I support the intent of van Achterberg's submission regarding the need to protect the name *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862 against any possible attempt to substitute *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 for it, but consider his exposition unnecessarily complex. Two issues are involved: what is the correct spelling of *Gnamptodon/ Gnaptodon*, and which species should be recognised as the type species? Protection of *Dapsilarthra* will be automatic if the question of the type species of *Gnamptodon/ Gnaptodon* is settled.

*Gnamptodon* and *Gnaptodon* are not different names but different spellings of the same name. When a name is spelt in two different ways in the same paper, this is evidence that one or other spelling is a lapsus or error of some kind. The fact that we are not dealing with two different names is shown by Haliday's inclusion of only *Bracon pumilio* Nees in *Gnaptodon* in 1837 and his citation of the same species as the type of *Gnaptodon* in 1840. Since the spelling *Gnamptodon* was used by Haliday at least three times (in 1833, 1837 and 1840, as cited by van Achterberg) while the spelling *Gnaptodon* appears only once (in 1837), clearly *Gnamptodon* was the intended spelling. Van Achterberg's preference for *Gnaptodon* is no doubt due to that spelling having been used in his 1983 revision and other recent literature. If recent usage is sufficient ground for the Commission to rule *Gnaptodon* to be the spelling to be used, I have no objection to this. But the case should be argued in terms of usage, not through the stratagem of treating *Gnamptodon* and *Gnaptodon* as different names when they are not.

A ruling on the type species of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 is needed because the type species, by monotypy, *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], was misidentified. This specific name is at present applied to an alysiine braconid placed in *Dapsilarthra*. In Haliday's (1833) key the gaping (exodont) mandibles characteristic of alysiine braconids are denoted by the phrase 'Mandibulae hiantes'. But *Gnamptodon*, with *rufiventris* as sole included species, is denoted by 'mandibulae forcipatae'. Therefore Haliday did not intend to apply the name to an alysiine braconid and it is not necessary to assume any change in Haliday's concept of *Gnamptodon* between 1833 and 1837. The species included in 1837, *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834, could represent the species misidentified as *Bassus rufiventris* in 1833, although this cannot be determined with certainty. Designation of *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834 as type species of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 would solve the problem and remove any possible threat to *Dapsilarthra*.
I should like to express my support for the proposal to conserve *Dapsilarthra* Foerster, 1862. I believe that the suppression of *Gnampoton* Haliday, 1833 will result in greater stability and consistency of usage in the braconidae. However, I am surprised to find that the proposal is inconsistent with the radical changes the same author has proposed for generic names in this family, which are based on strict priority (van Achterberg, 1979, 1982).

Some minor points may be helpful to the Commission in considering this case: (1) *Dapsilarthra* in its widest sense has been the subject of recent studies by Königsmann, 1959, Griffiths, 1968a, b, Wharton, 1980 and van Achterberg, 1983. Griffiths and Wharton are at present rearing and collecting material to be used in a revision of the Nearctic species. *Dapsilarthra* is quite diverse (Wharton, 1980; van Achterberg, 1983) and is unlikely to be maintained in its present sense (Wharton, 1980). However, *D. api* (Curtis, 1826), the type species of *Dapsilarthra*, and *D. rufiventris* (Nees), the type species of *Gnampoton*, are in separate but apparently closely related species groups. Thus any reorganisation at the generic level will probably lead to the retention of both species in *Dapsilarthra* s.s.

(2) There are several generic names available for the species now placed in *Dapsilarthra*; and *Adelura* Foerster, 1862 has been used in the past about as frequently as *Dapsilarthra* (Shenefelt, 1974). Thus the contention that *Dapsilarthra* is ‘... long established and much used ...’ (vol. 41, p. 54, lines 28–29) is a weak argument for its conservation. The similar statement that ‘... *Dapsilarthra* has been used consistently for the genus since 1862 ...’ (vol. 41, p. 54, lines 24–25) is somewhat misleading because of the widespread use of *Adelura* until Strand, 1928, showed that it was a junior homonym. Even after this discovery, one of the most detailed biological studies on any species of *Dapsilarthra*, that by Keilin & Tate, 1943, used the combination *Adelura api* (Curtis).

**ADDITIONAL REFERENCES**


(3) Replies by Dr van Achterberg

(1) to Dr Griffiths: The statement that there is doubt about the identity of the nominal type species of *Gnampoton* Haliday, 1833, p. 265 (where it is clearly indicated) and of *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837, p. 220, where only one species is included, is in my opinion incorrect. If the interpretation of these species by Haliday is taken as
the basis for the interpretation of the genera, the uncertainty about both names will continue. As Dr Griffiths correctly notes, there is no proof that Haliday’s *Bracon pumilio* Nees, 1834, is the same as his *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], 1814; it is even unlikely. For instance, according to the original descriptions, the colour of the two species is very different and this should have been noted by Haliday. However, Haliday made some sort of mistake and the case should be settled to avoid possible confusion in the future.

(2) to Dr Wharton: I agree with most of these remarks. I prefer the application of generic names to be based strictly on priority. However, if this increases the chance of confusion (in this case, two generic names differing only in one letter, both proposed by the same author in a conflicting manner) the case should, in my opinion, be brought before the Commission. The solution proposed is to conserve the name most in use at the moment. Therefore whether the term ‘much used’ or another is used is not important: it is a relative statement. *Dapsilarthra* is commonly accepted as the name for the genus that includes *Bassus rufiventris* Nees, [1812], 1814 and *Alysia apii* Curtis, 1826 (see e.g. Shenefelt, 1974, pp. 986–991).

*Adelura* Foerster, 1862 (non Bonaparte, 1854; = *Adelurola* Strand, 1928) has been used extensively, but in terms of its type species it is not closely related to *Dapsilarthra*; its use for the group including *D. rufiventris* and *D. apii* was incorrect and cannot be accepted. Of the available names for this genus *Dapsilarthra* has indeed been the most consistently used since 1862.

(4) Note by the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The Commission must clearly decide on the relative status of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 and *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837. On the direct evidence of the 1837 work, on the assumption that Haliday knew what he was doing, they must be regarded as separate names; for *Gnamptodon* is sunk as a synonym of *Opius* (*Opius*) Wesmael, 1835 (though it is difficult to see why), while *Gnaptodon* is a separate subgenus of *Opius*, with its own type species.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to treat *Gnaptodon* as a misspelling of *Gnamptodon*. The Greek verb gnampto means to bend or curve; the Greek word gnapto means to card or comb wool. Haliday was a good enough classicist to have known this.

I therefore conclude that Dr Griffiths’ argument has little to sustain it and that Dr van Achterberg’s original proposals should be preferred.

---

**DESIGNATION OF A NEOTYPE FOR ADIANTHUS BUCATUS AMEGHINO, 1891 (MAMMALIA) UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS: A RESPONSE.** Z.N.(S.)2430

(1) By Richard L. Cifelli (Division of Mammals, National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC, 20560, U.S.A.)

A comprehensive review of the *Adianthidae*, published recently (Cifelli & Soria, 1983), includes detailed discussion of all issues raised by Schoch in his critique, which otherwise largely reiterates the substance of my joint proposal with...
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