register at the British Museum (Natural History) has a note to say that although the Elliott Collection was registered in 1881, the collection includes the types of the species described by Walker in 1871. Dr. Wiebes’ lectotype designation is given in Tijdschr. Ent. 110, 1967.

The name Polanisa was validly published by Walker, 1875 (Entomologist 8:17) with Polanisa lutea the only species. A description was provided so that it is a perfectly available name as was already recognized by Patton, 1884. Idarnes was established by Walker, 1843 (Ann. Mag. nat. Hist. 12:47) with Idarnes carne the only species. Due to an oversight, it was not clear in the application that Idarnes was prior to Walker, 1871 and that transiens Walker, 1871 was not the type-species of Idarnes. Idarnes belongs to a different tribe from Polanisa, and cannot be the oldest available name for Philotrypesis.

**ORIGINAL REFERENCE**

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

Polanisa Walker, 1875, Entomologist 8:17.
CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (69)46 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been truly 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. 1018.

R. V. MELVILLE
Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
London
6 February 1974
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