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ABSTRACT: Overlooked information on the number of gatherings in the third livraison of this
work requires correction of the data given by Dickinson, David & Bruce (2015). The minor
changes to the pagination issued with each livraison do not affect precedence. However,
twelve names cited as in the synonymy should be advanced in date: ten are due to correction
to the livraison to which the page is assigned, and two are due to errors in Dickinson et al.
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The dating of the 28 livraisons making up the work entitled “Voyage autour du monde, exécute
par ordre du Roi, sur la Corvette de sa Majesté, La Coquille, pendant les années 1822, 1823, 1824 et
1825” has been discussed by Sherborn & Woodward (1901, 1906), Mathews (1913), Zimmer
(1926), Cretella (2010) and Dickinson et al. (2015). The underlying source for the information
on the content of each livraison derives from the Bibliographie de la France which reported
the number of sheets and the number of plates (but not the numbers of those plates or their
subjects, which do not further concern us here).

It has come to our attention that the make-up of the third livraison that until now has
been taken as correct needs correction.

In the Bibliographie de la France, Vol. 16 (1827), p. 334, entry 2784, the content of Livraison
3 is given as “5 feuilles, plus six planches” and these details have been almost universally
accepted. But when announcing Livraison 4 the Bibliographie de la France, Vol. 16 (1827),
p. 615, entry 4867 the editor adds in small print “C’est par erreur que, sous le n. 2784 de cette
année, on ne donne que cinq feuilles de texte à la troisième livraison; elle en contient six.”
This states clearly that six gatherings should be counted and not five. This is substantiated
by the notice in the Bulletin des sciences naturelles et de géologie (of Férussac) on p. 378 of
volume 11, in report No. 226, with a title relating to livraisons 2 and 3 (and a confusing
mention of livraisons 3 and 4) which states that these two livraisons contained gatherings 7
to 17 (as noted by Mathews, 1913, although his table, see below, counted only 16 sheets for
the first three livraisons). In conformity with this a later notice in the Journal général de la
littérature de France, Vol. 32 (1829), pp. 338-339, relating to the publication of livraison 14,
reported that this livraison contained gatherings 77 to 82 (i.e. pp. 609-656); whereas the
previously accepted make-up of this livraison (pp. 601-648, see Table I below), did not take
account of that sixth gathering in livraison 3.
Mathews indicated that Livr. 13 comprised 5½ sheets which would give 44 pages, but he gave just 40 – implying 5 complete sheets (with which entry 6998 in the Bibliographie de La France agrees). The gathering numbers in the book do not indicate a 4-page insertion and we believe these pages may have been those of the Preface, although its date is January 1828.

Cretella (2010) used the dates and pagination per part given by Sherborn & Woodward (1910) and by Mathews (1913). The changes we signal are entirely related to the extra gathering in livraison 3.

The effects of the correction to the pagination of livraison 3 are as follows:

A. Names changing their date that Dickinson et al., (2015) listed in their synonymies (and in which the page number proves to have been in the preceding livraison):

(a) Radjah radjah: mentioned by Garnot on p. 602: this page was thought to be in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 13 (with date 21 Nov. 1829).

(b) Rollandia rolland chilensis: mentioned by Garnot on p. 601: this page was thought to be in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 13 (21 Nov. 1829).

(c) Phalacrocorax gaimardi: mentioned by Garnot on p. 601: this page was thought to be in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 13 (21 Nov. 1829).

(d) Philesturnus carunculatus rufusater: mentioned by Lesson on p. 649; this page was thought to be in Livr. 15 (3 April 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830).

(e) Coreus tristis: mentioned by Lesson on p. 650; this page was thought to be in Livr. 15 (3 April 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830).

(f) Mino dumontii: mentioned by Lesson on p. 652; this page was thought to be in Livr. 15 (3 April 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 14 (9 Jan. 1830).
(g) *Alecthelia Urvillii*: mentioned by Lesson on p. 703; this page was thought to be in Livr. 16 (1 May 1830), but it belongs in Livr. 15 (3 Apr. 1830).

(h) *Philedon dumerilii*: mentioned by Lesson on p. 416; this page was thought to be in Livr. 10 (4 April 1829), but it belongs in Livr. 9 (28 Feb 1829).

B. Names, changing their date; Dickinson et al., (2015) listed these in their synonymies but dated them incorrectly:

(i) *Hemiprocne mystacea*: mentioned by Lesson on p. 647; Dickinson et al. (2015) erred listing this page in Livr. 15 (3 Apr. 1830), instead of Livr. 14 (as their livraison details implied) so it dates from 9 Jan. 1830.

(j) *Larosterna inca*: mentioned by Lesson on p. 253; this page should date from Livr. 6 (22 Mar. 1828) and not livr. 16 (1 May 1830) as mistakenly given by Dickinson et al., (2015).

The distribution of the plates and their content is not in question and it remains the case that many names were introduced in the plates where the captions included scientific names. As observed by Dickinson et al. (2019), in the context of a later French work published in parts, only the specimens that were depicted become the type specimens and where just one specimen is depicted the holotype, depicted in the plate, is fixed by monotypy under Articles 12.2.7 and 73.1.2 of the Code (ICZN, 1999). The identification of specimens from the *Coquille* voyage that were depicted in the plates awaits attention. The ‘types’ suggested in the series of papers on avian types in the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle – mostly by the diligent work of Claire and Jean-François Voisin, should be reviewed and the identity of the types verified against the plates, along with possible alternative choices, and perhaps revised.
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1 This paper is part of the history of this book but plays no part in the correction in respect of the birds.