OPINION 1260
ORTHUNGA DOHRN, 1859 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA):
ADDED TO OFFICIAL LIST

RULING.—(1) The generic name Orthunga Dohrn, 1859 (gender: feminine), type species, by monotypy, Emesa wahlbergi Stål, 1855, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2200.

(2) The specific name wahlbergi Stål, 1855, as published in the binomen Emesa wahlbergi (specific name of type species of Orthunga Dohrn, 1859) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2870.

(3) The following generic names are hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:
(a) Iccius Dohrn, 1859, rendered invalid in relation to Orthunga Dohrn, 1859, by the first-reviser action of Wygodzinsky, 1966 (Name Number 2137);
(b) Jccius Dohrn, 1859, rendered an incorrect original spelling by the first-reviser action of Melville, herein (Name Number 2138).

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1767

An application to conserve the generic name Orthunga Dohrn, 1859 was first received from Dr P. Wygodzinsky (American Museum of Natural History, New York) on 7 July 1966. It was sent to the printer on 8 November 1966 and published on 6 March 1967 in Bull. zool. Nom., vol. 24, pp. 39–40. No use of the plenary powers was involved. No comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 9 January 1969 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1969)7 for or against the proposals set out in Bull. zool. Nom., vol. 24, p. 40. At the close of the voting period on 9 April 1969 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — twenty-one (21) received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Lemeche, Mayr, Eisenmann, Obruchev, Vokes, Forest, Evans, Jaczewski, Simpson, do Amaral, Uchida, Bonnet, Binder, Mertens, Kraus, Alvarado, Starobogatov, Sabrosky (in part), Tortonese

Negative Votes — none (0).

Melville abstained. Brinck returned a late affirmative vote. No voting papers were returned by Munroe and Ride.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:
Holthuis: ‘No action by the Commission is required here since Orthunga is the valid name and Iccius an objective synonym. But no harm is done by placing these two names on the Official List and Official Index as requested.’

Eisenmann: ‘It seems to me that Dohrn, 1859, in his Emendanda et Corrigenda might be considered to be the first reviser. In any event, Article 23b also results in preferring Orthunga.’

Melville: ‘Surely this should be a plenary powers case? If Iccius Champion, 1886, is to be rescued, it is not enough to treat Iccius Dohrn, 1859, as a nomen oblitum since Article 23b does not apply to homonyms. The voting paper should be withdrawn. New proposals for dealing with Iccius Dohrn should be prepared and submitted to Wygodzinsky & Hussey for their approval.’

Simpson: ‘On evidence submitted Orthunga is valid under the Code. No suspension is needed and no objection arises to placing the name on the Official List.’

Sabrosky: ‘Use of the first-reviser rule made it unnecessary to bring Orthunga to the Commission. Page precedence (cited in the applicants’ paragraph 6) is not binding. However Iccius as a properly proposed name has standing under the Code and its suppression for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy will require use of the plenary powers, not mentioned in the application and not supported by evidence.’

**SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE**

After the voting had been completed the file was put on one side while the problems concerning Article 23b and nomina oblitae were being resolved. The case was then overlooked. In 1977 I asked Dr I. W. B. Nye to prepare an Opinion. This led to a difference of view between us as to the relative status of Iccius and Orthunga which was referred to the Council in February 1983. The question then to be decided was whether Dohrn could be considered to have been his own first reviser, even though his Emendanda et Corrigenda had been published simultaneously with the rest of the Catalogus Hemipterorum, or whether that role could only be filled by a subsequent author (in this case Wygodzinsky, 1966). Council took the view that the latter was the correct position to adopt. I thereupon prepared the present Opinion.

**THE STATUS OF JCCIOUS DOHRN, 1859**

In proposing Orthunga, Dohrn, 1859, p. 105, said: ‘Seite 52 statt Iccius Dohrn: Orthunga Dohrn.’ The status of Iccius has never been considered. Clearly it is one of two original spellings, Iccius and Jccius, and as such is susceptible to first reviser action. I now act as first reviser.
and declare that *Iccius* Dohrn, 1859 is the correct original spelling and *Jcchius* the incorrect original spelling.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on an Official List and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

*Iccius* Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 52

*Jcchius* Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 105

*Orthunga* Dohrn, 1859, *Catalogus Hemipterorum*, p. 105


The following are the original references to first reviser actions accepted in the present Opinion: for *Orthunga* vis-à-vis *Iccius*, Wygodzinsky, 1966, *Bull. amer. Mus. nat. Hist.*, vol. 133, p. 146; for *Iccius* vis-à-vis *Jcchius*, p. 148 herein.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(69)7 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 on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion Number 1260.
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