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Despite having studied Greek and Latin in High School and been good at those, I prefer the traditional approach and I am 100% for MAGASCELINAE, LAMPROSOMINAE and AULACOSCELINAE, so I support this proposition.

Comment on the proposed precedence of the generic name Ataenius Harold, 1867 over Aphodinus Motschulsky, 1862 (Insecta, Coleoptera)  
(Case 3377; see BZN 64: 39–42; 123; 65: 307–309)

Frank-Thorsten Krell  
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I strongly support the conservation of the name Ataenius Harold, 1867 because changing a name for one of the largest genera of SCARABAEIDAE, that is amongst the most frequently used scarab names in the taxonomic, ecological and applied literature and has even been adopted as a common name for an important pest species, would cause widespread confusion. This confusion would be even more severe since its senior synonym, Aphodinus Motschulsky, 1862 shows only a one letter difference to an even more frequently used scarab name, Aphodius Illiger (with counts for 186 references between 2002 and 2008 in Zoological Record, searched on 28 December 2008).

Ataenius has continuously and frequently been used since its description. Howden & Smetana’s (BZN 64: 40) statement that this name has been used in at least nine papers since the synonymy between Aphodinus and Ataenius was established by Dellacasa et al. (2001) is an underestimate. A list of 126 papers using Ataenius as valid between 2002 and 2008 is held by the Secretariat. Howden & Smetana (BZN 64: 40) also state that Ataenius has a history of use in over a hundred references. Since this name has been used at least 126 times during the last eight years alone, this estimate is likely to be wrong by an order of magnitude. Aphodinus Motschulsky has obviously not gained recognition in the scientific community. It has apparently been noted but deliberately rejected by leading taxonomists. Stebnicka (2007) lists Aphodinus as a senior synonym of Ataenius but considers it incorrectly as a nomen oblitum. Smith & Skelley (2007, p. 33) also list Aphodinus as an older synonym, and likewise use Ataenius as valid. Ratcliffe & Paulsen (2008) cite both those publications but do not even mention Aphodinus and use Ataenius as valid. The only authors to consider Aphodinus Motschulsky as valid with ‘Ataenius Harold, 1867: 100 (partim)’ as a junior synonym are Dellacasa et al. (2001, p. 36) but they are unsure whether the type species of Aphodinus is congeneric with the type species of Ataenius, and one of them expressed support for Case 3377 in a comment in BZN 65: 307–308.
Fifteen references documenting use in the taxonomical literature were given in the Application (BZN 64: 40) and the leading authority on this taxon, Z. Stebnicka, indicates about 150 taxonomical references in her comment (BZN 64: 123). *Ataenius* is frequently mentioned in the ecological literature also (e.g. Deloya et al., 2007; Koller et al., 2007; Steinbauer & Weir, 2007; Utz et al., 2007; Horgan, 2008; Pawson et al., 2008). *Ataenius spretulus* (Haldeman) is a common turfgrass pest in Ontario and the United States, reported from 41 states and causing damage on golf courses in at least 23 states (Tashiro, 1987; Jo & Smitley, 2006) resulting in an extensive body of applied literature, e.g. Weaver & Hacker (1978), Vittum (1995, p. 35), Kido et al. (1996, p. 12), Smitley & Davis (1999, p. 53), Labonte (2002), Dreistadt et al. (2003, p. 2), Koppenhöfer et al. (2004, p. 88), Williamson et al. (2005, p. 803), Baghzouz et al. (2006, p. 4139), Ontario Ministry of Agriculture Food and Rural Affairs (2008, p. 4). *Ataenius* has even been adopted as a common name in the form of ‘black turfgrass ataeinuis’/‘black turfgrass Ataenius’ or ‘BTA’ in the pest control literature (e.g. Grewal, 1999, p. 288; Willmott, 2000; Rogers & Potter, 2002, p. 12; Fresenburg et al., 2003: 7; Hodgson, 2007, pp. 1–2 and most other references mentioned in this paragraph) and has been approved as a common name by the Entomological Society of America (Werner, 1982, p. 7; Bosik, 1997, p. 13). *Ataenius* is not only a commonly used name in pest control, but some *Ataenius* species are threatened and have entered the conservation literature. *Ataenius superficialis*, the Big Pine Key Dung Beetle, and *A. woodruffi*, Woodruff’s Dung Beetle, were listed by the IUCN as vulnerable and endangered, respectively (Groombride, 1993, p. 171). These and other *Ataenius* species are used in the conservation and planning literature (Woodruff & Deyrup, 1994a–f; Deyrup, 1994; Drewry, 1994; MacAllister & Harper, 1998, p. 26; Mazzotti et al., 2002; Scott, 2003, p. 72).

The change of such a widespread name because of a subsequent type species designation in another genus causing *Ataenius* to be a junior subjective synonym should be avoided, particularly since one of the authors of this designation does not appreciate its consequences. Had Dellacasa et al. (2001) chosen another one of the originally included species, *Aphodius compacticollis* Motschulsky, as type species, *Ataenius* would not be threatened. Asking the Commission to use its plenary power to change the type species of *Aphodinus* to *A. compacticollis* would mitigate, but not solve the problem. *Ataenius* would no longer be threatened but the well-established though less frequently used genus-group name, *Aganocrossus* Reitter, 1895, would be instead. *A. compacticollis* was claimed to be a senior synonym of *A. urostigma* Harold, 1862 (Kozhantshikov, 1916, p. 192) which belongs to this subgenus or genus. However, this synonymy needs revision (Bordat & Dellacasa, 1996, p. 148). With the taxonomy of *A. compacticollis* being unresolved, changing the type species of *Aphodinus* is no feasible alternative to Howden & Smetana’s original proposal (BZN 64: 40).

Branco & Dellacasa (BZN 65: 307–308) supported maintaining *Ataenius* as a valid name but claimed that it was threatened by another senior synonym, *Auperia* Jacquelin-Duval, 1857, because the type species of this genus, *Scarabaeus stercorator*, designated by Dellacasa himself in 1988, is currently included in *Ataenius*. However, Dellacasa’s type species designation is invalid. *Auperia* was introduced by Jacquelin-Duval (1857, p. 50) as replacement name for ‘Euparia’, Erichs., Arch. f. Naturg., 1847, I, 110’ on the grounds that the name *Euparia* had been used before by Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville and the name *Euparius* by Schönherr. However, *Euparius* is not a homonym of *Euparia* (Article 56.2), and Erichson (1847, p. 110) did not...
describe a new genus *Euparia*, but simply used ‘*Euparia*’ Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville. Since the author is not part of the scientific name (Article 51.1) but only a bibliographic reference, *Euparia* as used by Erichson as subsequent user (Article 51.2.1) is actually *Euparia* Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville, thus *Auperia* Jacquelin-Duval being a replacement name for the latter. According to Article 67.8 *Auperia* Jacquelin-Duval, as a replacement name, has the same type species as the genus is intended to replace. The type species of *Euparia* Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville is *Euparia castanea* Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville, 1828, by monotypy (Le Peletier de Saint-Fargeau & Serville, 1828, p. 357). The type species of *Auperia* Jacquelin-Duval is the same. It is irrelevant that *Auperia* was an unnecessary replacement name since Article 67.8 applies to all nomina nova. Therefore, *Auperia* is a junior objective synonym of *Euparia* and does not threaten *Ataenius*.

Stebnicka (2002, p. 742) erroneously considered *Auperia* Jaquelin-Duval a nomen nudum although it was introduced as a replacement name, hence fulfilling the requirements of Article 12.2.3 to be available by indication. She uses the name *Auperia* Chevrolat, 1864 as valid and she designates *A. denominata* Chevrolat, 1864 as its type species (according to Article 70.3). However, Chevrolat (1864, p. 413) did not describe a new genus but referred to Jacquelin-Duval’s *Auperia* (‘*Auperia stercorator* Jac. Duval, loc. cit., p. 117’). There is no ‘*Auperia* Chevrolat’ and Stebnicka’s type species designation is invalid since it relates to *Auperia* Jacquelin-Duval the type species of which is determined by the type species of the name it was supposed to replace (Article 67.8). No action of the Commission is required relating to the genus-group name *Auperia*. Consequently, Branco & Dellacasa’s other requests (BZN 65: 308) are also unnecessary.

I suggest that the Commission votes on Howden & Smetana’s original requests (BZN 64: 40) with the only correction that, as indicated by Branco & Dellacasa (BZN 65: 307), the type species of *Ataenius* was first designated by Chapin (1940) and not Cartwright (1974).

Additional references


Comments on the proposed conservation of Buettneria Case, 1922 (Amphibia)
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I oppose the petition of Lucas et al. for the Commission to use their plenary power to conserve Buettneria Case, 1922 in preference to either of the senior homonyms. Both the initial proposal to conserve Buettneria Case, 1922 and the comments supporting this proposal ignore the full content of Article 23.9.1 of the Code. This