

## OPINION 1128

## PLATYRHACUS KOCH, 1847 (DIPLOPODA): DESIGNATION OF PLATYRHACUS FUSCUS KOCH, 1847, AS TYPE SPECIES

RULING — (1) Under the plenary powers, all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Platyrhacus* C.L. Koch, 1847 hitherto made are hereby set aside and the nominal species *Platyrhacus fuscus* C.L. Koch, 1847, is hereby designated as type species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Platyrhacus* C.L. Koch, 1847 (gender, masculine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Platyrhacus fuscus* Koch, 1847, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2075.

(3) The specific name *fuscus* C.L. Koch, 1847, as published in the binomen *Platyrhacus fuscus* (specific name of type species of *Platyrhacus* C.L. Koch, 1847) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2666.

(4) The family name PLATYRHACIDAE Pocock, 1895 (type genus *Platyrhacus* C.L. Koch, 1847) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 495.

## HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.) 2078

An application for the use of the plenary powers to designate a type species for the nominal genus *Platyrhacus* C.K. Koch, 1847, was first received from Dr Richard L. Hoffman (*Radford College, Virginia, USA*) on 18 July 1974. It was sent to the printer on 27 August 1974 and published on 31 December 1974 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31: 249–251. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials and to seven entomological serials.

The application was supported by Dr R.M. Shelley (*North Carolina State Museum of Natural History*) and by Dr H. Enghoff (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*). No adverse comment was received.

At the suggestion of the late Dr Lemche the "old and faded square paper label" mentioned in paragraph 7 of the application was examined under ultra-violet light. Dr K.H. Hyatt (*British Museum, Natural History*), who made the examination, reported



that the following was readable:

Platyrrhacus

fuscus Kch.

Polydesmus Heros

Hglch.

Java

No light could be thrown on the meaning of the name "*Polydesmus Heros*" or of the abbreviation "Hglch."

### DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 7 April 1978 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1978)8 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 31: 251. At the close of the voting period on 7 July 1978 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty (20) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Eisenmann, Mroczkowski, Brinck, Vokes, Sabrosky, Cogger, Habe, Tortonese, Binder, Willink, Nye, Alvarado, Corliss, Starobogatov, Bernardi, Welch, Bayer, Ride

Negative Vote — Heppell.

No voting papers were returned by Dupuis and Kraus.

Mr Heppell commented as follows in returning his vote: "I do not believe the applicant had made out a sufficiently good case for the use of the plenary powers in the way proposed. I am not prepared to vote for the addition of *P. fuscus* Koch to the Official List without knowing more about the usage of that name. The applicant states that it 'appears to be very similar to, if not identical with, *Platyrrhacus flavisternus* Pocock, a common Javan species' which name is, I presume, junior to *fuscus*, though no date is given. Is the name of this common species to be upset by recognition of *fuscus*, interpreted only by the presumed type? Or is the name *fuscus*, which seems to have been identifiable by a sufficiently good figure which agrees closely with the Koch specimen, also in general use? Only in the latter case would I think its addition to the Official List acceptable."

Dr Hoffman was invited to reply to this comment and did so as follows:

"So far as I can find out, *flavisternus* has been cited in the literature only four times since its original description in 1894. Of these, a mention in 1899 is possibly a misidentification, references in 1914 and 1938 are mere lists, and one in 1945 is a *bona fide* use as a valid name. I do not think that this amounts to general usage. I



said that the species was common on the basis of a verbal communication from a colleague who has made large collections of it, but who has not published on the species.

"On the other hand, *fuscus* has not been used since 1863 except in several lists of *species inquirendae*, but this is not uncommon in diplopod taxonomy. Plenty of well-described species, with extant types in the larger museums, have fallen into obscurity because the previous generation of milliped specialists just did not believe in either restudying types or trying very hard to match up old names with their material (better to name it all as new!)."

It is thus clear that the case presented by Dr Hoffman is not concerned with usage, but with the problem of the misidentification of the type species of *Platyrhacus* — a problem which, under Article 70 of the Code, he was obliged to submit to the Commission.

#### ORIGINAL REFERENCES

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

*fuscus*, *Platyrhacus*, C.L. Koch, 1847, *System der Myriapoden*, in Panzer & Herrich-Schaeffer, *Krit. Revis. Insectenfauna Deutschlands*, III Bändchen: 132

PLATYRRHACIDAE Pocock, 1895, (as "PLATYRRHACIDAE"), *Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. nat. Genova*, vol. 34: 788

*Platyrhacus* C.L. Koch, 1847; *System der Myriapoden*, in Panzer & Herrich-Schaeffer, *Krit. Revis. Insectenfauna Deutschlands*, III Bändchen: 131.

#### CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on voting paper (78)8 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. 1128.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

13 November 1978



International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. 1979. "Opinion 1128."  
*The Bulletin of zoological nomenclature* 36, 73–75.

**View This Item Online:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/44478>

**Permalink:** <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/28797>

**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>.