are proof of this. However, many additional papers could be cited in which the well known species is referred to under the name *foetidus*, as noted in para. 6 of the application.

4. *Aegialia rufa* (Fabricius, 1792) is not the sole name for the species commonly mentioned in faunistic and ecological papers, as well as those concerning applied entomology. As a species collected sporadically it is known to specialists under both the names *A. rufa* and *A. spissipes* (LeConte, 1878) (para. 7 of the application). For this reason I agree with Dellacasa, Silfverberg and the Code that the first available synonym, *spissipes*, should be adopted for this taxon.

(2) Frank-Thorsten Krell
*
*Theodor-Boveri-Institut für Biowissenschaften der Universität, Lehrstuhl Zoologie III, Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

I should like to put forward some information on the usages of the names *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782) and *Aphodius scybalarius* (Fabricius, 1781) in addition to that given in my joint application (BZN 51: 121–127) and subsequent comment (BZN 52: 72–73).

In addition to the references cited in the application (para. 6) I have found a further one (Costessèque, 1993, p. 124) in which *Aphodius scybalarius* has been used in the sense of *Aphodius foetidus* (Herbst, 1783). Hence the name *Aphodius scybalarius* is still in use for two different species. Article 51a of the Code states that citation of the author of the name for a taxon is optional. However, without citing the author’s name the binomen *Aphodius scybalarius* is ambiguous and it has therefore lost all usefulness as the name for a species.

To illustrate how common the name *Aphodius rufus* (Moll, 1782) is I have given the Commission Secretariat a list of 54 references by 53 authors since 1990 in which it is used as valid. The senior authors of these references are from Austria, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Germany, Great Britain, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Poland and Switzerland. The publications deal with different aspects of biology. Most of them are faunistic but the list also includes works that are veterinary, ecological, agricultural, conservational, comprehensive regional or national faunal lists and identification keys. It is clear that *Aphodius rufus* (Moll) is a name that is well known, and frequently used in different branches of biology, as noted by Stebnicka (BZN 52: 73). The continued usage of *Aphodius rufus* (Moll) clearly results neither from national tradition nor from adherence to a single influential reference work.

Prior to 1990 the name *Aphodius rufus* (Moll) was used just as frequently, with the exception only of the 11 citations mentioned in our application (BZN 51: 123) and those listed by Silfverberg (BZN 52: 71). After Landin (1956) discovered the true identity of *Aphodius scybalarius* (Fabricius, 1781) and emphasized that this name should not be used (para. 3 of the application), only Silfverberg (1977, 1979) used it before Stebnicka in 1979 submitted an application to conserve *Aphodius rufus* (Moll) by suppressing *Scarabaeus scybalarius*. Unfortunately this application was not published until 1984 (BZN 41: 265–266) because there was at that time some doubt over the availability of the earliest homonym *Scarabaeus rufa* De Geer, 1778. During this delay G. Dellacassa (1983) published his influential monograph on Italian
APHODINII, he dealt with Landin’s (1956) discovery at some length but did not follow the latter’s recommendation to maintain the usage of *Aphodius rufus* and adopted *scybalarius* (para. 4 of the application).

Article 80a of the Code states that existing usage (i.e. *Aphodius rufus* (Moll)) is to be maintained when a case is under consideration by the Commission. Stebnicka’s (1984) application has never been resolved but in the meantime some authors have unfortunately, and in the face of nomenclatural stability, used *Aphodius scybalarius* in the sense of *Aphodius rufus*. This usage should not now be legalized by accepting it as established. Furthermore, *Aphodius scybalarius* in the sense of *Aphodius rufus* Moll is not the only sense in which this name has been used, as I have shown above.

In summary, I reiterate that approval of our application will result in an unambiguous and stable nomenclature for these scarabid species.

Additional reference


Comment on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN 53: 28–37)

Richard H. Meadow

Zooarchaeology Laboratory, Peabody Museum of Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 11 Divinity Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, U.S.A.

I write as a member of the Executive Committee of the International Council for Archaeozoology. I have been delegated to pass on the following official declaration.

At a meeting on 9 September 1995 held at Basel, Switzerland, the International Committee of the ICAZ voted to strongly support the application of Juliet Clutton-Brock, Anthea Gentry and Colin Groves (see para. 9 of the application). Names based by Linnaeus (1758, 1766) and some other authors on domestic animals should emphatically not be used for wild animals.