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ABSTRACT: This article provides the first accurate representation of the chronology of publications from 1826 to 1830 covering 83 taxa involving 94 names, including variable orthographies, of birds newly described from the collections of the voyage of the Coquille (1822-1825), with 59 names currently used as valid for recognised species or subspecies based on the fourth edition of the Howard and Moore Checklist (2013-14). This voyage resulted in collections from multiple countries and the avian novelties were published in a variety of works over a period of five years (1826-1830) and the complexity of this publication stream was not thoroughly examined for its full geography until the various experts worked on the Peters Check-list. It seems that section authors were provided with no set policy on how to assign authorship to new birds first named in plate captions; and also that they were mostly misled by inaccurate information on the date of publication of Lesson’s Manuel d’Ornithologie. An earlier publication date for the Manuel d’Ornithologie of R.-P. Lesson is documented and other dates of publication reviewed with special relevance for “Férussac’s Bulletin”. The findings are compared with those of previous standard references, particularly the Check-list of Birds of the World by J.L. Peters & others and Sherborn’s Index Animalium, all differing in their inconsistencies in their citations to source works of the new names covered here. Authorities have also differed in their attributions of authorship. This article is a thorough in-depth review of the many issues involved, including authorship, spellings and date precedence, and decisions are reached reflecting a consistent philosophy about shared authorship that takes account of the rules of zoological nomenclature. Sherborn’s treatment in the Index Animalium is reviewed and found problematic. A table compares our results with the “Peters Check-list” and the most recent edition of the Howard and Moore Checklist.
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INTRODUCTION

The voyage of the Coquille was one of a series of French circumnavigations exploring and surveying in various regions of the world, but especially in the southern Pacific. Under the command of Louis Isidore Duperrey (1786-1865), the corvette departed France on 11 August 1822, spending about six months in parts of South America before beginning its

1 ZB Contribution No. 1 to the ZooBank verification process.
work in the Pacific in April 1823. For the next 16 months the Coquille explored parts of Polynesia, Micronesia, Melanesia and Australia, extending as far west as the Moluccas and as far south as New Zealand, before returning to France on 24 March 1825 (Dunmore, 1969; Howgego, 2004, Stresemann, 1975, Cretella, 2010 and Duyker, 2014b). The itinerary was usefully summarised by Cretella (2010).

The zoological reports comprised two volumes, originally issued in 28 parts, or livraisons. All appeared under the general title “Voyage autour du Monde, exécuté par order du Roi, sur la Corvette de Sa Majeste, La Coquille, pendant les années 1822, 1823, 1824 et 1825”, hereinafter referred to as “Voyage”2. A complete summary of the relevant details of all livraisons was provided by Cretella (2010). Earlier Mengel (1983) provided a table that dealt with everything except the huge 28th livraison which, according to Cretella, formed part 2 of volume 2 of the Zoologie (not examined by Mengel or Cretella as apparently lacking in the Ellis Library in the University of Kansas) and appeared only in 18383.

The collecting was mainly undertaken by two naturalists in parallel with their official duties; these were René Primevère Lesson (1794-1848)4,5, the naval apothecary, and Prosper Garnot (1794-1838)7,8, the medical officer. They were assisted by others, including Auguste Béard (1796-1852), a veteran of the voyage of the Uranie in 1818-1820 (Duyker, 2014a). Initially, Garnot was apparently responsible for mammals and birds, while Lesson covered other vertebrates and invertebrates. However, Garnot began to suffer from the dysentery he picked up when they were in Peru and this steadily worsened, eventually becoming severe enough for Garnot to have to leave the expedition in Port Jackson (now Sydney), Australia, on 1 March 18249. A significant portion of the collections made thus far accompanied Garnot on his passage back to France. Unfortunately, all was lost in a shipwreck off southern Africa in July 1824, when Garnot barely escaped with his life10. He returned to France in March 182510.

---

2 The title is usually listed in library catalogues under the name of Duperrey, the expedition leader and captain of the ship, as he had overall responsibility for the whole report of which the Zoologie came first. This approach seems to be standard for the French voyages of discovery.
3 The only details seemingly missing relate to the few text pages such as plate lists issued for inclusion in the Atlas volumes.
4 Zimmer (1926) was unsure of the date of this last livraison and his suggested pagination is far short of the pagination reported by Cretella (2010) and evident in the work displayed by the Biodiversity Heritage Library (BHL: www.biodiversitylibrary.org).
5 Born 20 March 1794 (Lesson, 1846); b. 21 [sic] March 1794, d. 28 April 1847. (http://geneatie.net/genealogie/ChristopheGrosbon/les-familles-de-rochefort-surmer/LESSON_Rene_Primevere_271575306; accessed 9 July 2015).
6 Made a chevalier of the Légion d’Honneur on 5 November 1825 (Lesson, 1846: 60).
9 See Duyker (2014).
10 See the Voyage (pp. 573-578) for Garnot’s story of the events, and Lesson (1828e: 344) for an example of mention of lost specimens. Duyker (2014: 24, 25) reported “three cases of specimens, including 365 birds” and that “all his cases had been penetrated by seawater and were too damaged to be saved”; Garnot (1829b: 577) reported that only one unbreached case came ashore and that the content was badly damaged. Elsewhere he mentioned attempting to dry out the contents.
Lesson and Garnot were charged with writing up the zoological findings of the voyage and they did indeed collaborate, but apparently with difficulty (Whittell, 1954: 218, 266). In the *Voyage* on p. iv Lesson, with date January 1828, wrote: “... appelé après quelque temps de séjour dans la capitale, à la place de chirugien en chef de l’île de la Martinique, M. Garnot nous remit divers Mémoires qu’il avait rédigés, en nous priant de les insérer textuellement, et sous son nom, en nous laissant par conséquent responsable de nos propres travaux. Nous avons donc dû apposer le nom de leurs auteurs aux divers articles qu’on trouvera dans les deux volumes de cet ouvrages, où ils sont insérés à leur place naturelle, et au milieu de Mémoires sans signature, dont nous réclamons ici la propriété.”

The issue of the preliminary pages (pp. i-iv) is not covered by Mengel (1983) but in view of the above mention of Martinique these were most probably published in livraison 16 in May 1830. Garnot in late 1827 was the second chief surgeon at the naval hospital in Brest, but he sailed for Martinique on 23 May 1828 (see Duyker, 2014a) to take up a government position and hoped to recover his health there. Already in Brest communication with Lesson will have been slow and in Martinique it would have been much slower. Levot (1857) in a disappointingly brief and belated obituary suggested that Garnot only went to Martinique later. His spell there appears to have been from 1828 to 1832 (http://www.smih29m.fr/memorial/legionnaires/12474_garnot_prosper; — accessed 9 July 2015). Garnot died in Paris aged 44 in 1838.

As regards the birds, which are our subject, all were dealt with in the first 16 livraisons of volume 1 of the Zoologie by Lesson and Garnot. That volume, when completed, totalled 743 pages made up of 16 livraisons and arranged in two parts (Mengel, 1983). The two parts each come with a title page; one for ‘partie 1’ (pp. 1-360) with date 1826, and one for ‘partie 2’ (pp. 361-743) with date 1828, and are often bound separately. With some of these first 16 livraisons came a variety of plates that would relate to text in volume 2 (see Cretella, 2010 for details).

The purpose of this review is to provide clear details relating to bird names in respect of all matters of source, date and authorship. As part of this exercise each name has been checked to Sherborn’s *Index Animalium* to establish what names and citations he listed (and those he did not) and is cited to the appropriate page. Our research has also involved checks to the appropriate volumes of the *Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum*, the *Catalogue of the Birds of the Americas* and the *Systema Avium Australasiarum* and a few later works in order to clarify early revisions of relationships.

As will emerge, this exercise is by no means limited to the main report (Zoology, Vol. 1) because both Garnot and Lesson, singly or together, published in other works for which it has been necessary to consider dates of publication and to explore the evidence of authorship: these two subjects are those we tackle next, before providing a systematic list which, for currently recognised taxa, follows the sequences of families, genera and species.

11 “...after staying for a while in the capital, M. Garnot was appointed chief surgeon of Martinique, and he handed me various reports that he had written, instructing me to insert them verbatim, and thus leaving me responsible of my own work. I have therefore appended the name of their authors to the various texts constituting the two volumes of this work, where they are inserted in their appropriate place, and, amidst unsigned reports, of which I claim authorship.”

12 The date shows it to be too late for issue with the first livraison. It was normal practice for such texts to be included only when the work as a whole was finished.
used by Dickinson & Remsen (2013) and Dickinson & Christidis (2014) to bring together the evidence.

DATES OF PUBLICATION

The chronology we have derived from the best available information, as finalised here, demonstrates that what authors may plan to do is not always what happens. Their intended major publication, which should have been the source of any new names, can be pre-empted by content in separate publications by an author or by someone drawing on the author’s knowledge. In the case we deal with here the two main complications are, firstly, the publication of the plates before the related text for their subjects, and, secondly, Lesson’s parallel work on another major publication: his Manuel d’Ornithologie.

a. THE ‘ZOLOGIE’ VOL. 1.

The plates relating to the text were issued for assembly as an “Atlas” and the 44 plates that depict birds all appeared before any of the relevant text. The title page of the Atlas bears the date 1826 which corresponds to the year the first livraison and its plates appeared. The Atlas includes a plate list that may have been intended to clarify the authorship of the names of the taxa depicted, but it is evident that that list would not have been ready for publication until the whole of the volume’s text was published, which was on May 1, 1830 but there is no record of when any Atlas text pages were issued; it seems likely to have been in 1830 but as we cannot even provide a month date we date it “1830”. The list of plates within the text, at the end of the volume (pp. 741-743) is part of livraison 16, dating from May 1, 1830 and must be seen as the prior list. It is apparent from the very few minor differences between the page in the Atlas and the three pages in the text volume that these two indexes were prepared essentially at the same time as the final livraison.

The Atlas plate captions include scientific names and, where the depictions were of birds as yet undescribed in words, the validity of their introduction is covered by Art. 12.2.7 of the Code.

Sherborn & Woodward (1901a, 1906), concerned with the whole subject matter of volume 1, drew on the information in the Bibliographie de la France to date the livraisons. Mathews (1913) found information in Férussac’s Bulletin (see below) which allowed him to identify the numbers of the plates that appeared with each text livraison. All the bird plates are found in livraisons 1 to 11, and the full text for volume 1 is completed in the first 16 livraisons. Zimmer (1926) gave both sets of information and added the cautions mentioned above (but see below in relation to the Manuel). Mengel (1983) found original parts wrappers in the Ellis Collection in the University of Kansas Library (EC-UKL) and provided complete details of the composition of each of the 27 livraisons (not just of those concerning birds). It

---

13 The implications of the minor differences between this and the list in pp. 741-743 are contradictory as to which plate list was prepared first. First, that several uses of “Less.” in the Atlas are reduced in pp. 741-743 to “L.” which Lesson would have known indicated Linnaeus; but, second, where the indication is to the identities of the different birds figured the author’s name precedes that information in pp. 741-743 whereas it followed it in the Atlas list. The two differences in the spelling of a scientific name (relating to pl. 31, fig. 2 and pl. 50) do not help.
would be of great benefit to science if these wrappers could be scanned and added to what is now available on the Biodiversity Heritage Library.

In his *Index Animalium* Sherborn cited names from the *Voyage* from the text and not from the plates. His treatment of names introduced by Temminck in the *Planches Coloriées* was confused and inconsistent – and is discussed in our Conclusions – where we also set out the relevant policy statements of Sherborn (1902, 1922).

Where, in our text, dates are given for a plate in the *Voyage* or for a text page in there, these dates are taken from Mengel (1983) and are the dates of issue of the *Bibliographie de la France* in which their publication was announced. The dates and details in Appendix I, which we reproduce from table VIII from the CD accompanying Dickinson et al. (2011) are the same except that some livraisons contained text by different authors and these are now signalled. It is not certain when the list of contents or title page for the *Atlas* were published so the plate list for that is dated “[1830]” but it will not have been before May.

It is evident from the incorrect numbers for plates14 cited by Lesson in the *Manuel*, noted in this article, that while the plates had been executed their final numbers and captions had not been assigned, i.e. they were in the state known as *avant la lettre* (see Dickinson et al. 2011, p. 285).

b. THE ANNALES DES SCIENCES NATURELLES

There are two relevant articles in this journal. The main one deals with the visit to the Falkland Islands (Les Malouines), early in the voyage. This is reproduced in full in chapter 6 of vol. 1 of the *Voyage*, appearing on pp. 535-552, where Garnot appears to be the author. The footnotes on p. 196 and 535 evidence inclusion in the January issue in 1826. Lesson (1831: 548) once dated this 1825, but was perhaps citing the year the paper was read to the Société d’histoire naturelle de Paris. A second paper by Lesson (1825) includes just one new name (*Epimachus regius*, see species 77 below); this been dated to November.

c. BULLETIN DES SCIENCES NATURELLES ET DE GÉOLOGIE (FÉRUSSAC)

This title originated as a subsidiary title used for the second of the eight sections of Férussac’s *Bulletin Universel des Sciences et de l’Industrie* and that overarching title is sometimes cited with or without the ‘subsidiary’ title. Here we standardize, using the subsidiary title alone; it was possible to subscribe for the section separately and it is usually bound as a separate journal. Where we cite, for example, “8 (1)” we refer not to the first section within the *Bulletin Universel* but to the first part of the *Bulletin des Sciences naturelles et de géologie* in volume 8. Prior to the split into eight titled sections Férussac called his journal the *Bulletin Général et Universel des Annonces et des Nouvelles Scientifiques* which existed for just one year (1823), during which four volumes appeared.

---

14 Plates 33 and 34 were reciprocally affected, as were 15 and 16 in which there were three figures. Other mistakes were limited to figure numbers and these concerned plates 19, 30 and 31 bis. In three cases we could not find them the species listed in the *Manuel* (*Ardea heliosyla* now *Zonerodias heliosylus*; *Falco longicauda* now *Henicopernis longicauda*; *Sitta otata*).
Sherborn in treating the 14 names that concern us in the various volumes of his *Index Animalium* only provided year dates\(^1\). Richmond (1992), however, had month dates for each of the names that concern us in his *Index*. Although Hellmayr sometimes cited Sherborn here Richmond had the data and Sherborn apparently did not. Thus, for example, the month-dates Hellmayr & Conover (1948a, b) used in the *Catalogue of the birds of the Americas* might have been provided by Richmond.

Dickinson et al. (2011) included no table of dates of publication for the *Bulletin des Sciences naturelles et de Géologie* and they erred in stating that “beginning in April 1825 there were 4 volumes per year”. In fact, from 1824 through 1828 there were, in each year, 3 volumes of 4 issues. From 1829 to 1831 there were, in each year, 4 volumes of 3 issues. We now include a table for all 27 volumes, covering the whole period during which all the publications by Lesson and others relevant to the *Voyage* appeared (see Appendix II and the note to that suggesting that the month dates relate to journal compilation and that printing occurred after the month end and referring back to our footnote below).

d. **DICTIONNAIRE DES SCIENCES NATURELLES (ÉD. LEVRAULT)**

Nine volumes concern us (Nos. 39, 40, 42, 48, 50, 51, 52, 54 and 56). Mathews & Iredale (1915) and Sherborn (1922: xlv) provided dates of all the volumes – the former providing the day-dates of the entries in the *Bibliographie de la France*; the latter just the month-dates.

e. **DICTIONNAIRE CLASSIQUE D’HISTOIRE NATURELLE**

Here four volumes (13, 14, 15 and 16) contain six relevant entries. These volumes have a month date on their title pages.

f. **MANUEL D’ORNITHOLOGIE**

Lesson’s two volumes were apparently published together in June 1828. Zimmer (1926: 386) cited Mathews for use of the date 28 June 1828 and Mathews (1927, 1930) certainly used that, and we too have used this date in the past. However, checking to the *Bibliographie de la France* we find that the correct date is earlier because the entry in the bibliography is item 3634 on p. 447 (in issue No. 24 date 14 June), which has been noted by Richmond in an unpublished index card. This is important because in issue 25, a week later, item 3891 on p. 473 reports the 7th livraison of the *Voyage*. Thus the *Manuel* takes precedence in the case of several names previously cited from the *Voyage*.

Compared to our preliminary data, used by Dickinson & Remsen (2013) and Dickinson & Christidis (2014), we found reasons to revise authorship in a few cases, but no errors in the year dates; the misdating of the *Manuel* was one of the causes of corrections to authorship.

---

\(^1\) By contrast listing *Megapodius* Gaimard (Gaimard, 1823) from p. 451 of Vol. II of the *Bulletin Général* in 1823 Sherborn had this from June (which evidence suggests is wrong – the single issue in which this appeared was for parts 4, 5 and 6 of volume 2; 6 is the June issue, however inside the front cover of the wrapper is the statement “Il parait le 1er de chaque mois ...” (it appears on the first day of every month) thus either the June issue related to what appeared in May or to June and it was published in July. On p. 450 it is stated that the report by Gaimard is from a paper he read to the *Société d’Histoire naturelle de Paris* on 6 June 1823. This we consider sufficiently proves that the month-dates used by Férrusac related to the month of compilation. There is some substantiation in the March issue (in Vol. I, p. 495) where a list of the French journals published in March was no doubt complete for the month and would have appeared in April.
g. **MÉMOIRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ D’HISTOIRE NATURELLE DE PARIS**

Only one issue concerns us and that is discussed below under *Todiramphus divinus* because we found it appropriate to act as First Reviser under Article 24.2 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999; hereinafter “the Code”) to fix the source of that name.

**AUTHORSHIP**

Once every relevant publication has been dated, and it is clear which will be cited as the original source, attention must turn to the question of who to cite as the author. This is arguably the most complex decision area. Our intention is to present a consistent interpretation and application of Article 50 of the Code (ICZN, 1999) with particular attention to cases where judgements are needed over questions of joint authorship.

Establishing who named new birds offers its own complexities as much as where and when they were named. The standard references works not only differ in how they cite new names, their sources, dates and authorship, but are often inconsistent in doing so. While we treat a primary set of publications that deal with the results of the *Voyage* and by bringing these all together resolve multiple issues of source citation, we are aware that Lesson continued to work on material from the expedition and published some later. We are also aware that Lesson wrote at a time when, particularly in France, there was a continuing reluctance to accept Linnean hierarchy and nomenclature and indeed the subordination of French to Latin\(^{16}\). There were also widely different opinions on how to best arrange the relationships of the birds – their systematics (the French term of the period being “Méthodes”) – and Vieillot (1818), before providing what he claimed to be the system used in the *Nouveau Dictionnaire*, reported on twelve publications on this subject during the years 1760 to 1815. Due to these different offerings there were choices as to what name to use for a known bird and by extension choices of genus-group name to be made – for example the names *Edolius* and *Dicrurus* were in concurrent use for the drongos. Even spellings varied; while most authors used a capital letter to commence a genus-group name Lesson, both in the *Voyage* and in his *Manuel*, used a small initial letter.

At the level of species-group names there was also indiscipline; some authors, such as Temminck, objected to names that reflected geographic origin, and others rejected descriptive names that they considered poorly chosen, or were barbaric, or just from a source language of which they disapproved. It was these conflicts which led to what is known as the Stricklandian Code of nomenclature (Strickland, 1843), which, with the support of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, gradually gained broad but not universal support in Europe.

About the 1820s there seems to have been a growing realisation that an author’s name must be associated with a taxon’s scientific name, and it has been argued that this was influenced by the development of patent law. However, due to both differing opinions regarding attribution to a genus-group name and an evolving body of knowledge which was reshaping the limits to genus circumscription, when birds were reallocated to a different

\(^{16}\) This should be no surprise as throughout the 19th century French was the language of diplomacy throughout Europe including the courts of Frederick II of Prussia and the Russian tsars.
genus the name of the author of the original species name was often dropped and replaced by the name of the author of the new combination. While the timing and development of this practice deserves particular study it does seem that the French, and especially Vieillot and Lesson, were early converts to the idea that it was important to signal that a new combination was theirs.

Also in the first half of the 19th century some naturalists seem to have thought that just by discovering a bird and suggesting a name they would get credit for that; consider for example Hodgson (1839), who accused Blyth – and others – of appropriating his names (see Datta & Inskipp, 2004: 144; Dickinson, 2006: 128, 134).

It took some 140 years before the first edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature appeared (ICZN, 1961), although Strickland (1843) brought forward proposed rules for nomenclature within about 15 years from the first livraison of the Voyage, and within about 80 years the ICZN developed a set of “Règles” (ICZN, 1905) which were not universally respected. However, following Strickland there was growing acceptance of the importance to be attached to priority and perhaps there was more reason to try to publish first. Without doubt the changes from 1961 through to the latest edition of the Code (ICZN, 1999), have tended to give appropriate weight to the more complex job of taxon description rather than the simple provision of a ‘label’ (i.e. just a name). However, the rules, as so often, deal mainly with black and white and not with shades of grey – which are often perceptible – and in interpreting the rules there is no clear mandate to consider the original intention of the author(s) and retrospective changes have been judged to be required. For more background see Bruce (2003).

In applying the Code there has been general attention to the spelling and construction of scientific names. By contrast there has been only periodic attention to the importance of date of publication and even less obvious attention to issues of original authorship. We suggest, as an example of this, that it is not widely understood that a name cannot simply be traced back to its first seemingly unrecognised author whose name just replaces some widely accepted author. And yet the rules on homonymy remind us that zoological nomenclature is

---

17 The growth of collection resources also led to reconsideration and republication, and Lesson on reconsideration made changes to species names, particularly in his Traité (1830-31), not all seeming to be due to preoccupation.

18 Often using the term “Nob.’ or ‘Nobis’, meaning “of us” to do so (although this was also used in the context of genuinely new names for new taxa, thus leading the incautious to think all such usage was of this kind).

19 However within museums the placement of a name on the label of a museum specimen, as was done by, for example, Lichtenstein, was very quickly considered to have been insufficient without publication.

20 In fact Hodgson did usually provide descriptions, but they were not what Blyth was looking for and he made only modest use of them.

21 Art. 86.3 makes clear that this edition of the Code must be followed wherever the rules have changed.

22 The Code requires that such cases be determined on the basis that it must be “clear from the contents” (Art. 50.1). The Code is consistent in its logic: Art. 32 mentions the complementary dictum “without recourse to any external source” and Art. 33 cites “demonstrably intentional” and explains that. In relation to authorship this often means that where an author published a name supplied by a friend, intending that the friend be credited as the author, the publishing author must now be seen as the author. Of course authors in the early 19th century could not foresee the Code, and there was no way in 1826 that Lesson could have foreseen the need for a clear policy statement on authorship. “The contents” applies to the whole work. Any expression of intent that is not within the contents cannot be applied.
based on types and thus a senior homonym that is based on different type material (whether specified or implied) made need to be rejected through the use of Art. 23.9 (ICZN, 1999).

With few exceptions, apart from names deriving from published plates (which we discuss below in the context of the Zoologie of the Voyage), the decisions we face concern works where the author of the work may not have been the author of the name under the terms of Article 50.1.1 of the Code (ICZN, 1999). The fundamental problem is distinguishing between a case where a manuscript name was supplied and one where in addition a description was supplied. Based on the example inserted after Art. 50.1.3, we take the position that the evidence for that supply must be explicit and within the contents; a phrase must make this clear or failing that the presence of either a signature or quotation marks can do so. The second issue then arising is “did the author of the work do enough to be a co-author of the name?” Here, following Article 50.1 dealing with the author of the work, we find “… if it is clear from the contents that some person other than the author of the work is alone responsible both for the name or act and for satisfying the criteria of availability other than actual publication, then that other person is the author of the name or act”. The crucial phrase here is “other than publication”. Applying Article 50.1.1 of the Code, however sensitively, is a process wholly different from seeking to determine what Lesson and Garnot might have agreed as to regards the sharing of authorship. Notice that use by Lesson of the polite first person plural ‘nous’ (both in the Voyage and elsewhere) should not be taken to mean “Garnot and I”: this was simply the form of address that the etiquette of the period required.

Article 51 dealing with citation includes a Recommendation 51E and we adopt this in all cases except those where we can find no explicit evidence that more than a manuscript name was supplied. To make our view clear we insert “MS” before the author(s) we recognise and after the name of he who apparently proposed the name; however, we use the abbreviated form in all entry headings.

Although Art. 50.1.3 says that joint authors are also covered by the provisions of Art. 50, nothing is said about how to judge potential co-authorship, but Art. 50.1.1 however vaguely phrased has helped us to deduce the extent of collaboration although we feel others may arrive at different conclusions and that the wording in the Code needs improvement to minimise ambiguity.

Sometimes we have found, especially in the Manuel, that Garnot alone seems responsible (for everything except the act of publication). In such a case one must cite Garnot, or – where there is a need to be more explicit so that the work is evident – Garnot in Lesson. More difficult to decide is when Lesson contributes more than just the ‘act’ of publication. In the letterpress on the Voyage these considerations arise in respect of each chapter author.

Article 50.7 relates to names introduced as synonyms. Together with Article 11.6 this controls whether a name introduced as a synonym can be available or not. There are 11 synonyms that we list which were created by Lesson or by Garnot after the other had introduced a name which we list. Because of the piecemeal process of publication ten of these were introduced as if valid new names were being proposed, i.e. Art. 50.7 does not

---

23 Art. 50.1 makes clear that a work with co-authors can contain a new name by just one of them (having just put one’s name to the publication of the work is not enough); Art. 50.1.1 extends that logic to any author who was not an author of the work. (i.e. a ‘third party’).
apply. The eleventh name is that of Podiceps americanus; this is discussed under Rollandia rolland chilensis below.

We deal below with seven “source works”24:

a. THE 'ZOLOGIE' VOL. 1.

The index to the Atlas, listing the plates, included page numbers relevant to each depicted species; but these text pages appeared months after the plates and the page numbers could only have been known when the pages were set in type. On this basis Zimmer (1926) wrote “The plates of the birds antedate the corresponding descriptions in the text and hence must be cited, under Lesson and Garnot, together, for certain names”25. Zimmer’s views have been reproduced by Mengel (1983) and accepted by Dickinson et al. (2011). Zimmer’s intention that this apply only to certain names is best explained by Zimmer adding “Some of the species were first described elsewhere …”. Zimmer (1926) cautioned that “the authors’ general remarks in early chapters occasionally contain a characterization of a species which has priority over the detailed description in a later chapter.” And indeed because of the separation of the text into different livraisons priority is a valid term as it is not likely to be simply page precedence. Thus Zimmer has generally been interpreted to mean that any plate depicting a bird not previously described should be credited to both authors. Zimmer explained “first described elsewhere” by listing Annales des Sciences naturelles, Lesson’s Manuel d’Ornithologie, etc.

Considering Zimmer’s position, taken in 1926, one can understand that he knew from the 1826 title page that the Zoologie was authored by Lesson and Garnot and that he thus assigned authorship of the names in the plate captions to the authors of the work. This seems completely consistent with the Code (ICZN, 1999). The only tenable alternative would have been to assign the names to the painter (which can make sense at least when the painter is also an author). However, we need to remark that in accepting Zimmer’s view we have chosen not to apply the square brackets mentioned in Recommendation 51D. These imply “original anonymity” and indeed that might be argued if the 1826 title page for the text is seen to be external evidence of authorship of the names in the plates. That we do not use these brackets is because we see no other examples of such usage in the principal ornithological since 1999 and we feel that such usage would not be understood.

What however was the role of Garnot? Above we have shown that he was probably in Paris in 1826, but was in Brest in 1827 and in Martinique after that until 183226. Taking into account the chapter content, where Garnot’s main contribution begins on p. 507 which was

24 A term we use to cover the sum of the works of Lesson and Garnot, and related parties, which bring forward new avian names on the basis of the work of the expedition by the corvette La Coquille up to May 1830. Two contemporary parallel works by Lesson, his Centurie Zoologique (1830-32) and his Traité d’Ornithologie are, to the extent that they predate May 1830, excluded on the grounds that these are successor works. However, Lesson did continue to name birds from the collection made in 1822-1825 and in some cases these were described in these works or in his Complément aux oeuvres de Buffon (vols. 15-20). All these works may contain later synonyms than those we list but none, we judge, will displace the primary source we give for each name we treat.

25 Mengel (1983: 169) set out the text of the wrappers and they contain no mention of Lesson & Garnot; it seems Zimmer’s decision must have been based on the 1826 title page for part 1 of the Zoologie.

26 He received a doctorate in medicine in April 1828 and may have returned to Paris for that.
published in 1829, it seems that Lesson was only able to communicate with Garnot by exchanges of letters; any such exchanges may have been very slow. Against this however one must examine the extensive descriptive notes which Garnot supplied to Lesson for use in the latter’s *Manuel d’Ornithologie* all of which will have been available to Lesson by early 1828. But the well-signalled contributions by Garnot in Lesson’s *Manuel* contrast sharply with the composition of the text in the *Voyage* and in general Art. 50.1. of the Code (ICZN, 1999) must be interpreted to require single authorship by Lesson except where the chapter or section author is self-evidently Garnot. An examination of the volume reveals that Garnot’s contributions were specially provided by assigning him two chapters, but that some – not including any new avian names – were also inserted in chapter I. All the chapter topics and lengths are listed in Table I.

**Table I.** Authorship of new taxon names introduced in the text (by chapter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Subject (abbrev.)</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Pagination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Considerations générales (l’espèce humaine)</td>
<td>Lesson [+ Garnot]</td>
<td>1-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Considerations générales (mammifères)</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>117-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Descriptions des mammifères</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>137-176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Observations générales (cétacées)</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>177-186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Observations générales (ornithologiques)</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>187-506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Observations générales</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>507-587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Quelques espèces nouvelles d’oiseaux</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>588-613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Catalogues des oiseaux recueillis …</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>614-735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of authors indicated in the *Atlas* plate list appear to reliably indicate who coined the name, but not who first published that name. Based on Zimmer’s view every taxon depicted in the plates, if not published earlier elsewhere, should be credited to Lesson & Garnot. Based on our research we agree with Zimmer, except for plate 39 of *Columba zoeae* where exceptionally Lesson’s name appears in the plate caption; however at the time that this appeared it had already been published elsewhere, as shown below. Because, in all the cases other than plate 39, the authors of the work were not mentioned in the plate captions we cite them as “[Lesson & Garnot]”.

Acceptance of Zimmer’s views has not been universal; for example in his early volumes Peters (1931: 118; 1934: 344; 1937: 68) apparently did not adopt them, and later he (Peters, 1940: 67 and 258) seems to have chosen different options (see Table III). Here Peters (1940) cited Lesson & Garnot in respect of pl. 33 (*Centropus menbeki*) and Lesson alone in respect of pl. 22 (*Cypselus mystaceus*). He cannot have based this on the information in the plate list,
there Garnot is named for the first and Lesson for the second. It is thus unsurprising that inconsistencies recur in later volumes especially in those after the death of Peters\textsuperscript{27}.

Some citations to this work add Duperrey to the credits, but his name appears because he commanded the expedition. If he played any role in the production of volume 1 of the Zoologie it can only have been as an editor content to let his experts do their job. We do not recommend his mention – because this has been an unusual practice and we think it will add to the inconsistency of citations; however, some may consider mention of him to be appropriate and preferable.

b. THE ANNALES DES SCIENCES NATURELLES

Here there is just the one article to consider. In 2002 Éric Pasquet \textit{(pers. comm., 30.01.2002)} of the \textit{Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle} told us that only microfilm could be consulted and copies would be difficult to supply, but he listed the novelties and the page numbers for their descriptions. However in his e-mail he mentioned Lesson as the author (which may have been an idea he took from our enquiry). Since then the reproduced pages in the \textit{Voyage} were noticed showing Garnot to be the author; and, finally, scans of the original work were downloaded from www.gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/ (on 30.05.2015) — and these confirm Garnot’s authorship.

c. BULLETIN DES SCIENCES NATURELLES ET DE GÉOLOGIE (FÉRUSSAC)

The overall style of the journal – of which for volume 7 the editors were Delafosse, Raspail, Desmarest and Lesson – is of a series of edited reports on publications that had come to the notice of the publisher (for Férussac had established a network for the specific purpose of bringing such works before his audience). It would normally be the case that such publications had already appeared and they were here only ‘noticed’. Thus no editor would have expected to see himself as the author of any new name.

However, an exception seems to have been made in respect of the French voyages of discovery. Gaimard (1823), in the predecessor journal the \textit{Bulletin Général}, established the genus \textit{Megapodius}\textsuperscript{28}. And in respect of the voyage of \textit{La Coquille} the reports in the \textit{Bulletin} were all too often before the publication of a plate from the \textit{Voyage} for inclusion in the \textit{Atlas}, and in 1828 competed for priority not just with plates and text from the \textit{Voyage} but also with Lesson’s \textit{Manuel} which, as we have shown, appeared on or before 14 June 1828. In every case the 13 ‘notices’ in this \textit{Bulletin} that concern us include mention of Lesson or Lesson & Garnot as part of the title, as if they were authors of a mentioned publication – or publication in press, although they were not. From the evidence set out in Table II we judge that only two papers, signed “D” should be considered for the potential that the editor in question might be required by the Code to be considered as the author.

\textsuperscript{27} Many citations to the \textit{Voyage} in Peters Check-list combine a reference to a plate and to a text page (usually, but not always, giving two dates). This treatment suggests that the author was considered to be the same which is hard to reconcile with the plates having appeared before the text and the judgement of Zimmer on how to assign authorship to names introduced in the plate captions. Overall it seems unlikely that Peters and his successors considered it to be necessary to be consistent in their treatment of this work and that prior ‘authorities’ were usually followed without question.

\textsuperscript{28} Although inclusion of this was based on the paper having been read to a society in Paris.
### Table II. Analysis of evidence of authorship of works in the Bulletin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus name</th>
<th>Species-group name</th>
<th>Authors per Bulletin</th>
<th>Our No.</th>
<th>Details from the Bulletin itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vol./p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonygammus</td>
<td>keraudrenii</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8: 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centropolis</td>
<td>ateralbus</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8: 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megapodius</td>
<td>duperryii</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8: 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alecthelia</td>
<td>urvilii</td>
<td>L&amp;G in L</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8: 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mino</td>
<td>dumontii</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>10:159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melloria</td>
<td>quoyi</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10:289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus</td>
<td>tristis</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10:291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philinopus</td>
<td>puella</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10:400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemiprocn</td>
<td>mystaceus</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11:113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peltops</td>
<td>blainvillii</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11:302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myzomela</td>
<td>eques</td>
<td>L&amp;G</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11:386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syma</td>
<td>torotoro</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11:443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melidora</td>
<td>macrorhinus</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12:131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In two of the above cases (Myzomela eques and Peltops blainvillii) the plate was published before the Bulletin appeared.

As Lesson was an editor of the Bulletin he may well have been asked to submit content to it (or felt he had the right to propose or even make such insertions) and he certainly had an interest in getting names published sooner rather than later, perhaps including a wish to see that Cuvier, who was then revising his Règne Animal, should be aware of them. This, we believe, explains 11 of the 13 cases and supports recognition of either Lesson or Lesson & Garnot as authors. However, in two cases the signature D (for Desmarest) suggests, and the text lends some support to the idea, that these were exceptions. The logic may have been that the first in the chronological sequence was handled by an existing editor, perhaps to satisfy convention but perhaps also leading to a realisation that as the work had not been published this was not ideal. For the second case a more convincing answer might be that Desmarest (1826) had published the dictionary entry for “pigeons” and that on these grounds Lesson asked him to handle this. However, even in these cases the article title ascribes authorship and it is not to Desmarest. Based on the general pattern of the Bulletin this would suggest
that the editor ‘compiled’ these articles and, treating them as notices, edited them when necessary. We conclude that we should not list Desmarest as the author. It may be noted that Lesson became a signed editor of other entries in the Bulletin.

These are just the ornithological notes that appeared in the Bulletin; Cretella (2010) listed a good many others and it seems that Lesson and others used their entrée to ensure that the coming work was widely publicised.

d. Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles (Éd. Levrault)

Articles inserted in this dictionary were ‘signed’ in an abbreviated way by the author(s) who were either editors or adjunct editors. Desmarest was the author of the long account on pigeons in vol. 40 – signed on p. 377 – and of the even longer account on perroquets (parrots) in vol. 39 – signed on p. 137. Only if in a particular species account Desmarest signalled that he had received a description can the taxon authors he named be credited with what he wrote.

There is no doubt that Lesson’s claim to proposing the name zoae for a pigeon to honour his late wife had a foundation in fact, but at the time and in the circumstances he may have been pleased that the description could be published by Anselme Gaëtan Desmarest (1784-1838), one of the editors of the Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles (and one who could undoubtedly help Lesson in his career). In all probability Desmarest intended authorship to be attributed to Lesson, but as this is not explicit the Code obliges us to disregard this.

Another editor in the Dictionnaire was Charles Henri Frédéric Dumont de Sainte-Croix (1758-1830), who became Lesson’s second father-in-law (see Lesson, 1828a: 40). This Dumont should not be confused with Jules Sébastien César Dumont d’Urville (1790-1842) who, on the Corvette La Coquille, was the expedition leader Duperrey’s first lieutenant. By 1828 Charles Dumont and Lesson co-authored an article in the Dictionnaire and as early as 1827 Lesson supplied short articles for inclusion, being treated as an editor.

e. Dictionnaire Classique d’Histoire Naturelle

Entries in this dictionary are all signed with an initial and these can be traced to the list of editors on the title page for each volume. Lesson was an editor of the four volumes that concern us, but some of his new species were listed in longer entries by Drapiez (one of the other editors) and in these cases the names had already been proposed elsewhere and original authorship is unaffected.

f. Manuel d’Ornithologie

According to the title pages of the two volumes Lesson was the sole author. In some cases the text clearly includes content from Garnot. Does this suffice in the context of Article 50.1.1 of the Code (ICZN, 1999) to modify Lesson’s ‘right’ to sole authorship? In general what is implied by the requirement that the author must satisfy the criteria for availability (“other than the actual act of publication”) is the provision of the name and a description in a work that is otherwise available. We see two differing scenarios: in one there is explicit evidence that the description is that of Garnot and we then treat the name as Garnot’s, albeit in the work of Lesson; in the second Lesson’s merely gives him as an author of a name in which case we treat this as a case where a MS name was supplied. But there are also cases where Garnot’s evident descriptions are embedded in texts that seem to be Lesson’s. In such composite cases we consider co-authorship must be recognised. Reaching this judgement required every case where one of the names that concern us first appeared in the Manuel to
be investigated (and we extended this review to all the entries in the Manuel which we think helped us better understand Lesson’s situation). The presence of a description in Latin usually occurs when Garnot was involved but this is not always the case and nor are all such descriptions explicitly credited to him.

Note that the Code does not make allowances for what an author intended, thus publications that precede the main work in which the author may have intended it to appear are not denied availability or precedence.

g. MÉMOIRES DE LA SOCIÉTÉ D’HISTOIRE NATURELLE DE PARIS

The single paper that concerns us is unequivocally by Lesson alone.

METHODS

Our first requirement was to collect and cross-check the information provided by others. Others who have published on the ornithological content were Mathews (1913), Zimmer (1926), Mengel (1983) and Dickinson et al. (2011).

Dickinson et al. (2011), who slightly mistook the pagination per part, provided preliminary details, including a table (Table VIII) in their accompanying CD, much like those given by others, and said that “a report … is under preparation”. They also mentioned the work of Cretella (2010) and noted that his information agreed with that of Mengel (1983), and indeed each had access to, or help from, the original wrappers at the Ellis Collection, University of Kansas, Lawrence.

Our next was to obtain copies of, or sight of, all the other works in which Lesson or Garnot published and to determine their dates of publication as accurately as possible.

When Peters (1931) published the first volume of his Check-list the works of Mathews (1913, 1925a, b), Mathews & Iredale (1915), Sherborn (1922) and Zimmer (1926) had all been published. The Richmond Index was also available29, although only in its original card form in the National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C (then the U.S. National Museum), but the information provided in the various volumes of the Peters, shows that few of the different section authors drew on that.30 There is little evidence to show they used Sherborn’s Index Animalium either although the last of its volumes was published in 1933. Because that checklist has been extremely influential we have, as far as possible, included information drawn from its volumes. In a few cases by the time the checklist volumes appeared the names we treat were deliberately excluded by the space-saving policies adopted by Peters and later editors31. In these cases we have consulted the necessary volumes of the Catalogue of the Birds of the British Museum, the Catalogue of the Birds of the Americas and the Systema Avium Australasianarum in which there were fuller synonymies. Where appropriate we also cite later publications and specialist personal advice.

29 See Richmond (1992) in References. The cards were often lacking detailed dates and they were always a work in progress in the sense that Richmond would add further information (e.g. on dates of publication) when it was discovered.

30 However, both Deignan and Watson worked at the U.S. National Museum.

31 For comments on the deliberate omission of synonyms in the various volumes of the Peters Check-list see Dickinson (in press 2015).
SYSTEMATIC LIST

In showing names below, any genus-group name that was used with an initial lower-case letter (as all names did in the Manuel) the capital letter is here inserted, while for species-group names any that originated with a capital letter are altered to begin with a lower case letter; hyphens are also removed. All these changes to original format are made to comply with how the Code (ICZN, 1999, Art. 5.1, 5.3) requires we spell them\(^{32}\). Where, in the lists of synonymy, a name is listed that differs in spelling from the original spelling we insert “[sic]” once against the first usage of that changed spelling, and if there is a third spelling that too will gain a “[sic]” against its first usage. In a few cases Lesson or Garnot created different names for the same bird, thus some listed synonyms reflect this. Note that our synonymy is limited to the various works we have covered; it does not extend to include each name as listed in the Traité d’Ornithologie of Lesson (1830-1831) or other major works by him dated 1830 or later. Many works in French in this period, including Temminck & Laugier’s Planches Coloriées, were captioned not with scientific names but with French names; not so in the Voyage and we use “caption on pl. ..” to remind readers of this.

We render Lesson as “Less.” when that is how it was given in the place cited; similarly Garnot is rendered as “Garn.” when it was given in that form.

We treat names in three groups: first, those that are in current use for birds newly named from the fruits of this expedition and where such birds were given two names by the authors the junior one is dealt with in the synonymy of the senior name; second, are those which were assigned to birds that had been named before (here our presentation changes slightly); and, third, we list some special cases: one, a pigeon where the male and female birds were not the same species, although described as such, and in both the species to which this name was wrongly applied the name should be in synonymy (although we have not pursued this), and three other cases where there are identity issues that make placement in synonymy inadvisable and indeed one of these names has been formally suppressed.

We choose to use “livraison” because each can be dated; the zoology of the Voyage was divided into parties which are lengthy and comprise several livraisons each with its own date.

A primary reason for this study was the inconsistency of the bibliographic information in the literature. Compilers of the major catalogues (that of the birds in the British Museum, that on the birds of the Americas, and even Mathews’s Systema Avium Australasianarum) evidently compiled their lists taxon by taxon over the years and did not recognise the extent to which they were either missing earlier sources or treating the data inconsistently across their whole series\(^{33}\). This inconsistency continued in Peters’ Check-list for very much the same reasons. When this study began it was hoped to complete the task in time for the 4th edition of the Howard & Moore Checklist (Dickinson & Remsen, 2013; Dickinson & Christidis, 2014). Unfortunately this was not to be and only a first rough outline of this article was available.

\(^{32}\) There is a case for retaining the original orthography of the period (e.g. small initials letters for genus-group names and initial capital letters for the species-group names) in a list of synonyms, but in a work such as this that merely looks peculiar.

\(^{33}\) This is a general observation. We have not always commented on the inconsistencies as they are only of passing interest due to the many years that have passed since.
A. **NAMEs CURRENTly IN USE**

Each entry begins with a sequence number and the current scientific name, which is in bold. This is followed by the author and date derived from our study34; these are in parentheses as and when dictated by the Code (ICZN, 1999). To the right in bold type are abbreviated references: “H&M4; 1:00” to Dickinson & Remsen, 2013 and “H&M4; 2:00” to Dickinson & Christidis, 2014.

Below that headline comes the citation to the original publication. This will be followed by the citation link [e.g. Lesson (1826)] and then by a best date of publication (b.d.). If the citation is to the *Voyage* the source is our Appendix I; if the source is not from the *Voyage*, there follows a reference to where the date comes from, such as [Mathews & Iredale, 1915: 7] or [Richmond Index].

Here too we signal Sherborn’s data recording. If, for the first citation line, we include an [S] then Sherborn in his *Index Animalium* (Sectio Secunda, 1801-1850) either cited a later source or missed the name altogether. This applies to synonyms proposed by either Lesson or Garnot. If Sherborn did cite the source we have found to be the original one then the “b.d.” will be followed by a reference – for example Sherborn (1929d: 5230) which implies part 21, page 5230. This part will be listed in our references.

The reference for the date of publication of the two volumes of Lesson’s *Manuel d’Ornithologie* (discussed above) which we give as 14 June, 1828, and cite to “BdF”, 1828, is the date of issue of the *Bibliographie de la France* in which the following entry appears:

![Manuel d'Ornithologie, ou Description des genres et des principales especes d'oiseaux. Par R. P. Lesson. Deux volumes in-18, ensemble de 24 feuillets 4°/g. Impr. de Gapelet, a Paris. — A Paris, chez Roret, rue Hautefeuille, n. 12. Prix. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7—0](image)

Figure 1.

Sometimes we add a comment below the baseline citation. Most often this reports the mention of a plate number in the *Voyage*. Placing this on a separate line allows every baseline citation to conclude with a Sherborn reference or an [S].

Having established a baseline, we provide a synonymy listing each reference we found in the period up to 31 December 1830 – we exclude the livraisons of Lesson’s *Traité d’Ornithologie* which were issued in 1831 but in inserting comments we treat as one those that appeared in 183035 (Lesson, 1830d). In that synonymy each line is dated and in each case where Sherborn has an entry for that name from that source the same kind of reference to his *Index Animalium* is given as we described above. Where a date is given without the citation

---

34 Thus the authorship in Dickinson & Remsen (2013) or Dickinson & Christidis (2014) may differ.
35 On p. 632 in the *Voyage* Lesson wrote “... les naturalistes trouveront dans notre Traité d’Ornithologie, qui va bientôt paraître, tous les détails qu’ils pourront désirer sous ce rapport” (“naturalists will find all the details they could require in our Traité d’Ornithologie which will shortly appear”) and this suggested we might find further relevant information in here, but there is little and a number of species do not get mentioned in the *Traité*. We do not include birds from the voyage of *La Coquille* which were first described in the *Traité* as these would not affect our decision-making.
of an authority in the square-bracketed manner described above the reader will find that the table in Mengel (1983) or our slightly revised table (Appendix I) is the source.

Birds that were depicted in plates36 (other than those already named by previous writers) have longer synonymies because there were two plate lists: one in the text – which evidence places in livraison 16 dated to 1 May, 1830, and one supplied for insertion in the Atlas of plates and this may have been issued then or somewhat later, we date this “[1830]”. The listings of the names on the plates have been checked to the plate captions; authorship of such names is given as “[Lesson & Garnot]” based on the views of Zimmer (1926), with the exception of Columba zoae.

Names listed as appearing in text in the Voyage are from chapters by either Lesson or Garnot; thus, in the synonymy, citations are to these chapters but in the context of the livraison concerned (and so where we say “no author given here” the citation after the page number provides the authorship to ascribe).

(1) Radjah radjah (Garnot & Lesson, 1828) H&M4; 1:13


With cross-reference to pl. 49.

Synonymy:

Anas radjah [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 8, caption on pl. 49 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.
Anas radjah (no author given here), Voyage, livr. 9, p. 373 (Lesson, 1829a) – 28 February 1829. With cross-reference to pl. 49.
Anas radjah Garnot, Voyage, livr. 14, p. 602 (Garnot, 1830) – 9 January 1830.
Anas radjah Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

In the account in the Manuel where the heading includes “Less. et Garn. (Zool. de la Coq., pl. 49)” Lesson wrote “Garnot a décrit cette espèce en ces termes”37 giving a description in Latin in italics after which the further descriptive text is evidently by Lesson and the two must share the authorship. Thus the authorship cited by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 13), and previously used by Johnsgard (1979: 451) was incorrect.

Mathews (1927: 213) mistakenly listed this from p. 49 instead of pl. 49.

Treatment in genus Radjah follows Dickinson & Remsen (op. cit. supra) and the authorities they cited.

36 In works such as Peters Check-list citations to names in the Voyage often included details of both the plate and the later text. This is helpful if the two dates are separately, and clearly and correctly given; this was not always the case (use of 1826 from the title page of the work should be avoided except for plate captions in the very first livraison).
37 “Garnot described this species in these terms”.
(2) *Talegalla cuvieri* Lesson, 1828  


**Synonymy:**


*Talegallus cuvieri* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, *Voyage*, livr. 8, caption on pl. 38 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – b.d. 29 November 1828.

*Talegallus cuvieri* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 716 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.


When the *Manuel* appeared plate 38 was at this point unpublished and so cannot support the new name, but there is long description of the genus signed “(Lesson)” followed by a very brief description of the species, and there is no mention of Garnot.

Mathews (1927: 16) cited this from the plate in 1828.

(3) *Rollandia rolland chilensis* Lesson, 1828  


**Synonymy:**


*Podiceps americanus* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 599 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.


An incorrect subsequent spelling.

In the *Manuel* the Latin description of *Podiceps americanus* is clearly attributed to Garnot. The description in French is almost identical with that given just before it for *Podiceps chilensis* but it is not suggested that the two are the same species. In the headings the name Garnot appears after each species name. Hellmayr (1932: 418-9) credited both to Lesson but preceded his name with “(Garnot MS)”. We agree with Hellmayr as regards the authorship of *chilensis*, but we recognise Garnot as a co-author of the name *americanus*.

Hellmayr (1932: 419) acted as First Reviser in assigning priority to *chilensis* over *americanus* the two having been described on the same page in the *Manuel*. Hellmayr & Conover (1948a: 24 fn.) restated this. They also mentioned that Lesson (1831: 594) gave the name *albicollis* to an immature specimen collected on this voyage. From the entries above it will be seen that *Podiceps americanus* was used as valid by Garnot (1829b) at a date after its original introduction by Lesson in a context treating it as a synonym. This may have made the name available under Article 11.6.1 however the above-mentioned First Reviser action ensures the name will not now be used as valid unless there is a type specimen that proves that Garnot was referring to a bird other than *Rollandia rolland chilensis*. The original descriptions given suggest that the species was the same and the differences due to some evidence of breeding plumage in the individuals named *americanus*. 
(4) *Podiceps occipitalis occipitalis* Garnot, 1826


**Synonymy:**

*Podiceps kalipareus* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 5, caption on pl. 45 [Lesson & Garnot, 1827g] – 17 October 1827.

*Podiceps callipareus* [sic] (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 5, p. 213 (Lesson, 1827f) – 17 October 1827.


*Podiceps occipitalis* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 12, p. 544fn. (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.

*Podiceps calipareus* [sic] Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 727 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830. [S]

*Podiceps calipareus* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.


In the *Manuel* the account begins “Grèbe à calotte noire, *Podiceps occipitalis*, Less. Zool. Coq., pl. 45” and neither Garnot nor his paper in the *Annales* is mentioned.

Sherborn (1927: 3305) listed *Podiceps kalipareus* from its mention by Gray (1846) in his *Genera of Birds*, p. 633, seeing it as an emendation of *callipareus*, but the evidence shows the reverse to be true; see also Wetmore (1926).

It is curious that Lesson (1830c) made no mention at all of Garnot’s (1826) description of *Podiceps occipitalis* from the Falkland Islands; this must surely reflect the problems Lesson had communicating with Garnot during the later stages of work on the text of the *Voyage* for there can be no doubt that the plate and Lesson’s text relate to the same bird.

(5) *Patagioenas araucana* (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)

*Columba araucana* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 4, caption on pl. 40 [Lesson & Garnot, 1827f] – b.d. 25 July 1827. [S].

**Synonymy:**

*Columba araucana* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 242 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828.


*Columba araucana* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 706 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.

*Columba araucana* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Columba araucana* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 706”. [1830]

In the *Manuel* where there are descriptions in Latin and French there is no mention of Garnot.

Peters (1937: 68) was almost correct in his citation to both plate and then text, but for the latter he referred to ‘livr. 6’ in error for ‘livr. 16’. However, in contrast to Zimmer (1926) he gave Lesson alone as the author.

---

38 Lesson (1828a) provides a description in Latin as well as in French; neither is signalled as from Garnot.
(6) **Ducula oceanica** Desmarest, 1826


**Synonymy:**

*Columba oceanica* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 4, caption on pl. 41 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – 25 July 1827.

*Columba oceanica* Lesson, *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 166 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. With cross reference to pl. 41 (but not making this a plate in the *Voyage*).

*Columba oceanica* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 10, p. 432 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.

*Columba oceanica* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 708 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.

*Columba oceanica* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Columba oceanica* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 708”. [1830]

The original description is embedded in a long article about pigeons and Desmarest, under whose name the article appeared, did not make clear that his description was supplied by them. Despite this Peters (1937: 44) credited the authorship to Lesson & Garnot.

In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot.

(7) **Ducula zoeae** (Desmarest, 1826)


**Synonymy:**

*Columba zoeae* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 6, caption on pl. 39 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828a) – 22 March 1828.

*Columba zoeae* Less., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 164 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. With cross reference to pl. 39 (but not stating that this plate number related to the *Voyage*).

*Columba zoeae* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 705 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.

*Columba zoeae* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Columba zoeae* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 705”.[1830]

39 Desmarest (1826b) in his article on pigeons in the *Dictionnaire des Sciences Naturelles* introduced three pigeon names from the *Voyage* (we treat two here in our section A and one in our section B). It seems likely that Desmarest had some MSS notes from Lesson (and Garnot), but in only the third of these individual species accounts (our no. 80) did Desmarest actually state that they provided a description. Thus only in that one case do we have explicit evidence to contradict use of Desmarest as author of the name. The final decisions on the interpretation of the ICZN Code are the responsibility of the lead author who absolves his co-authors of any obligation to support the majority view in any given case.
Named for Lesson’s first wife (Jeanne Zoé Massiou; b. 20 March 1799, d. 23 November 1819). Desmarest in his long account of the pigeons called this an “espèce nouvelle” and of the name he wrote “que M. Lesson consacre à une épouse chérie”. They married in 1817 and she died within some two days of giving birth to a daughter Cécile Estelle Atala Lesson (b. 21 November 1819, d. 28 June 1845). In the Manuel, where Garnot is not mentioned, Lesson wrote “… consacrée à la mémoire d’une épouse expirée à l’aurore de la vie”.

Peters (1937: 54) credited the authorship to Lesson, but it is evident from the phrase cited above that Demarest provided this article and he did not make clear that Lesson supplied the description.

Uniquely, for this work, the plate caption here includes “Less.” treating him as the author. This is the one valid exception to Zimmer’s “rule”. Had this plate appeared before the dictionary entry this name would have been cited to Lesson alone.

8) Ptilinopus magnificus puella (Lesson & Garnot, 1827) H&M4; 1:76


Referred to as “variété A de la Columba magnifica de Temminck”.

**Synonymy:**


*Columba puella* N. (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 342 (Lesson, 1828e) – 29 November 1828.

*Columba puella* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 9, p. 355 (Lesson, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.

*Columba puella* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 711 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.

The work of the bulletin editor, presumably Desmarest, is evident in the phrase “C’est à la Nouvelle-Irlande et à la Nouvelle-Guinée, que MM. L et G. observèrent …” but the article title is associated with Lesson & Garnot. Here we accept that joint authorship, contrary to the treatment by Peters (1937: 41) and Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 76).

In the *Manuel* the account is entirely in the first person singular and there is no mention of Garnot.

---

41 “New species”.
42 “Which Monsieur Lesson names for a beloved wife.”
43 Source: Lesson (1846: 58).
44 “Consecrated to the memory of a wife who died [while still at] the dawn of [her] life.”
45 “It was in New Ireland and New Guinea that Messieurs Lesson and Garnot observed …”
(9) **Hemiprocnus mystaceus mystaceus** (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

HAV; 1:95


Includes a cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 22.

**Synonymy:**

*Cypselus mystaceus* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 5, caption on pl. 22 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827g) – 17 October 1827.


*Cypselus mystaceus* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 647 (Lesson, 1830a) – 9 January 1830.

*Cypselus mystaceus* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Cypselus mystaceus* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 647”. [1830]

In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot and no description in Latin. Mathews (1927: 398) mistakenly cited this from plate 22.

Peters (1940: 68), who credited the name to Lesson alone, cited this from plate 22 with date 1827 and text page 647 from 1830, but the joint paper in the *Bulletin* appeared earlier. Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 95) appropriately credited both authors.

(10) **Orthorhynchus sephanioides** (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

HAV; 1:112

*Orthorhynchus sephanioides* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 4, caption on pl. 31, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – b.d. 25 July 1827.  

**Synonymy:**

*Orthorhynchus sephanioides* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 240 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828. With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 31, fig. 2.


*Ornismya sephanioides*, Lesson, *Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux-Mouches*, p. 69 – 1829 per Sherborn (1922: lxxx); May or later per Sherborn’s MS notes (see Dickinson *et al.* 2011: 117).


*Orthorhynchus sephanioides* [sic] Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830. An incorrect subsequent spelling.


46 Lesson’s term for his *Histoire naturelle des oiseaux-mouches.*
In the Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux-Mouches the depiction is on pl. XIV where the caption uses only a French vernacular name. In the Manuel the description is unsigned and thus seemingly Lesson’s.

Peters (1945: 104) cited this from the plate crediting Lesson alone as opposed to the views of Zimmer (1926) whose advice was followed by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 112).

The spellings used in all main texts consistently agreed with the plate caption (although Sherborn’s entry relating to the Manuel incorrectly gave the spelling as sephanioides) until Lesson’s use of sephanioides in the Traité. But the spelling -oides appears in both versions of the plate list (not reflecting earlier usage); and in one of these lists the usage is stephanioides. In as much as Stephan is a plausible Greek stem meaning crown and the vernacular name introduced was Oiseau mouche à couronne violette this may have been a deliberate emendation and as such a justified correction. However, it seems more probable that the change was a lapsus because it was not made in both versions of the plate list and was not repeated six months later in the Traité. For the sake of stability we sustain the original spelling, in agreement with Meyer de Schauensee (1966: 183).

This name was mistakenly treated as a subjective synonym of Eustephanus galeritus (Molina, 1782) by Salvin (1892: 156) and by Cory (1918: 276). This treatment was not accepted by Hellmayr (1932: 233) who observed that the name Eustephanus Reichenbach, 1849, is junior to Sephanoides Gray, 1840, and that he did not see how the description of Molina’s Trochilus galeritus “il suo becco e curvo, ... tutta la parte inferiore del suo corpo e di un colore di aurora cangiante”47 could possibly apply to the Fire-crested Hummingbird of Chile. He thus regarded Molina’s bird as ‘fictitious’. Hellmayr also used the original spelling sephanoides for the specific epithet. Peters (1945: 104) followed Hellmayr, but made no mention of the sephanoides spelling (and incorrectly cited sephanoides from the plate and p. 681 in the Voyage)48.

(11) *Amazilia amazilia* (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

*Orthorynchus amazilia* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 4, caption on pl. 31, fig. 3 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – b.d. 25 July 1827. [S].

**Synonymy:**


*Ornismya amazili* Lesson, Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux-Mouches, p. 67 – 1829 per Sherborn (1922: lxxx); May or later per Sherborn’s MS notes (see Dickinson et al. 2011: 117). Incorrect subsequent spelling.

Oiseau-mouche amazili Lesson, Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux-Mouches, pl. XII & XIII.

*Trochilus amazilia* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 587 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.

47 “Its beak and curved ... the whole of underparts are the colour of [an] iridescent aurora”.

48 A perfect example of how difficult it can be to correct past errors; perhaps too of a failure to check the original.


Peters (1945: 74) cited the Manuel where the account is written in the plural but it is unsigned and thus presumably Lesson’s. In citing the Manuel perhaps Peters followed Sherborn (1923a). However, the Manuel appeared after the plate so, following Zimmer (1926), both authors were cited by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 127).

(12) Thaumastura cora (Lesson & Garnot, 1827) H&M4; 1:133

Orthorhynchus cora [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, Voyage, livr. 4, caption on pl. 31, fig. 4 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – b.d. 25 July 1827. [S]

Synonymy:


Peters (1945: 131) cited the name from the plate with Lesson as the author so again he did not follow Sherborn, and nor did he follow Zimmer (1926), whose views were followed by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 133).

In the Manuel the account is in the plural but the description is unsigned.

(13) Centropus ateralbus Lesson, 1826 H&M4; 1:138


Synonymy:

November, 1828. With cross reference to pl. 34.
Centropus ateralbus Less., Voyage, livr. 14, p. 620 (Lesson, 1830a) – 9 January 1830.
Centropus ateralbus Less., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

We accept authorship by Lesson because of the title statement and of the name, the more so because Desmarest, the editor, wrote “Less. décrit spécifiquement de la manière suivante”49. In the Manuel nothing suggests that Garnot was involved with the account.

(14) Centropus menebiki Lesson & Garnot, 1828

Centropus menebiki [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, Voyage, livr. 6, caption on pl. 33 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828a) – b.d. 22 March, 1828. [S].

Synonymy:
Centropus menebiki Garnot, Voyage, livr. 14, p. 620 (Lesson, 1830a) – 9 January 1830.
Centropus menebikii Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

Note the different spellings were all at different dates so no First Reviser action is required.

There is no mention of Garnot in the Manuel.

(15) Eudynamys orientalis rufiventer Lesson, 1830

Cuculus rufiventer Less., Voyage, livr. 14, p. 622 (Lesson, 1830a) – b.d. 9 January 1830.
Sherborn (1930a: 5655).

Mathews (1927: 418) treated this as a subspecies of Eudynamys orientalis.

(16) Pterodroma lessonii Garnot, 1826


Synonymy:
Procellaria Lessonii Garn., Voyage, livr. 6, p. 224 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828.
Procellaria Lessonii Garn., Voyage, livr. 12, p. 548 fn (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.
Mentions Pl. IV in the Ann. Sci. naturelles.

49 “Lesson specifically described this in the following way.”
50 The plate, printed on a different size of paper to the text, was probably published separately; we have no information on which appeared first.
In volume 1 of Peters Check-list there is a noteworthy change between the two editions. Peters (1931: 61) adopted a changed type locality based on the views of Mathews, although asking “why?”; Jouanin & Mougin (1979: 67) removed that and retained the original one.

(17) *Pelecanoides garnotii* (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)  


With cross reference to _Voyage_ pl. 46.

_Synonymy:_

_Puffinuria garnotii* (no author given here), _Voyage_, livr. 6, p. 254 (Lesson, 1828c) – b.d. 22 March 1828. *Nomen nudum.*

_Puffinuria garnotii* [Lesson & Garnot], _Voyage_, livr. 8, caption on pl. 46 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.

_Puffinuria garnotii* Less., _Voyage_, livr. 16, p. 730 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.


In the _Manuel_ the text, written in the polite plural, is by Lesson and he specifically names the birds for his colleague; but included in the text, within quotation marks, is Garnot’s own long description. It seems clear that Lesson did not intend co-authorship seeing this as conflicting with the etiquette which determined that one did not name a taxon for oneself. However, the use of quotation marks is firm evidence for Garnot’s authorship of that part of description and it cannot be argued, under Art. 50.1, that the name is introduced by Lesson alone.

The text by Lesson on page 730 seems to list _Procellaria urinatrix_ Gmelin as a subjective synonym of _Puffinuria garnotii_ and on p. 731 there is reference to p. 611 where Garnot (1830) seems to speculate whether what he describes, without comparative material, is Gmelin’s species. Lesson appears to have decided this, if perhaps only in a cautionary manner, by approving a new name that would be used in finalising the plate. Salvin (1896: 439) treated the two as distinct species, _garnotii_ being larger and ranging offshore western South America. They were later placed in separate genera (Murphy & Harper, 1921).

(18) *Zonerodius heliosylus* (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)  

_Ardea heliosyla* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, _Voyage_, livr. 7, caption on pl. 44 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – b.d. 21 June 1828.  

_Synonymy:_


_Ardea heliosyla* Less., _Voyage_, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

_Ardea heliosyla* Less., _Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 722”. [1830]

Payne (1979: 236) cited the plate and gave Lesson as sole author of the name. By contrast Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 184) cited both authors following Zimmer (1926).
(19) **Phalacrocorax gaimardi** (Garnot, 1828)  


With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 48.

**Synonymy:**  
*Carbo gaimardi* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 7, caption on pl. 48 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – 21 June 1828. [S].  
*Pelecanus gaimardi* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 14, p. 601 (Garnot, 1830) – 9 January 1830.  
*Carbo gaimardi* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Carbo gaimardi* Garn., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 601”. [1830]

In the *Manuel* the heading does not mention Lesson and the italicised description in Latin is signed “(Garnot)”. Both the Latin and French descriptions are signed Garnot.

In volume 1 of Peters *Check-list* there is a noteworthy change between the two editions. Peters (1931: 91) cited the source as the *Manuel d'Ornithologie*. However, Dorst & Mougin (1979: 174) switched to the citation to the plate from the *Voyage* – which presumably came from Hellmayr & Conover (1948a: 151fn). However, based on our validation of an earlier date of publication for the *Manuel* (see pp. 74 and 85), their change is reversed here.

(20) **Haematopus leucopodus** Garnot, 1826  


**Synonymy:**  
*Haematopus leucopodus* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 12, p. 542fn (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.  
*Haematopus leucopodus* [sic] Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 721 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.  
Listed first as *Ostralega leucopus* Less., and then as *Haematopus leucopodus* Garn.

Although the second spelling (*leucopodus*) is probably just an incorrect subsequent spelling by Lesson of Garnot’s name the treatment on p. 721 makes it look like a deliberate but unjustified emendation. Indeed, reference to Hellmayr & Conover (1948b: 24-25) demonstrates that it seems to have been universally accepted until 1923.

(21) **Larosterna inca** (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

*Sterna inca* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 3, caption on pl. 47 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827e) – b.d. 18 April 1827. [S].

**Synonymy:**  
*Sterna inca* Lesson & Garnot, Dumont, *Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles*, 50, p. 539
(Dumont, 1827b) – 24 November, 1827 [Mathews & Iredale, 1915: 7].
*Sterna inca* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 253 (Lesson, 1828c) – 1 May 1830.
*Sterna inca* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 731 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.
*Sterna inca* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.
*Sterna inca* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 731”. [1830]

Peters (1934: 344) although citing this from the plate gave Lesson alone as the author of the name. Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 230) followed Zimmer (1926) and cited both authors.

In the *Manuel* the account is in the first person plural, but there is no mention of Garnot and no Latin description.

**22) Henicopernis longicauda** (Lesson & Garnot, 1828) 

*Falco longicauda* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, *Voyage*, livr. 7, caption on pl. 10 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – b.d. 21 June 1828. {S}.

**Synonymy:**

*Falco longicauda* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 10, p. 445 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.

*Falco longicauda* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 588 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829; Sherborn (1927c: 3639).


*Falco longicauda* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Falco longicauda* Garnot, *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 588”. [1830]

In volume 1 of Peters Check-list there is a minor change between the two editions. Peters (1931: 198) cited “livr. 12” for the text p. 588; Stresemann & Amadon (1979: 286) corrected this to livr. 13 (as given by Mathews, 1913). They listed Garnot alone as the author. Following Zimmer (1926) we list both authors. Mathews (1927: 258) correctly cited the plate.

Sherborn (1927c: 3639) revealed that this name was preoccupied by *Falco longicauda* Wilkes, 1805, a name reported by Cassin (1867) which was then already a *nomen oblitum* and has remained so.

**23) Syma torotoro torotoro** Lesson, 1827


Includes cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 31 [sic].

**Synonymy:**


*Syma torotoro* Less., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 98 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828
[BdF]. Cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 31 bis, fig. 2 on p. 97 in the note on the genus.  
*Syma torotoro* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 11, caption on pl. 31 bis, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829c) – 30 May 1829.  
*Syma torotoro* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 689 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.  
*Syma torotoro*51 Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Syma torotoro* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 689”. [1830]

The text in the *Bulletin* in 1827 shows no evidence of editorial addition or change.  
In the *Manuel* there is no reference to Garnot.  

(24) *Todiramphus sanctus vagans* (Lesson, 1828)  

**H&M4; 1:345**


**Synonymy:**  
*Halcyon vagans* (no author given here), *Voyage*, Livr. 10, p. 418 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.  
*Alcedo vagans* Less., *Voyage*, Livr. 15, p. 694 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.  

Peters (1945: 205) cited this from p. 694 in the *Voyage*52. He thus missed the data in Sherborn (1931c). This was corrected by Schodde (1997: 367) who cited the *Manuel* and its date, followed by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 345).  

In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot.  
Mathews (1927: 379) cited this from the *Voyage* in 1830.  

(25) *Melidora macrorrhina* (Lesson, 1827)  

**H&M4; 1:346**


**Synonymy:**  
*Dacelo macrorhinus* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 11, caption on pl. 31 bis, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829c) – 30 May 1829.  
*Dacelo macrorhinus* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 692 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.  
*Dacelo macrorhinus* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Dacelo macrorhinus* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 692”. [1830]

No evidence noticed in the original description of any involvement of anyone else but Lesson. The account in the *Manuel* ends on p. 95 with “je ne me suis procuré …”53 and the

51 Actually rendered toro-toro in both plate lists.  
52 The date format used in Peters was “1826 (1830)”; the former is the purported date, taken from the title page issued for vol. 1 of the *Zoologie*; the latter is a livraison date no doubt derived from Mathews or Zimmer.  
53 “I did not procure ...” (a rare use by Lesson of the first person singular).
description is apparently by Lesson, although both authors are mentioned in relation to the plate.

Lesson (1830d: 249) placed this in a subgenus *Melidora*, which was treated as a full genus by Peters (1945: 192).

Mathews (1927: 371) gave the original combination as *Dacelo macrorhinus* [sic] making no mention of the differing spellings before him.

(26) *Psittaculirostris desmarestii* (Desmarest, 1826)  

*Psittacus desmarestii* ‘Lesson & Garnot’ MS, Desmarest, 1826, *Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles*, 39: 89 (Desmarest, 1826a) – b.d. 29 April 1826 [Mathews & Iredale, 1915: 7].  

**Synonymy:**

*Psittacula desmarestii* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 5, caption on pl. 35 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827g) – 17 October 1827.


*Psittacus desmarestii* [sic] Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 600 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.

*Psittacula desmarestii* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Psittacula desmarestii* Garn., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 600”. [1830]

Desmarest in using the name *desmarestii* wrote “… que MM. Garnot et Lesson ont bien voulu me dédier”54. In general etiquette dictated that one did not name a taxon for oneself, and no doubt Desmarest did not intend to do so, but he did not indicate that Lesson and Garnot provided him with the description55.

In the *Manuel* the account is in the first person plural and no mention is made of Garnot. Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 383) mistakenly gave Dumont as the author. Although Dumont was listed on the verso of the title page of the volume, as responsible for the birds, the whole article in question is signed “Desm.”

(27) *Muscisaxicola maclovianus maclovianus* (Garnot, 1826)  


**Synonymy:**


*Sylvia macloviana* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 12, p. 540 fn (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.

*Curruca macloviana* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 663 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.

54 “Which Messieurs Garnot and Lesson have kindly dedicated to me.”

55 As in the case of the three pigeons described in Desmarest (1826b), the names of two of which we attribute to Desmarest, this is a case dependant on explicit internal evidence of other authorship and to be consistent we treat Desmarest as the author, as did Peters (1937) and most other authorities.
Sherborn (1928a: 3757).

_Sylvia macloviana_ Garnot, _Voyage_, livr. 15, p. 663 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.

Traylor (1979: 169) cited this from the text missing the prior publication in the _Annales_. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 61) correctly dated it from the 1826 paper therein.

(28) _Cinclodes antarcticus antarcticus_ (Garnot, 1826)  


**Synonymy:**


_Furnarius fuliginosus_ (no author given here), _Voyage_, livr. 5, p. 208 (Lesson, 1827f) – 17 October 1827. _Nomen nudum._  


_Certhia Antarktica_ Garnot, _Manuel d’Ornithologie_, 2, p. 15 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF].  

_Certhia Antarktica_ Garn, _Voyage_, livr. 12, p. 540 (footnote) (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.

In the _Manuel_ Lesson refers to his name first but follows it with mention of Garnot’s earlier name. It is as if he renames it deliberately, perhaps thinking the name inappropriate for a bird from the Falkland Islands and not Antarctica itself.

(29) _Cinclodes patagonicus chilensis_ (Lesson, 1828)  


The two authors are mentioned in the form “Lesson et Garn. (Zoolog. de la Coq.)”, followed by “Furnarius lessonii Dumont (Atlas, Dict. Scienc. Nat.)”. Lesson thus implied that these names attached to the same species, which is confirmed in the _Voyage_ on p. 671.

**Synonymy:**

_Furnarius lessonii_ “Dum”, _Voyage_, livr. 6, p. 240 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828.  

_Nomen nudum._  


_Furnarius chilensis_ Less., _Voyage_, livr. 15, p. 671 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.  

_Furnarius lessonii_ “Dumont, Atlas, Dict. scienc. nat.”, in Lesson, _Voyage_, livr. 15, p. 671 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April, 1830. [S]

The account in the _Manuel_ is unsigned and must be credited to Lesson.

We might lack here a citation to a publication by Dumont to whom Lesson (1828c) referred, but he seems to have thought that Dumont named this in an entry in the _Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles_ – however, the dictionary’s entry for “Fournier” by Dumont (1820) in volume 17 (pp. 331-336) makes no mention of a species named for Lesson
and as it antedates the voyage of the *Coquille* cannot therefore be relevant. However, in the volume of collected ornithological images from the *Dictionnaire (2e partie: Règne organise)*, all images captioned with vernacular names but not scientific names, image 58, fig. 1 is labelled “Fournier Lesson” and is linked in the index to Dumont’s 1820 entry but we have not found out when this plate was published although if this is the Chilean bird the earliest it could have been depicted would be in 1824 and that only if a specimen had survived Garnot’s shipwreck (but one did not). The Richmond Index includes a card for “Fournier Lesson” based on text in Lesson (1840) where Lesson cited “Dumont, pl. 75, fig. 1” and Richmond added “where in vernacular only”: the plate he referred to is plate 75 in the *Traité d’Ornithologie* of Lesson (1831) where “Fournier de Lesson, Dumont” is inserted as a synonym for *Furnarius chilensis*. Sherborn (1927: 3508) had no listing for an original Dumont source for *Furnarius lessonii*.

The descriptions offered for this taxon by Lesson (1828a), Garnot (1829b) and Lesson (1830b) are sufficiently different to suggest that the specimens described differed enough to signal the collection in Chile of at least two species of *Cinclodes*.

(30) *Myzomela eques* (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

*Cinnyris eques* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 4, caption on pl. 31, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – b.d. 25 July, 1827. [S].

**Synonymy:**
*Cinnyris eques* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.
*Cinnyris eques* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 678”. [1830]

In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot.


Salomonsen (1967b: 341) gave the source of this name as the *Bulletin* but the article is in the July issue and with no day-date known the evidence for the date of the name in the plate caption gives that source precedence. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 156) based their date on the *Bulletin*, the need to change being discovered only now.

5e Or later; see Note to Appendix II.
We do not consider the recognition of the plate caption as the first source for this name to be a First Reviser action. There is evidence for the date of the plate to “on or before” a day earlier than the end of July, and, by contrast, the date for the Bulletin depends – in the absence of other evidence – on Art. 21.3.1 of the Code to sustain its July date (as July 31) and, as footnoted, evidence exists to support a general hypothesis that the issues of the Bulletin were dated with the month of compilation and printed after the month end (see footnote to Appendix II).

(31) Myzomela rubrata rubrata (Lesson, 1827)  H&M4; 2:157


Synonymy:
Cinnyris rubrater Lesson, Manuel d’Ornithologie, 2, p. 56 (Lesson, 1828a) – b.d. 14 June 1828 [BdF].

Cynniris [sic] rubrater (no author given here), Voyage, livr. 10, p. 433 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.

The Manuel makes no mention of Garnot.

(32) Xanthotis flaviventer (Lesson, 1828)  H&M4; 2:164

Myzantha flaviventer [Lesson], Manuel d’Ornithologie, 2, p. 67 (Lesson, 1828a) – b.d. 14 June 1828 [BdF]. Nomen novum. {S}.

Synonymy:
Philedon chrysotis [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, Voyage, livr. 6, caption on pl. 21 bis (Lesson & Garnot, 1828a) – 22 March 1828. {S}


Philedon chrysotis Less., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.


It is clear from the Manuel, in the account of the genus Myzantha, where a final note\(^\text{57}\) begins with the name Philedon chrysotis, and says that the name chrysotis has already been given to a ‘philédon’, that Lesson was aware of Lewin’s new combination Meliphaga chrysotis – derived from Latham’s Certhia chrysotis – and, considering Latham/Lewin’s species and this to be conspecific, he proposed the new name flaviventer. However, it would appear that this change was too late to affect the caption for plate 21 bis. Salomonsen (1967b) inserted a footnote on page 372, linked to Meliphaga lewinii which was directly relevant to Meliphaga flaviventer which he had on p. 386 where there is no link to p. 372.

The suppression of Latham’s name by Opinion 792 (ICZN, 1966) does not allow Lesson & Garnot’s name to be restored to use. However their name is not suppressed for the purposes of homonymy.

\(^{57}\) Written in the first person plural but with no mention of Garnot.
Mathews (1930: 784) cited plate 21 rather than 21 bis, with the entry in the Manuel d’Ornithologie in his synonymy.

**33) Garritornis isidorei isidorei (Lesson, 1827)**


**Synonymy:**

*Pomatorhinus isidorei* Less., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 64 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. With cross reference to the above-mentioned *Dictionnaire*.


*Pomathorhinus* [sic] *isidori* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 10, caption on pl. 29, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.

*Pomatorhinus isidori* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 680 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.

*Pomatorhinus isidori* [sic] Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Pomatorhinus isidori* [sic] Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 680”. [1830]

In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot and no description in Latin.

Mathews (1930: 565) cited this from plate 29 not from the earlier dictionary entry.

Although one might have supposed that this was named for the expedition’s commander – Louis Isidore Duperrey – it seems that this was not the case, as on p. 681 in the *Voyage* Lesson says clearly that he had Isidore Geoffroy St. Hilaire in mind. In 1827 the latter was only 22 years old, but he was “docteur en medicine, jeune naturaliste connu par d’importants travaux”.

**34) Melanocharis nigra nigra (Lesson, 1830)**


Sclater (1858: 157) erected the genus *Melanocharis*: four species were assigned to this genus by Sharpe (1885).

Mathews (1930: 727) mentioned the depiction of this species in ‘1830’ in pl. 23 of the *Centurie zoologique* (Lesson, 1830–32). Dickinson *et al.* (2011: 118) considered it most probable that the plates of this work appeared in numerical order; that would place plate 23 in livraison 5 which appeared in or before March 1831; however, if it was in livraisons 1 through 3 publication would seem to have been in or before about November 1830 and precedence would still lie with the text in the *Voyage*.

**35) Toxorhamphus novaeguineae (Lesson, 1827)**


**Synonymy:**

*Cinnyris novaeguineae* Less., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 44 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF].
Cinnyris novaezelandiae Lesson, Drapiez, Dictionnaire classique d’Histoire naturelle, 15, p. 513 (Drapiez, 1829) – May 1829.
Cinnyris novaezelandiae Less., Voyage, livr. 15, p. 677 (Lesson, 1830b) – b.d. 3 April 1830.

The account in the Manuel, written in the formal first person plural, makes no mention of Garnot.

(36) Philesturnus carunculatus rufusater (Lesson, 1828) H&M4; 2:174

Icterus rufusater Less., 1828, Manuel d’Ornithologie, 1, p. 355 (Lesson, 1828a) – b.d. 14 June 1828 [BdF]. [S]

Includes mention of pl. 23, fig. 1 in the Voyage.

Synonymy:
Icterus rufusater [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 10, caption on pl. 23, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.
Icterus novaezealandiae (no author given here), Voyage, Livr. 10, p. 415 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829. [S] With cross reference to plate 23, fig. 1.
Icterus rufusater Less., Voyage, “Atlas” plate list – 1 May 1830.

In the Manuel there is no mention of Garnot. It seems as if Lesson named rufusater from the Bay of Islands but that in the text in the Voyage he briefly employed novaezealandiae – after the plate caption had been added. That he did not go on to use this in 1830 in later pages in the Voyage may have been an oversight, but he may have temporarily adopted novaezealandiae after seeing that Stephens (1826) had used that as a new name for carunculatus.

Mathews (1930: 856) showed that the name novaezealandiae had been introduced by ‘Shaw’ [= Stephens] (1826: 265) as a new name for carunculatus Gmelin, which was from South Island in New Zealand. Mathews treated Philesturnus carunculatus as a monotypic species and observed that novaezealandiae ‘Lesson & Garnot’ from p. 415, was applied to North Island birds; it is in fact an unavailable junior synonym (presumably objective) of rufusater preoccupied by Shaw’s name (actually Stephens not Shaw) and was unnecessary. Mathews (1930: 856), who gave the source publication of novaezealandiae of Lesson & Garnot, not Shaw, as p. 451 in the Voyage and the source of rufusater as plate 23 but gave no date for that plate, and made no mention of the Manuel.

Treated in the genus Creadion by Amadon (1962a: 158). However Creadion has recently been rejected in favour of Philesturnus, see Opinion 2284 (ICZN, 2011).

Gill et al. (2010) rightly listed Icterus novaezealandiae Lesson & Garnot as a synonym of the North Island bird; but the name is also, as they point out, a junior homonym of Creadion novaezealandiae Stephens, 1826, which is now a junior synonym of nominate Philesturnus carunculatus (Gmelin, 1789) – treated as a separate species by Gill et al. (2010). This separation should probably have been followed by Dickinson & Christidis (2014) (Paul Scofield, in litt., 26 July 2015).
(37) *Mohoua ochrocephala albicilla* (Lesson, 1830)  
*H&M4*; 2:174


Mathews (1930: 554) placed this in the genus *Certhiparus* Lafresnaye, 1842; this account was preceded by one for *Mohoua ochrocephala* seen as quite different, and yet in both these accounts there is reference to exactly the same plates in Buller (1872-73) and (1887-88).

See Mayr (1986a: 460), but see also Gill et al. (2010: 294) who, like Mathews, treated *albicilla* as a different species from *ochrocephala*, which *contra* Dickinson & Christidis (2014) is probably correct as the two are very different (Paul Scofield, *in litt.*, 26 July 2015).

(38) *Edolisoma melas melas* (Lesson, 1828)  
*H&M4*; 2:182


**Synonymy:**

*Lanius niger* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 589 (Garnot, 1829b)98 – 21 November 1829.

Here called the Pie-grièche mélanure. Sherborn (1928c: 4315).

Lesson (1837: 422) listing the Pie-grièche mélanure provided a footnote reading “*Lanius melas*, Less., et Garn., zool de la Coq., texte. *Lanius niger*, Horsf.” This evidence links the name used by Lesson in the *Manuel* (but not, so far as we could find, in the *Voyage*) with the name used by Garnot.

Mathews (1930: 543) cited this from the *Manuel* with the date 28 January 1828 (which we have shown to be wrong); he also listed *Lanius niger* as a synonym of *Edolisoma melas*.

Mayr (1941: 99) cited the name as *melas* but spelled it *melan* (perhaps following Sclater, 1858); Peters & Mayr (1960) listed this from the correct source and date, but from the original *melas* they changed the spelling to *melaena*. For restoration of the original spelling see David & Gosshelin (2002).

In the *Manuel* although referring to “Less. et Garnot Zool. Coquille” there is nothing to suggest that Garnot contributed to the brief account in the *Manuel*.

(39) *Lalage leucomela karu* (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  
*H&M4*; 2:183

*Lanius karu* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 3, caption on pl. 12 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827e) – b.d. 18 April 1827.  {S}.

**Synonymy:**


*Lanius caru* [sic] (author not given here), *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 344fn. (Lesson, 1828e ) – 29 November 1828. An incorrect subsequent spelling.


98 Name preoccupied by *Lanius niger* Forster, 1781 see Sherborn (1902: 656).
*Ceblepyris karu* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Ceblepyris karu* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 633”. [1830]

Mathews (1930: 549) treated *Lalage karu* as a polytypic species distinct from Australian *L. leucomela*.

Mayr (1960: 201) correctly cited this from the plate – although without reference to the later text – and, by citing both authors, was in accord with Zimmer (1926); but it was Lesson who was cited by Sherborn (1927b) and whose name appeared in the plate lists.

The account in the *Manuel* is written in the formal first person plural; there is nothing to suggest that Garnot was involved.

**(40) Pitohui kirhocephalus kirhocephalus (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)**

*Lanius kirhocephalus* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 2, caption on pl. 11 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827d) – b.d. 17 January 1827. {S}.

**Synonymy:**


Note different spelling only in the plate list.

The account in the *Manuel* bears only Lesson’s name and makes no mention of Garnot.

Mayr (1967: 45), who cited both authors, gave no livraison number and listed the mention in the text from p. 632, a number taken from the plate list but not quite correct there.

**(41) Peltops blainvillii (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)**

*Eurylaimus blainvillii* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 3, caption on pl. 19, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827e) – b.d. 18 April 1827. {S}.

**Synonymy:**


*Eurylaimus blainvillii* Garnot, Livr. 13, p. 595 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.

*Eurylaimus blainvillii* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Eurylaimus blainvillii* Garn., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 595”. [1830]

Mayr (1986c: 529) ascribed this to the plate and the text, but gave the author as Garnot, not agreeing with the views of Zimmer (1926) whose opinion was followed by Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 205).
Named for Henri Marie Ducrotay de Blainville (1777-1850). In the Manuel part of the account is in the first person singular and there is no mention of Garnot. Lesson made reference to Temminck’s account of the genus which is discussed below.

Sherborn (1924a: 804) reported this name from Temminck, May 1822 as “Pls. color. (22)”. This is a mistake based on confusing evidence (see Dickinson, 2001, p.30). Livraison 22 of the Planches Coloriées includes an extra leaf of text. That leaf, headed “Additional” is self-evidently a belated insertion into the work intended to bring together the text relating to species in the genus Eurylaimus – the recto deals with plate 261, which is from livraison 44 (May 1824), and the verso relates to plate 297 from livraison 50 (September 1824). It now seems certain that this leaf of Temminck’s text must have followed the publication by Lesson & Garnot (1827e) – although there may have been an earlier insertion in or after May 1828 meaning two changes – and until there is firm evidence of a genuine delivery date for this leaf we suggest it be dated from 31 December 1827.

**(42) Melloria quoyi (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)***


Cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 14.

**Synonymy:**

*Barita quoyi* [Lesson], *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 1, p. 140 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. Mention here made of pl. 14 (see also above) but no description included and that plate had not yet been published.60

*Barita quoyi* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, Livr. 9, caption on pl. 14 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.


*Barita quoyi* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Barita quoyi* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 639”. [1830]

In the *Bulletin* the proposed name is followed by “Nob.”61 and the evidence of editorial action is limited to “M L et G dédient cet oiseau au savant …”62. In the Manuel the authorship of the name is not ascribed to anyone but the account reads “que nous décrirons …” seeming to imply that it had not already been named and using the formal French first person plural ‘nous’ which Lesson used even when referring to no-one but himself. There is no mention of Garnot so had this been newly described here the description would have to be seen as by Lesson.

---

59 Later succeeded Cuvier as Chair of Anatomy at the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle.

60 Thus a *nomen nudum* but already published in 1827 although no mention made of that.

61 For “Nobis” (Latin) meaning ‘to us’ or ‘ours’; at the time generally used when signalling a novelty (see also Olson, 2015).

62 “Messieurs L and G dedicate this bird to the learned ….”.
For many years treated, as by Amadon (1962b: 168) – who gave Lesson as the sole author – and by Schodde & Mason (1999: 534), in the genus *Cracticus*; but the subgeneric name *Melloria* mentioned by the last authors, and which had been used by Mathews (1930: 653) – who had erected the genus in 1912, was restored to use at genus rank following Kearns *et al.* (2013); see Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 206) where authorship of the name in the plate caption was ascribed to both Lesson and Garnot.

(43) *Corvus tristis* Lesson & Garnot, 1827


A cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 24 is included (but the caption added used a different name, see below; strong evidence for plate number insertion from plates *avant la lettre*).

**Synonymy:**


*Corvus senex* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 8, caption on pl. 24 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.

*Corvus senex* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 650 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.

*Corvus senex* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Corvus senex* Less., *Voyage*, “*Atlas*” plate list, citing “[p.] 650”. [1830]

In this *Bulletin* article describing two new taxa, each name, where introduced, is followed by “Neb.”; the other taxon named is *Barita quoyi* and the evidence of editorial involvement mentioned in that context relates to this taxon too. However, it does not appear that Desmarest had any involvement with the descriptions. In the *Manuel* there is no mention of Garnot.

Mathews (1930: 898) cited this correctly and listed the synonym; he used the genus-group name *Gymnocorvus* coined by Lesson (“1830” = 1831) – the page Mathews cited (p. 327) is better dated 1831 (see Dickinson *et al.* 2011: 119).

(44) *Myiagra alecto chalybeocephala* (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)


Cross reference to *Voyage* pl. “16, fig. 1 [sic]” is included here and in that context attributed to Lesson & Garnot.

**Synonymy:**

*Musciaca chalybeocephalus* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 8, caption on pl. 15, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.

*Musciaca chalybeocephalus* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 589 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.

*Musciaca chalybeocephalus* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Musciaca chalybeocephalus* Garnot, *Voyage*, “*Atlas*” plate list, citing “[p.] 589”. [1830]
In the Manuel on p. 187 the species account is immediately preceded by “Aux espèces de gobe-mouches que nous venons de citer, nous en décrirons sept espèces nouvelles”63 a phrase in formal French not, of itself, implying joint authorship of these descriptions, although each of these seven accounts64 begins with the name “Less et Garn.” and reference to the Voyage, and in each case there is a Garnot signature after the description, although in the case of this species only the description on p. 188 of a bird in moult is attributed to “(Garnot)” Nonetheless, taken together the evidence supports all seven of these accounts in the Manuel being joint accounts.

Mathews (1930: 517) cited this from pl. 15 overlooking the earlier appearance in the Manuel.

Mayr (1986b: 525) cited pl. 15 from November 1828, and text p. 589 from a year later; overlooked was the account in the Manuel which we find must be given precedence. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 243) offered no correction to the source reference.

(45) Arses telescophthalmus telescophthalmus (Lesson & Garnot, 1827) H&M4; 2:243

Muscicapa telescophthalmus [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, Voyage, livr. 5, caption on pl. 18, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827g) – b.d. 17 October 1827. [S].

Synonym:
Muscicapa telescophthalmus [sic] ‘Less. et Garn.’ in Lesson, Manuel d’Ornithologie, 1, p. 190 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. Sherborn (1931b: 6399). With cross reference to Voyage pl. 18 [sic], fig. 1. An incorrect subsequent spelling; but see also below.

Muscicapa enado [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, Voyage, livr. 8, caption on pl. 15, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.

Muscicapa telescophthalmus Garnot, Voyage, livr. 13, p. 593 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.


Sherborn (1926a: 2151).

Muscicapa enado Less., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list. 1 May 1830.

Muscicapa telescophthalmus Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

Muscicapa telescophthalmus Garn., Voyage, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 593”. [1830]


The text in the Manuel, which seems to be signed by Garnot, is descriptive and makes no mention of any differences from Lesson’s enado. However, as discussed above, we see the account in the Manuel as implicitly jointly authored.

Sharpe (1879: 409) listed Muscicapa enado in synonymy65, but Lesson (1831: 387) did not list it as such in the Traité d’Ornithologie nor had he in the Manuel.

63 “To the species of flycatcher listed above we add the descriptions of seven new species”.

64 The seven are chalybeocephala (44), telescophthalmus (45), guttula (46), chrysomela (47), pomarea (48), inornata (49), and toitoi (52).

65 This refers to the synonymy of Arses telescophthalmus [sic]; a typical example of Sharpe using the spelling he considered classically correct (thanks to Sharpe, the museum catalogue is at the root of the arguments about many of the names where, today, usage of a spelling is argued on the grounds of prevailing usage).
Correctly cited by Mathews (1930: 512) with enado listed in his synonymy; but although cited from the plate the name was credited to Garnot alone. This name was applied to the female.

A correct original spelling which is an incorrect Latinization of a Greek compound name with no internal information. Had this derived from télescopus (τηλεσκόπως), meaning conspicuous, and the Latinized op(h)thalmos, meaning eyes, the correct result would have been the variable adjectival telescopop(h)thalamus. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 243) treated it as variable on that mistaken basis, but due to the overlap between the stem and the suffix we now suggest that it must be treated as invariable (note too that the original combination had telescophthalmus with the feminine gender Muscicapa).

Mayr (1986b: 515), citing the plate, gave the author as Garnot and used the emended spelling from the Manuel – an unjustified emendation.

(46) **Symposiachrus guttula** (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)  


With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 15 [sic], fig. 2.

**Synonymy:**

*Muscicapa guttula* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 9, caption on pl. 16, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.

*Muscicapa guttula* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 591 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.


Mayr (1986b: 507) cited plate 16 from early 1829 and p. 591 in the later text and gave the author as Garnot. This overlooked the precedence of the *Manuel* (even without a date correction). Although the species account in the *Manuel* ends with “(Garnot)” Lesson did not explicitly say that Garnot alone provided the description; however, the overall context – discussed above – merits acceptance of co-authorship. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 244) gave the author as Lesson alone; the need to accept both authors for this in the *Manuel* has been stated above (p. 109).

Mathews (1930: 515) cited this from the plate, crediting Garnot alone, and overlooked the earlier publication in the *Manuel*.

Placed in *Symposiachrus* following Christidis & Boles (2008) and sources therein.

(47) **Carterornis chrysomela chrysomela** (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

*Muscicapa chrysomela* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 5, caption on pl. 18, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827g) – b.d. 17 October 1827. [S]

**Synonymy:**


*Muscicapa chrysomela* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 344 fn. (Lesson, 1828e) – 29 November 1828.
Muscicapa chrysomela Garnot, Voyage, livr. 13, p. 594 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.
Muscicapa chrysomela Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.
Muscicapa chrysomela Garn., Voyage, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 594”. [1830]

In the Manuel the closing signature of Garnot suggests he may have supplied the text but Lesson did not explicitly say so; however, as stated above, we consider co-authorship was implied and merited.

Mathews (1930: 524) cited this correctly and listed both authors.

Mayr (1986b: 514) cited Garnot as the sole author, as opposed to the views of Zimmer (1926) which were accepted and followed by Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 245).

Placed in Carterornis following Christidis & Boles (2008) and sources therein.

(48) Pomarea pomarea (Lesson & Garnot, 1828) H&M4; 2:246


With cross reference to Voyage pl. 17.

Synonym:
Muscicapa pomarea [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 7, pl. 17A, 17B, 17C (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – 21 June 1828.
Muscicapa pomarea (no author given here), Voyage, livr. 8, p. 298 (Lesson, 1828e) – 29 November 1828. With cross reference to pl. 17.
Muscicapa maupitiensis Garnot, Voyage, livr. 13, p. 592 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829. Sherborn (1928a: 3914).
Muscicapa pomarea Less., ‘Man’, Voyage, livr. 13, p. 592 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.
Muscicapa pomarea Less., Voyage, livr. 14, p. 643 (Lesson, 1830b) – 9 January 1830.
Muscicapa pomarea Less., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.
Muscicapa maupitiensis Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.
Muscicapa pomarea Less., Voyage, “Atlas” plate list. No. page given. [1830]
Muscicapa maupitiensis Garn., Voyage, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 592”. [1830]

The plate caption, unlike the plate lists, refers solely to Muscicapa pomarea; fig. A is an adult male; fig. B is said to be an old bird (and the text infers that this is what Garnot called maupitiensis for on p. 593, after describing the bird depicted in fig. B, its says “Cet oiseau a été rapporté de l’île de Maupiti”)66, and fig C. a female.

The ‘Man’ – cited in relation to the use of the name pomarea on p. 592 – refers to treatment in the Manuel. In there a description of Muscicapa pomarea beginning on p. 192 leads to a description on p. 193 of an unnamed bird recorded from the island of Maupiti by M. de Blosseville67 and after this “(Garnot)” is added. While it is likely that Garnot provided

66 “This bird was brought back from the island of Maupiti.”
67 Jules Alphonse René Poret de Blosseville (1802-1833) (see Cretella, 2010).
both descriptions this is not made explicit by Lesson; however, as discussed above, co-authorship is implied and acceptance of that is merited.

Mathews (1930: 525), crediting both authors, cited this from the plate (and the synonym maupitiensis from the text) but did not mention that the name pomarea had appeared in the Manuel, which Mathews, as we have seen, dated from 28 June 1828.

Mayr (1986b: 493) cited the plate in 1828 from the Voyage and ‘Muscicapa maupitiensis’ from p. 592 in 1829 – on which page pomarea is also listed – and cited Garnot as the author. He did not refer to the name in the Manuel probably because Zimmer (1926) dated the Manuel from 28 June. Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 246) also took the plate caption as the source of the name and credited both Lesson & Garnot; however when the correct date is applied to the Manuel it is the prior publication.

(49) Monarcha cinerascens inornatus (Lesson & Garnot, 1828) H&M4; 2:247


With cross reference to Voyage pl. 15 fig 1.

Synonymy:
Muscicapa inornata [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 9, caption on pl. 16, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.
Muscicapa inornata Garn., Voyage, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

Mathews (1930: 522) cited this from pl. 16 fig. 2 [sic] and misdated that 1828 with no more precise date and apparently overlooked the inclusion of the name in the earlier Manuel.

As with the preceding species Mayr (1986b: 503) cited this from the plate in 1829 and from p. 591 in text from the same date giving Garnot as the author. This suffered from the same misinformation on dates of publication, and precedence goes to the Manuel where, for reasons discussed earlier, we now, contra Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 24&c) consider this a species account involving joint authorship.

(50) Phonygammus keraudrenii keraudrenii (Lesson & Garnot, 1826) H&M4; 2:251


Synonymy:
Barita keraudrenii [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 1, caption on pl. 13 (Lesson & Garnot, 1826c) – 1 November 1826.
Barita keraudrenii Lesson, Dictionnaire classique d’Histoire naturelle, 13, p. 399 (Lesson, 1828) – January 1828
Phonygama keraudrenii Less., ’Man’, Voyage, livr. 14, p. 636 (Lesson, 1830a) – 9
January 1830.

*Phonygama keraudrenii* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 741. Plate list – 1 May 1830.


At the end of the 1826 paper a “D.” appears; this presumably signals editorial involvement, evident where he wrote “MM. Lesson et Garnot ont dédié …”

The ‘Man’, mentioned in connection with p. 636 in the *Voyage*, refers to treatment in the *Manuel*. In the *Manuel* Lesson wrote “j’ai dédié …”, a phrase expressed in the singular voice which we consider shows that account to have been by Lesson alone.

Pierre François Keraudren (1769-1858) was the Inspector-General for the health of the French navy from 1813 to 1845 and an early admirer of Lesson.

For use of spelling *Phonygammus* see Lesson & Garnot, 1826, *Bull. Sci. Nat.*, 8 (2): 110; *op. cit. supra*. Sherborn (1929b: 4923) did not list that; he attributed the genus-group name *Phonygama* [sic] to “Voy.’ Coquille’, Zool. 1, pl. xiii (? 1826)” but this is based on the plate list from 1830 as the plate caption used the genus-group name *Barita*. Sherborn (1929b: 4923) also referred to the “Man. Orn. 1, June 1828, 141”, however this name appears to be an incorrect subsequent spelling of the 1826 name.

(51) *Manucodia ater* (Lesson, 1830)


Sherborn (1923b: 526).

Mathews (1930: 881) attributed this name to Lesson & Garnot although citing p. 638 in Lesson’s chapter; he also believed *Manucodia* to be feminine in gender and used *Manucodia atra*. See, however, Direction 26 (ICZN, 1955).

(52) *Petroica macrocephala toitoi* (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)


With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 16 [sic] fig. 3.

**Synonymy:**

*Muscicapa toitoi* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 8, caption on pl. 15, fig. 3 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828c) – 29 November 1828.

*Muscicapa toitoi* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 590 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.


The description in the *Manuel* appears to be signed by Garnot but this is one of the seven species dealt with as a series of species accounts involving both authors. We consider Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 257) to have wrongly attributed the name to Lesson alone.

---

68 “Messieurs Lesson and Garnot have dedicated …”.

69 “I have dedicated …”.

---
Mathews (1930: 451) attributed the name to Lesson alone.

(53) *Petroica longipes* (Lesson & Garnot, 1827)  

*Muscicapa longipes* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 3, caption on pl. 19, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827e) – b.d. 18 April 1827. {S}.

**Synonymy:**

*Muscicapa longipes* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 13, p. 594 (Garnot, 1829b) – 21 November 1829.  
*Muscicapa longipes* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  

Mathews (1930: 470) cited this from pl. 19 crediting Lesson alone as the author; he used the genus-group name *Miro* which had been coined by Lesson (‘1830’ = 1831).

Mayr (1986d: 568) gave Garnot as the author, where Zimmer (1926) would have cited both authors. Based on the plate and Zimmer’s views Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 257) cited both authors.

However, Mayr’s view could well have been taken from the *Manuel* where Lesson says “… que M. Garnot a nommée dans la Zoologie de la Coquille…”70 but the description is not ‘signed’ by Garnot. Although using the name *Muscicapa* Lesson’s text in the *Manuel* refers to it as a ‘fourmilier’ (or antbird) and not a ‘gobe-mouche’ (or flycatcher). Here Lesson also says “C’est la *myiothera Novæ-Zelandiæ*, Less.”71 although without explaining where, previously, he had used that name; a name not reported by Sherborn (1928c). This name was listed in synonymy by Mathews (1930: 470) who considered it a nomen novum.

It would seem that this species was overlooked when the *Manuel*, some 60 pages earlier, was dealing with the ‘flycatchers’ including the close relative of this species there named *Muscicapa toitoi*, and that its insertion on p. 248 was a belated one.

Gill *et al.* (2010: 305) apparently followed Mathews (1930) in considering that Lesson was here proposing *Myiothera novaezelandiae* as a nomen novum. *P. longipes* is treated as a separate species from *P. australis* following Gill *et al.* (2010: 305) and references therein.

(54) *Dicaeum erythrothorax erythrothorax* Lesson & Garnot, 1828  

*Dicaeum erythrothorax* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, *Voyage*, Livr. 7, caption on pl. 30, figs. 1 & 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – b.d. 21 June 1828. {S}

**Synonymy:**

*Dicaeum erythrothorax* Less., *Voyage*, Livr. 15, p. 672 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.  
Sherborn (1926a: 2215).  
*Dicaeum erythrothorax* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Dicaeum erythrothorax* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 672”. [1830]

70 “which Monsieur Garnot has named in…”.

71 “This is the *Myiothera novaezelandiae* Lesson”. One would normally conclude from the use of “the” that the reference was to a name already introduced elsewhere.
Salomonsen (1967a: 189) gave accurate plate and page numbers, but omitted livraison numbers and consequently offered dates (1828, 1826) that need explanation. As shown above 1828 applies to the plate, but the page dates from 1830. The 1826 date is from the title page for the book (the date of its first livraison). He also listed Lesson alone as the author, but Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 264) cited both authors following Zimmer (1926).

(55) *Leptocoma aspasia aspasia* (Lesson & Garnot, 1828)  

*Leucyris aspasia* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 7, caption on pl. 30, fig. 4 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – b.d. 21 June 1828.  

**Synonymy:**  
*Leucyris sericeus* Lesson, 1827, *Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles*, 50: 21 (Lesson, 1827e) – 24 November 1827 [Mathews & Iredale, 1915: 7]. Reference is made to pl. 30, fig. 3 [sic] of the *Voyage*.  


*Leucyris aspasia* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 676 (Lesson, 1830b) – April, 1830. Sherborn (1923b: 496).  

*Leucyris aspasia* Less., *Voyage*, p. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  

*Leucyris aspasia* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 676”. [1830]  

In the *Manuel* Lesson clearly ascribed the name *sericeus* to himself, no doubt based on his entry in the dictionary from where the name *sericeus* first has date precedence over the name *asipia* and it has been used as the species epithet by Rand (1967: 240) within the genus *Nectarinia* and by Cheke & Mann (2001) and Dickinson (2003) in genus *Leptocoma*. This was a mistake and was pointed out by LeCroy (2010: 137). *Leucyris sericeus* Lesson, 1827, was a secondary homonym of *Certhia sericeus* Bechstein, 1811. This had been pointed out by Hachisuka (1952) and by Mees (1966) in a paper on “Anthreptes malacensis” and, as observed by LeCroy (2010), the name *aspasia* had been used by Beehler & Finch (1985), Beehler et al. (1986) and by Coates (1990). Dickinson & Christidis (2014) made the correction with an explanatory footnote, but they should have referred to Art. 59.3 of the Code (ICZN, 1999) not Art. 57.

One might speculate that Lesson himself discovered that his name *sericeus* was preoccupied and deliberately introduced the name *aspasia* for that reason, but we found no clear evidence to support that except that a passage about the quality of the iridescent feathers that is present in the *Manuel* account of *sericeus* is repeated word for word in the account of *aspasia* in the *Voyage*.

(56) *Leucyris jugularis clementiae* Lesson, 1827  


72 Lesson’s comment was no doubt made from the plate *avant la lettre* and there is a fifth image although it is only of an enlarged bill. As the image that concerns us is the bottom one it could have been appropriate to refer to it as Lesson did.
Here Lesson referred to pl. 30 fig. 2 in the *Voyage*. However, the plate lists assert that Fig. 2 was a second illustration of *Dicæum erythrothorax* and the image confirms that.

**Synonymy:**
*Cinnyris zenobia* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, *Voyage*, livr. 7, caption on pl. 30, fig. 3 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828b) – 21 June 1828. {S}  
*Cinnyris zenobia* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Cinnyris zenobia* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 679”. [1830]

Named for Clémence Dumont (“*mon épouse*”), daughter of Charles Henri Dumont, and Lesson’s second wife (Lesson, 1846: 63)⁷⁷. The account in the *Manuel*, written in the first person singular, mentions this.

Mathews (1930: 734) citing Lesson’s dictionary description treated this as the nominate form in a polytypic species which he listed several species after *C. jugularis*. He listed *zenobia* as a synonym.  
Rand (1967: 246) listing *zenobia* as a synonym did not give the earlier and original source for the name which is the plate caption. We have not discovered why the name *zenobia* was introduced. It is extraordinary that Lesson did not use the name *clementiae* in the plate caption or the texts in the *Voyage*.

(57) *Sporophila telasco* (Lesson, 1828)  


With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 15 [sic], fig. 3.

**Synonymy:**
*Pyrrhula telasco* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 252 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828. *Nomen nudum*.  
*Pyrrhula telasco* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 9, caption on pl. 16, fig. 3 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.  
*Pyrrhula telasco* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 663”. [1830]

Paynter (1970: 148) was mistakenly able to cite this taxon name for 1828 because he had the wrong plate number (15 instead of 16); however, the 1828 date is valid based on the earlier publication of the name in the *Manuel*. The account in the *Manuel* is brief and nothing suggests that Garnot helped with it.

---

⁷⁷ In full she was Marie Clémence Dumont de Sainte-Croix and she bore Lesson a daughter Anaïs (b. 27.11.1827, d. 3.11.38).
(58) *Troglydtes aedon chilensis* Lesson, 1830


No synonyms or issues here.

(59) *Mino dumontii* (Lesson, 1827)


**Synonymy:**

*Mino dumontii* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 5, caption on pl. 25 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827g) – 17 October 1827.

*Mino dumontii* Less., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 1, p. 404 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 26 [sic].

*Mino dumontii* Less., *Voyage*, Livr. 15, p. 652 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.


In the *Bulletin* the name *Mino* is introduced on p. 158 as a subgeneric name. There is clear evidence of editorial work by Desmarest where the text says “*C’est encore dans les profondes forêts de la Nouvelle-Guinée, si peu connues et si riche en animaux nouveaux, que M. L. rencontre le Mino de Dumont*”74 (the beginning of this phrase mirrors the words of Lesson in the *Manuel* suggesting that Lesson provided his draft for, or a proof of, that to Desmarest but the authorship of the work is clearly stated with the title and of the authorship of the name by Lesson alone equally clearly shown.

**B. NAMES IN SYNONYMY**

In this section the names in the headings are the original combinations and, as in section A, are cited with a capital letter for the genus-group name and a small letter for the species-group name, and without hyphens or diacritic marks; all are names that belong in synonymy.

(60) *Alecthelia Urvillii* Lesson & Garnot, 1826


Here we employ a mandatory spelling correction to use two Ls; this is based on the dedication, i.e. on internal evidence.

74 “The Mino of Dumont was another finding of Monsieur L. in the deep forests of New Guinea so little-known and so rich in new creatures”.

---

ISSN 2045–4651  C4222F95-8DFC-4E32-846F-A9371A1B66E5  Published 30 November 2015
Synonymy:

*Alecthelia urvillii* [sic] [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, Livr. 4, caption on pl. 37 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f) – 25 July, 1827.


*Alecthelia urvillii* Less., *Voyage*, Livr. 16, p. 703 (Lesson, 1830c) – 3 April 1830.

*Alecthelia urvillii* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 743. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Alecthelia urvillii* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 703”. [1830]

Named for Dumont d’Urville.

In the paper first cited the genus-group name *Alecthelia* is proposed by Lesson on p. 114 and on p. 115 the new species is introduced as from “Less. et Garn.”. There is no evidence of editorial involvement by Desmarest. In the *Manuel* the account is by Lesson, but he uses the formal first person plural “nous avons dédié cet oiseau …”75 perhaps recalling that it had been described jointly two years earlier.

A junior synonym of *Megapodius freycinet* Gaimard, 1823 see Ogilvie-Grant (1893: 458), Mathews (1927: 15), and, as from Gebe, of the nominate form – see range given by Dickinson & Remsen (2013: 21).

(61) *Megapodius duperryii* Lesson & Garnot, 1826

H&M4; 1:21 [Syn]


Synonymy:

*Megapodius duperreyi* [sic] [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, Livr. 2, caption on pl. 36 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827d) – 17 January 1827.


*Megapodius duperreyii* (no author given here), *Voyage*, Livr. 16, p. 700 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.


The 1826 paper is apparently by both authors, but “Garn.” seems to signify that Garnot coined the name. There is no evidence of editing by Desmarest. In the *Manuel* there is no reference to the 1826 description and although Garnot may have helped with the fresh account there is little to suggest it.

A junior synonym of *Megapodius reinwardt* Dumont, 1823; see Mathews (1927: 12); Peters (1934: 4).

75 “We have dedicated this bird …”.
(62) *Columba kurukuru var. taitensis* Lesson, 1828

*Columba kurukuru var. taitensis* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 297fn (Lesson, 1828e) – b.d. 29 November 1828. [S]

While Lesson provided the scientific name in a footnote there is a link to that from the vernacular name in the main text where a description is provided. Sherborn (1931b: 6374) listed *Kurukuru taitensis* (Less.) from Prévost & des Murs (1849: 251) mentioning that they gave Lesson as their source: apparently Sherborn failed to find that although Prévost & des Murs cited the correct page.

Treated as a synonym of *Ptilopus* [sic] *purpuratus* (Gmelin, 1789) by Salvadori (1893: 105).

(63) *Crotophaga casassi* Lesson, 1828


**Synonymy:**
*Crotophaga casassi* [sic] (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 252 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828. *Nomen nudum.*

Incorrect subsequent spelling.

Shelley (1891: 432) treated this as a synonym of *Crotophaga sulcirostris* Swainson, 1827

(64) *Ardea jugularis* Lesson, 1828

*Ardea jugularis* (no author given here), *Voyage*, Livr. 8, p. 299 (Lesson, 1828e)– 29 November 1828. [S]

Lesson (1828e) described this, from the Society Islands, as follows “La seconde espèce est un crabier gris, de la taille de la petite aigrette. Son bec est en partie noir et rougeâtre. La tête, le cou et les dessus du corps sont d’un brun teinté de bleuâtre. Un trait blanc naît de la mandibule inférieure, et descend comme deux rubans long d’un pouce sur les parties latérales du cou. La région abdominale et les couvertures inférieures de la queue sont d’un gris enflammé. Ce héron nous paraît évidemment nouveau, et nous proposons de le nommer ardea jugularis.”

This name was proposed earlier by Wagler (1827) so that Lesson’s name is a junior primary homonym. Despite it clearly being proposed as new it was not listed by Sherborn (1927b: 3296).

Mathews (1927: 198) listed Wagler’s *Ardea jugularis* as a synonym of *Egretta sacra* – a species first described from the Society Islands – and almost certainly Lesson applied his name to the same species. Lesson’s name appears to be a *nomen oblitum* as well as a junior homonym so we have not delved deeper to confirm its identity.

76 “The second species is a grey ardeid the size of the little egret. Its bill is part black and part reddish. The head, neck and upperparts are brown tinged with blue. A white line begins from the lower mandible and runs for the length of a ’pouce’ down the sides of the neck. The abdomen and the under tail coverts are a smoky grey. This heron certainly seems to be new and we propose to name it *ardea jugularis*.” A ’pouce’ was a French measurement close to a modern inch.
(65) **Charadrius pyrrocephalus** Garnot, 1826


**Synonymy:**


*Charadrius pyrrocephalus* [sic] Less. et Garn., *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 331 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. Includes a cross reference to the *Voyage*, but not to Garnot, 1826.


*Charadrius pyrrocephalus* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 12, p. 541 and fn (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.

*Charadrius pyrrhocephalus* [sic] Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 719 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830. Incorrect subsequent spelling.

Lesson in the *Manuel* wrote, and the account seems to be by him alone, that this is “… sans doute l’espèce mentionnée … par Sonnini sous le nom de pluvier des îles Falkland, charadrius falklandicus”77.

A junior synonym of *Charadrius falklandicus* Latham, 1790; see Sharpe (1896: 295).

(66) **Tringa urvilii** Garnot, 1826


**Synonymy:**

*Tringa urvilii* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 5, p. 209 (Lesson, 1827f) – 17 October 1827.


*Tringa urvilii* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 12, p. 541 and fn 2 (Garnot, 1829a) – 4 July 1829.

*Tringa urvilii* Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 720 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.

In the *Manuel* the species account does not mention Garnot and is evidently by Lesson alone, putting his name *cinctus* before the prior name *urvilii* from Garnot.

A junior synonym of *Charadrius modestus* Lichtenstein, 1823; see Sharpe (1896: 238).

---

77 “Without doubt the species mentioned ... by Sonnini under name of Falkland Islands plover ...”.

78 Treated by Lesson (1828) as a synonym of *Vanellus cinctus* despite Garnot’s name having date precedence.
(67) *Vanellus cinctus* Lesson & Garnot, 1827  

*Vanellus cinctus* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, livr. 2, caption on pl. 43 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827d) – b.d. 17 January 1827.  \[S\].

**Synonymy:**  
*Vanellus cinctus* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 5, p. 209 (Lesson, 1827f) – 17 October 1827. Linked to a footnote giving the name *Tringa urvillii*. See above.  
*Vanellus cinctus*, *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 720 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.  
*Vanellus cinctus* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 720”. [1830]  

A junior synonym of *Charadrius modestus* Lichtenstein, 1823, and of *Tringa urvillii* Garnot, 1826; see Sharpe (1896: 238).

(68) *Picus chilensis* Lesson & Garnot, 1827  

*Picus chilensis* [Lesson & Garnot], 1827, *Voyage*, Livr. 3, caption on pl. 32 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827e) – b.d. 18 April 1827.  \[S\].

**Synonymy:**  
*Picus chilensis* (no author given here), *Voyage*, Livr. 6, p. 241 – 22 March 1828 (Lesson, 1828c). With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 32.  
*Picus pitius* (no author mentioned), *Voyage*, Livr. 6, p. 241 fn. – 22 March 1828 (Lesson, 1828c).  
*Picus chilensis* Garn., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.  
*Picus chilensis* Garn., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 241”. [1830]  

Lesson (1828a: 113), in a confusing account in his *Manuel* written apparently without involvement from Garnot, suggested that Molina had confused “notre Picus leuconotus” with some other species. Sherborn (1927c: 3525) listed *Picus leuconotus* only in the context of Bechstein, 1805.  

Lesson (1828c: 241) was clearer, he wrote “Sous le nom de carpentero, les Chiliens confondent indistinctement deux espèces de pic. Le Picus lignarius …. nous ne l’avons pas rencontré. Mais il se peut que son Picus pitius soit notre Picus chilensis.”

79 Using the name ‘carpentero’ the Chileans confusingly treat two species of woodpecker. [One is] the *Picus lignarius* … which we did not encounter. But it is possible that his [Molina’s] *Picus pitius* is what we call *Picus chilensis.*
Peters (1948: 104) did not list this synonym (in accordance with his policy for restricting such entries); however, he did refer to the name on p. 100 where the synonymy with *Picus pitus* is indicated in the context of that being the type species of the genus *Pitiusicus*.

A junior synonym of *Colaptes pitus* (Molina, 1782); see Hargitt (1890: 28) and Hellmayr (1932: 248).

**69** *Todiramphus divinus* Lesson, 1827

*H&M4; 1:345 [Syn]*


**Synonymy:**


*Todiramphus divinus* Lesson, Voyage, livr. 15, p. 687 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.


Drapiez (1830) noted that Lesson had at first thought this was the female of *Todiramphus sacer* (a new combination based on *Alcedo sacra*).

It will be noted we have two sources both dated ‘October 1827’. Sharpe (1892: 288) listed this name as a synonym of *Todiramphus veneratus* (Gmelin, 1788) and cited, first, p. 287 from the *Voyage* with date 1826, and then the *Mémoires* with date 1827; he did not mention the *Bulletin*. However Sharpe’s p. 287\(^82\) is a mistake for p. 687, which dates from 1830. Sharpe did not list Lesson’s article in the *Bulletin* and thus did not act as a First Reviser; nor did Mathews (1927: 385) who only listed the *Mémoires*. We therefore act as First Reviser under Article 24.2 of the Code (ICZN, 1999) selecting Lesson’s article in the *Mémoires* over his paper in the *Bulletin*. Our reason for this is our acceptance of October 31 as the date for the *Mémoires* against ‘post October’ for the *Bulletin* on the grounds that issues of the *Bulletin* were dated for the month of collation and appeared after that month (see footnote 81 below and the Note to Appendix II). Our selection, necessary because others may doubt the sufficiency of the evidence, is consistent with historical citational choice (see Ronsil, 1949).

\(^{80}\)The entire 1827 volume of the *Mémoires* seems, from the BHL display (accessed 02 July 2015), to have appeared in its entirety with a cover dated ‘Octobre, 1827’.

\(^{81}\)Best taken as published in November; see note to Appendix II.

\(^{82}\)A search close to p. 287 leads to mention of the genus Todirampe on p. 298 but no mention of *divinus*. 

---
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(70) *Psittacara patagonica* (Lesson & Garnot, 1829)  

*Psittacara patagonica* [Lesson & Garnot], 1829, *Voyage*, livr. 10, caption on pl. 35 bis (Lesson & Garnot, 1829b) – b.d. 4 April 1829. {S}

**Synonymy:**

*Psittacara patagonica* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 241 (Lesson, 1828c) – 22 March 1828.

*Arara patagonica* Lesson, *Manuel d’Ornithologie*, 2, p. 143 (Lesson, 1828a) – 14 June 1828 [BdF]. With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 35 bis – which was, as yet, unpublished so that the name here was a *nomen nudum* because there was no description and the ‘indication’ to the plate was invalid.


*Psittacara patagonica* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 625”. [1830]

Salvadori (1891: 205-208) treated the species *Cyanoliseus* [sic] *patagonus* on the basis of a nominate form *patagonus* Vieillot, 1817 from La Plata and Patagonia and a subspecies *byroni* Children, 1831, in Gray’s *Zoological Miscellany* (p. 12) from Chile. He listed *Psittacara patagonica* ‘Lesson’ in the synonymy of *byroni* but listed *Arara patagonica* from Lesson’s *Traité* in the synonymy of the nominate form. Hellmayr (1932: 255) also listed "*Psittacara patagonica* (not *Psittacus* Vieillot) Lesson" under *byroni*.

Lesson (1830: 625) stated that he met with this species at the Bay de Concepcion in Chili and thus well within the range of *byroni*; on the same page he listed “*Psittacus patagonicus*, Azara; Vieillot, Dict. Hist. Nat. 25: 367” which strongly suggests that Lesson did not consider he was coining a new name, especially as *patagonus* while apt for a bird from Patagonia is inappropriate for a bird from central Chile.

Olson (1995) showed that the name *byroni* had been mistakenly attributed to this species rather than to *Enicognathus leptorhynchus* (P.P. King, 1831) and proposed the name *bloxami* based on a type specimen collected near Concepcion. Of course *patagonicus* Lesson would have considerable date precedence over *bloxami* but we believe Lesson’s name is best considered an incorrect subsequent spelling of Vieillot’s name and treated as an unavailable senior synonym of *Cyanoliseus patagonus bloxami* Olson, 1995.

(71) *Anthus sordidus* Lesson, 1830  

*Anthus sordidus* Less., *Voyage*, Livr. 15, p. 664 (Lesson, 1830b) – b.d. 3 April 1830.

Sherborn (1930c: 6027).

A junior synonym of *Lessonia rufa* (Gmelin, 1789) see Cory & Hellmayr (1927: 34). Type species of the genus *Lessonia*.

(72) *Hymenops nyctitarius* Lesson, 1828  

*Hymenops nyctitarius* Lesson, 1828, *Voyage*, livr. 6, p. 239 (Lesson, 1828c) – b.d. 22 March 1828. {S}
This name is referred on this page to “Commers., Dessins inédits”\(^3\). Lesson here provided no description but did give a vernacular name “le clignot du Paraguay” which name Hellmayr (1932: 234) tracked down to “Buffon, 1778” and on the basis of this indication Traylor (1979) considered the name validly introduced. [S].

A junior synonym of *Hymenops perspicillatus* (Gmelin, 1789) see Traylor (1979: 178); however, the Chilean bird found by Lesson and Garnot must be assigned to *H. p. andinus* (Ridgway, 1879) the Chilean form.

**(73) Synallaxis tupinieri** Lesson, 1828


With cross reference to *Voyage* pl. 29, fig. 1 (as yet unpublished); but also described.  {S}

**Synonymy:**

*Synallaxis tupinieri* [Lesson & Garnot], *Voyage*, livr. 10, caption on pl. 29, fig. 1 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.

*Synallaxis tupinieri*, *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 665 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830. Sherborn (1931c: 6685).

*Synallaxis tupinieri* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.


The account in the *Manuel* is apparently by Lesson with no mention of Garnot.

Sclater (1890: 30) listed this as a synonym of *Oxyurus spinicauda* (J.F. Gmelin, 1789) and Hellmayr (1925: 56) listed it as a synonym of *Aphrastura spinicauda* but wrote that toptotypical *spinicauda* from Tierra del Fuego may differ from birds from mainland Chile whence came Lesson’s *tupinieri*. However, at the moment all these birds are considered to be nominate *spinicauda* – see Peters (1951: 73) and Dickinson & Christidis (2014: 129).

**(74) Sericulus regens** “Lesson & Garnot”, 1826

*Sericulus regens* [Lesson & Garnot], 1826, *Voyage*, livr. 1, caption on pl. 20 (Lesson & Garnot, 1826c) – b.d. 1 November 1826.  {S}.

**Synonymy:**


*Sericulus regens* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Sericulus regens* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 640”. [1830]

Although cited as a new name this was in fact just a new combination based on *Oriolus regens* Quoy & Gaimard, 1824, but the collection of the female, together with some males, by

---

\(^3\) “The unpublished drawings by Commerson” according to Traylor (1979: 178).
M. Fonton and of the plate provided by Lesson in the Zoologie, is mentioned by Dumont (1827a). Lesson in the Manuel acknowledged that this was the same species as that depicted by Lewin and called Meliphaga chrysocephala and made no mention of Garnot.

In Sharpe (1882: 395) Lesson & Garnot’s name is listed as a synonym of Sericulus melinus (Latham, 1801) and another listed synonym was Meliphaga chrysocephala Lewin, 1808. Sericulus melinus was supposedly the subject of Watling’s drawing 125 and Hindwood (1970) considered the subject to be indeterminable. We also consider Sericulus regens (Quoy & Gaimard, 1824) to be a junior synonym of Sericulus chrysocephalus (Lewin, 1808).

(75) Philedon dumerilii Lesson & Garnot, 1828

*Philedon dumerilii* [Lesson & Garnot], 1828, *Voyage*, livr. 6, caption on pl. 21, figs. 1 & 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1828a) – b.d. 22 March, 1828. {S}

**Synonymy:**


*Philedon dumerilii* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 10, p. 416 (Lesson, 1829b) – 4 April 1829.


*Philedon dumerilii* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.

*Philedon dumerilii* Less., *Voyage*, “Atlas” plate list, citing “[p.] 644”. [1830]

In the plate figure 1 is said to be an adult and fig. 2 an immature bird.

In the brief account in the Manuel there is no mention of Garnot.

Treated as a subspecies of *Anthornis melanura* (Sparrman, 1786) by Mathews (1930: 791) and by Salomonsen (1967b: 443); but subsequently made a junior synonym of *Anthornis melanura melanura* (Sparrman, 1786) by Gill et al. (2010: 289).

(76) Philedon rubrifrons Lesson, 1830


Gadow (1884: 210) listed this as a junior synonym of Glyciphila [sic] fulvifrons (Lewin, 1838) but in the same synonymy listed the prior name Certhia melanops (Latham, 1801) without accepting it. Mathews (1930: 752) accepted the prior name and treated this as a synonym of Gliciphila melanops (mistakenly citing Philemon in place of Philedon).

Salomonsen (1967b: 426) refers to this as the type species of Gliciphila Swainson, 1837, showing the equivalence of the two names, although he treated that genus group name as a synonym of Phylidonysir and on p 430 listed Phylidonysir melanops. Christidis & Boles (1994: 67) and Schodde & Mason (1999: 310, 316) restored the genus Glyciphila to use. Thus Lesson’s name is a synonym of Gliciphila melanops.

(77) Epimachus regius Lesson, 1825

Synonymy:

*Epimachus regius* [Lesson & Garnot, *Voyage*, livr. 1, caption on pl. 28 (Lesson & Garnot, 1826c) – 1 November 1826.


*Epimachus regius* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 9, p. 402 (Lesson, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.

*Epimachus regius* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 15, p. 667 (Lesson, 1830b) – 3 April 1830.

*Epimachus regius* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 742. Plate list – 1 May 1830.


A synonym of *Lophorina paradisea* (Swainson, 1825); previously *Ptilorhis*\(^{84}\) *paradiseus* (see Mathews, 1930: 867); Lesson in the *Manuel* makes this association and in pp. 7-10 quotes extensively from Swainson by means of a translation by Garnot, otherwise Garnot’s role in providing this account is not evident.

(78) *Sitta otatare* Lesson & Garnot, 1829

*Sitta otatare* [Lesson & Garnot], 1829, *Voyage*, livr. 10, caption on pl. 23, fig. 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1829b) – b.d. 4 April 1829. \([S].^{85}\)

Synonymy:

*Sitta otatare* N. (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 299 (Lesson, 1828e) – 29 November 1828. *Nomen nudum*.


Sharpe (1883: 525) listed this as a synonym of *Tatara longirostris* (Gmelin, 1789) from the Society Islands. Included in his synonymy were the senior name *caffra* Sparrman, 1786 (which Sharp elected not to accept) and *musae* Forster, 1844. Sharpe’s account is interesting in several ways. First he acknowledged that the genus *Tatara* as he conceived it was close to *Acrocephalus* referring to the work of Canon Tristram (1883), recently published in January. Secondly, he acknowledged that this genus should have been published in volume 5 of the *Catalogue of the Birds of the British Museum* and that Seebohm had admitted as much. Sharpe listed six other species from seven different Pacific islands or island groups (*mendanae* from the Marquesas, *syrinx* from the Caroline Islands, *rehsei* from what is now Nauru, *aequinoctialis* from Christmas Island, *pistor* from Fanning Island, now Tabuaeran\(^{86}\), in the Line Islands and *mariannae* from the Marianne Islands). Two of these names came from Tristram’s

---

\(^{84}\) Correct original spelling *Ptiloris* see Sherborn (1929d: 5210).

\(^{85}\) In his *Traité* Lesson (1830: 317) apparently renamed this *Tatara otaiiensis* which is a junior synonym. However, Lesson (1842) described *Tatara fuscus* which is considered to apply to a dark morph from the same island.

\(^{86}\) It was later found on Washington Island, now Teraina.
paper: *pistor* was wholly new, but *mariannae* was proposed as a new name to replace *luscinia* of Quoy & Gaimard which in *Acrocephalus* was a preoccupied name\(^8^7\). As Sharpe did not agree to subsume *Tatare* in *Acrocephalus* there could have been no preoccupation and he should have retained *luscinia*. The name *mariannae*, listed as a synonym by Mathews (1930:594), is not in current use, but birds from Aguijuan and Pagan in the northern Mariannas have been named in the second quarter of last century. Quoy & Gaimard (1830) collected only on Guam and although the name *luscinia* is in use for birds from Guam it seems likely that Tristram was correct and that *mariannae* should be used.

Although *otatare* was treated as a synonym of *Acrocephalus longirostris* (Gmelin, 1789) it is now considered that the extinct population from Mo'orea on which the latter name was based was a distinct species from *Acrocephalus caffer* (Sparrman, 1786) from Tahiti and it was on Tahiti that Lesson collected; so *otatare* is best treated as a synonym of *caffer* (Cibois et al., 2011, and A. Cibois pers. comm. 09.06.15).

In Dickinson & Christidis (2014) the range statement of *Acrocephalus luscinius* should have read Guam; the range given was that correctly applied on the opposite page to *Acrocephalus hiwae*.

**C. OTHER NAMES (IDENTITIES NOT SAFELY RESOLVED)**\(^8^8\)

**(79) Hirundo taitensis Lesson 1830**


Sherborn (1931b: 6374).

A junior synonym of *Hirundo tahitica* J.F. Gmelin, 1789. See Sharpe (1885: 141).

**H&M4; 2:479 [Syn]**

**(80) Columba cyanovirens Garnot & Lesson, 1826**


Sherborn (1925b: 1733).

*Synonymy:*

*Columba cyanovirens* [Lesson & Garnot], Voyage, livr. 4, caption on pl. 42, figs. 1 & 2 (Lesson & Garnot, 1827f)– 25 July 1827.


---

\(^8^7\) Tristram (1883) did not make clear what name existed that gave cause to claim preoccupation. No such name is listed by Sherborn (1902) and of the pre 1830 names listed in Sherborn (1927c: 3718) associated with the genera *Aedon, Curruca* and *Philomela* only the first seems to offer any basis for concern and this would relate to possible preoccupation in the wren genus *Thrrothorus* (because Quoy & Gaimard placed their bird in that genus). However, *Aedon lusciniia* Forster, 1817, is a nightingale not a wren and the name was a new combination based on *Motacilla lusciniia* Linnaeus, 1758; Forster adopted *Aedon* as a new genus with this species as his type species (see Ripley, 1964: 32), thus the wren connection is illusory.

\(^8^8\) The name *Dacelo furcatus* was applied by Lesson (1825) to a large kingfisher described by its call; this name is listed in the synonymy of *Dacelo novaeguineae* by Mathews (1927: 373) who considered he had used in validly in 1918, but bringing the name into use was unnecessary as Lesson (1830: 248) described it as *Choucalcyon australae* – also listed by Mathews. By its publication vehicle this falls outside our scope.
548 (Drapiez, 1828a) – January 1828.


*Columba cyanovirens* Less., *Voyage*, livr. 16, p. 713 (Lesson, 1830c) – 1 May 1830.


Desmarest, described this as an “espèce inédite”89, and wrote “cette petite espèce, dont la description nous a été communiqué par MM. Garnot et Lesson”90, on this basis we believe it correct to recognise them as the authors.

There is nothing in the *Manuel* to suggest any involvement in the species account on the part of Garnot.

Lesson (1831: 471) listed this, but attributed the name solely to the bird depicted in figure 1, now giving that in fig. 2 the name *Columba virens*. Salvadori (1893), like Lesson (1831), considered the two figures to relate to two different species; he (p. 112) thought fig. 1 to be a female of *Ptilinopus superbus* (Temminck, 1809) see Mathews (1927: 29), and (p. 149) thought fig. 2 depicted *P. pectoralis* (Wagler, 1829) see Mathews (1927: 41). Thus, if Salvadori was correct, this name should appear with ‘partim’ in the synonymy of both those species.

**81) *Psittacus stavorini* Desmarest, 1826**

*Psittacus stavorini* ‘Garnot et Lesson’ MS, Desmarest, 1826, *Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles*, 39: 60 (Desmarest, 1826a) – b.d. 29 April 1826 [Mathews & Iredale, 1915: 7]. {S} Synonymy:

*Psittacus stavorini* Lesson, *Voyage*, livr. 9, p. 355 (Lesson, 1829a) – 28 February 1829.


Sherborn (1931a: 6129).

Desmarest (1826a), within a long account of parrot species, described this as the size of the ‘lori tricolor’ of Buffon with the same body proportions. It’s plumage was a uniform shining black except for the lower underparts which were a beautiful red. He speculated that it might be the same as Gmelin’s *Psittacus novaeguineae* – a junior synonym of *Chalcopsitta atra* (Scopoli, 1786). While Desmarest must have had notes or even a description from Lesson & Garnot he did not explicitly say so.

Salvadori (1891: 15) reported that no specimen existed and indeed Lesson (1830a) stated that the specimen had been bought in Waigaeu and that it had been lost in the 1824 shipwreck. Salvadori wondered if this might be identical with *Chalcopsittacus insignis* Oustalet, 1878. See also Mathews (1927: 284).

Named for the Dutch admiral: Jan Splinter Stavorinus (see Jobling, 2010: 364).

---

89 “Undescribed species.”

90 “This small species of which the description was communicated to us by Messieurs Garnot et Lesson.”
(82) *Saxicola merula* Lesson, 1830


This name appears in Gadow (1883: 185) in the synonymy of *Pachycephala melanura* Gould, 1842, where Gadow provided an opinion from Salvadori who, it is stated, had examined the type and considered it “the female of *P. macrorhynchus* Strickland [1849]”. These two names are each ranked as species, with several subspecies by Dickinson & Christidis (2014), and Gadow in unifying two species erred in his treatment despite Salvadori’s identification. Mayr (1962) proposed suppression of this name for the purpose of priority on the basis that it was a juvenile and not certainly from New Ireland as stated (Strickland’s *macrorhynchus* had a type locality of Amboina) although Mayr does not seem to have arranged for the type to be compared with *P. citreogaster* which is from New Ireland). Mayr’s proposal was accepted and the name suppressed by Opinion 684 (ICZN, 1963).

(83) *Edolius comice* Lesson, 1828

*Edolius comice* (no author given here), *Voyage*, livr. 8, p. 344 (Lesson, 1828e) – 20 November 1828. {S}

Lesson (1828: 344) reported this as one of three ‘gobe-mouches’ collected in New Ireland of which the only specimen was lost in the shipwreck Garnot suffered on his way home. The description is of a drongo, but is rather general and makes no special mention of the exceptional tail feathers of the New Ireland endemic later described as *Edolius megarhynchus* Quoy & Gaimard, 1830, which although said to have come from Dorey [= Manokwari], New Guinea in fact came from Port Praslin in New Ireland (see Vaurie, 1949) the same harbour visited by *La Coquille*. Quoy & Gaimard (1830: 184-5) made no mention of a native name which Lesson reported to be *comice*. As Lesson’s name *comice* was not listed by Sherborn (1925a: 1416) or by Sharpe (1877), and has remained ignored, we recommend that this be treated as indeterminate.

**DISCUSSION**

We include a table comparing the names we have used as our numbered headings above with the names used in the volumes of the Peters *Check-list* and with those used in the Howard and Moore Checklist, 4th Edition. (Table III below).

We provide information on the earliest traced date of publication for 94 names of birds based on the work of the members of the expedition of the corvette *La Coquille* – for the list of names see Table IV (pp. 133-136) which lists all synonyms including the 11 that belong to group A names. Where appropriate we have also commented on spelling issues.
Table III a. Authorship and dates from this study compared with Peters’ Check-list and with the Howard and Moore Checklist (4th edition; 2013-2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Radjah radjah</td>
<td>G &amp; L</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>radjah</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>radjah</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talegalla cuvieri</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>cuvieri</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>cuvieri</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rollandia milland chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Podiceps occipitalis</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>occipitalis</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>occipitalis</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patagioenas arauana</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>arauana</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>arauana</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ducula oceanica</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>oceanica</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>oceanica</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ducula zoae</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>zoae</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>zoae</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ptilinopus magnificus puella</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>puella</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>puella</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hemiprocne mystacea</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>mystacea</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>mystacea</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sephanoides sephanoides</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>sephanoides</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>sephanoides</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amazilia amazilia</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>amazilia</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>amazilia</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Thaumastura cora</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>cora</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>cora</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Centropus ateralbus</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>ateralbus</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>ateralbus</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Centropus menbeki</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>menbeki</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>menbeki</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Eudynamys orientalis rufiventer</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>rufiventer</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>rufiventer</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pterodroma lessonii</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>lessonii</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>lessonii</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pelecanoides gamotii</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>gamotii</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>gamotii</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Zonorellus helosylus</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>helosylus</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>helosylus</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Phalacrocorax gaimardi</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>gaimardi</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>gaimardi</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Haematopus leucopodus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>leucopodus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>leucopodus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III b. Authorship and dates from this study compared with Peters’ Check-list and with the Howard and Moore Checklist (4th edition; 2013-2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>p.</th>
<th>Spelling</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Larosterna inca</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>inca</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>inca</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Henicopenis longicauda</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>longicauda</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>longicauda</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Syma torotoro</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>torotoro</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>torotoro</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Toudinampus sanctus vogans</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>vogans</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>vogans</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Melidora macloviana</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>macloviana</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>macloviana</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Psittaculinostris desmarestii</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>desmaresti</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>desmaresti</td>
<td>Dumont</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Muscisaxicola maclovianus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>macloviana</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>maclovianus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cincodes antarcticus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>antarcticus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>antarcticus</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>ASN</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Cincodes patagonicus chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>chilensis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Myzomela eques</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>eques</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>eques</td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table III c. Authorship and dates from this study compared with Peters’ Check-list and with the Howard and Moore Checklist (4th edition; 2013-2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>This study</th>
<th>Peters’ Checklist</th>
<th>Howard &amp; Moore Checklist (4th edition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td><em>Peltops blainvillii</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>Melloria quoyi</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td><em>Corvus tristis</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td><em>Myiagm alecto chalybeocphala</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td><em>Arthes telescophthalmus</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><em>Symposiachrus guttula</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td><em>Carteromis chrysomela</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><em>Pomarea pomarea</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Monarcha cinerces inornatus</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><em>Phoynagmmus keraudrenii</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td><em>Manucodia ater</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><em>Petroica macrocephala toitoi</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><em>Petroica longipes</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td><em>Dicaem erythrothorax</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><em>Leptocoma aspasia</em></td>
<td>L &amp; G</td>
<td>Atlas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Cinnyris sericeus</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris jugularis clementiae</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Dict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td><em>Sporophila telasco</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td><em>Troglydtes aedon chilensis</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td><em>Mino dumontii</em></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Bull.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table IV a. An evaluation of the reliability of the Index Animalium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Taxon name</th>
<th>Pl. no.</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Authorship accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Radjah radjah</em></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot &amp; Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Talegalla cuvieri</em></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Rollandia rolland chilensis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Podiceps occipitalis</em></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Podiceps kalipareus</em></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Patagioenas araucana</em></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Ducula oceanica</em></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Ptilinopus magnificus puella</em></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Hemiprocne mystacea</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Sephanoides sephanoides</em></td>
<td>31 f2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Amazilia amazilia</em></td>
<td>31 f3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td><em>Thaumastura cora</em></td>
<td>31 f4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td><em>Centropus atertibus</em></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td><em>Centropus menbeki</em></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><em>Eudynamys orientalis ruizcenter</em></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td><em>Procellaria Lessonti</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><em>Pelecanoides garnotii</em></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td><em>Zonerodius heliosylus</em></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>Phalacrocorax gaimardi</em></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>Haematopus leucopodus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Ostrealegla leucopus</em></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV b. An evaluation of the reliability of the Index Animalium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Taxon name</th>
<th>Pl. no.</th>
<th>Sherborn source (S) vs. Actual original source (A)</th>
<th>IA Correct?</th>
<th>Authorship accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plate    Text  Manuel  Annales  Bulletin  Dict  Memoire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>Yes  No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Hemicoperis longicauda</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Syma torotoro</td>
<td>31 bis f1</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Todiramphus sanctus vagans</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Melidora macrorhina</td>
<td>31 bis f2</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Psittaculirostris desmarestii</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Muscisaxicola maclovianus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cinclodes antarcticus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Furnarius lessonii</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Myzomela equeus</td>
<td>31 f1</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Myzomela rubrastra rubrastra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Xanthotis flaviventer</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philesturnus chrysotis</td>
<td>21 bis</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Garritornis isidorei</td>
<td>29 f2</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Melanocharis nigra</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Toxorhamphus novaeguineae</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Philasternus carunculatus</td>
<td>23 f1</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Mohoua ochrocephala albicilla</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Edolisoma melas</td>
<td></td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lalage leucomela karu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pitohui kirhocephalus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Peltops blainvillii</td>
<td>19 f2</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Melloria quoyi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1  1  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A  S  A</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IVc. An evaluation of the reliability of the Index Animalium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Taxon name</th>
<th>Authorship accepted</th>
<th>Sherborn source (S) vs. Actual original source (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Corvus tristis</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Corvus corone</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ardea alba</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Ardea cinerea</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ardea heuglinii</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ardea pacifica</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Ardea rufa</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ardea surrea</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ardea uncinata</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ardea xanthoptera</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table IV d. An evaluation of the reliability of the Index Animalium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Taxon name</th>
<th>Plate</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Manuel</th>
<th>Annales</th>
<th>Bulletin</th>
<th>Dict</th>
<th>Memoire</th>
<th>IA Correct?</th>
<th>Authorship accepted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Columba kurukuru var. taitensis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Crotophaga casassi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Ardea jugularis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Charadrius pyrrhocephalus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Tringa urellii</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vanellus cinctus</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Picus chilensis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Todiramphus divinus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Psittacara patagonica</td>
<td>35 bis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Anthus sordidus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Hymenops nycticarius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Synallaxis tupinieri</td>
<td>29 f1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sericulus regens</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>'Lesson &amp; Garnot'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Philedon dumerili</td>
<td>21 f1, 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Philedon rubrifrons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Epimachus regius</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Sitta otatara</td>
<td>23 f2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson &amp; Garnot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Hirundo taitensis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Columba cyanovirens</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Garnot &amp; Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Psittacus stavorini</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Desmarest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Saxicola merula</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Edolius comice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the way in which the Voyage was published, with the plates preceding the text, and the prior and parallel publications of Lesson, there has long been confusion over dates of publication and over spellings. We have analysed the 94 names that should have appeared in Sherborn’s Index Animalium and in Table III eight of the 94 lines lack the grey background that signals that Sherborn cited one of the given publications we cover.

These eight names are:

- **Podiceps kalipareus** Sherborn (1927b: 3305) cited this to Gray (1846)
- **Furnarius lessonii** was omitted by Sherborn (1927c: 3508)
- **Myzantha flaviventra** – now Xanthotis flaviventra – was omitted by Sherborn (1926b: 2450)
- **Eurylaimus blainvillii** – now Peltops blainvillii – here Sherborn (1924a: 804) was seriously misled, due to one of Temminck’s rare, and often unremarked, updatings of his texts for the Planches Coloriées (not, in this case, the issue of a cancellans but a signalled additional page)
- **Columba kurukuru var. taitensis** where Sherborn (1931b: 6374) attributed this name, as Kurukuru taitensis, to the authors of the zoology of a later voyage although those authors cited the original publication to the page
- **Ardea jugularis** Lesson was not listed by Sherborn (1927b: 3296) who instead listed the name *Ardea jugularis* Wagler, 1827, just the year before; normally in such a case Sherborn would list the two competing sources for Lesson stated that he was naming this as new
- **Hymenops nictitarius** which Sherborn (1928c: 4447) omitted
- **Edolius comice** which Sherborn (1925a: 1416) omitted

Of the 27 cases where a plate from the Voyage should have been cited as the original source – had Sherborn accepted names in plate captions – 15 are cited from the Manuel d’Ornithologie, one is cited from the Bulletin des Sciences naturelles et de Géologie, nine are cited from the later text of the Voyage and the other two are the unusual cases of Eurylaimus blainvillii and Podiceps kalipareus.

It will be observed from the same set of evidence that Sherborn’s treatment of names which did first appear in the Manuel d’Ornithologie is also inaccurate. Philesturnus carunculatus rufusater, Sporophila telasco and Synallaxis tupinieri should have been credited to that source and Myzantha flaviventra was overlooked. Wrongly credited to the Manuel – apart from names from the plates – were (1) Centropus ateralbus where the original publication was in the Bulletin des Sciences naturelles et de Géologie, and (2) three taxa (Psittaculirostris desmarestii, Cinnyris sericeus and Cinnyris jugularis clementiae) which should have been cited from volumes of the Dictionnaire des Sciences naturelles.

In the case of the Voyage there is not a single case where Sherborn cited a name from a plate caption. This looks like a deliberate policy, and merits comparison with Sherborn’s treatment in the Index Animalium of the first 20 livraisons of Temminck & Laugier’s Planches Coloriées; in respect of names in those parts he dated most names with the uniform date

---

91 A nomen novum.
“Ap[ril] 1822” which is evidently based on his belief that all the texts were made available together with livraison 21.

For Temminck’s *Planches Coloriées* Sherborn must have chosen not to rely on the dates of the parts on which he had reported over 20 years earlier (Sherborn, 1898)92 – probably on the grounds that he would then need to know the spellings on the wrappers and only two out of 20 wrappers were available to him – Sherborn could not cite page numbers for the *Planches Coloriées* as there were none. Sherborn (1922: cxxii) did not reveal any awareness that 101 parts were needed to deliver 600 plates (see Dickinson, 2001) and thus that attribution of a particular plate to a given livraison was a matter of guesswork.

So there is considerable similarity between the *Planches Coloriées* and the *Voyage* because not only did Temminck’s plates, for his early livraisons, appear before the text but Sherborn dated some names from Temminck’s *Manuel d’Ornithologie* when, in fact, plates in the *Planches Coloriées* had appeared first. It is likely that in other works, where captioned plates appeared before the related texts, Sherborn focussed on the letterpress. Sherborn (1902: vii) wrote:

“In the case of plates appearing before the text, the date of each is given if ascertainable …, but in no case is the date of a plate accepted in preference to the date of text, for the reasons which follow: –

The figure depicted on a plate may, or may not, be the drawing intended by the author; it is the work of the artist, who is also responsible for the descriptive legend. In numerous instances the description legend on a plate is quiet erroneous, and has been repudiated by the author in his text. Until the text descriptive of the plate appears, the names on the plate must be considered *nomina nuda*, and it is open to anyone to describe and rename such *nomina nuda*.”

This was reprinted in full in Sherborn (1922: viii-ix) in quotation marks but the text is footnoted “This paragraph is reprinted from vol. 1. The practice now obtains that names combined with recognisable figures must be accepted as valid”93.

If we first compare the data in Peters *Check-list* with what was provided by Dickinson & Remsen (2013) and Dickinson & Christidis (2014), drawing on the first 10 years of this study, the following changes can be seen to have been made:

- *Patagioenas araucana* had Lesson alone as author; this was corrected to Lesson & Garnot.

---

92 Sherborn in the *Index* along with his usual date “Ap. 1822” gave the livraison number in a rounded bracket and that number was almost always correct, so he could have used his 1898 findings hence our assessment that his primary reason for not doing so was the lack of the wrappers and an inability to spell out the names that appeared therein. However, where Sherborn (1930c: 6038) wrote, of *Strix spadiceus*, “I have not seen the wrapper, but suspect this to be the trivial name” he recognised, as he had in (1922: ix), that the names on the wrappers combined with the depictions validly introduced the names concerned.

93 This note should not be taken to imply that Sherborn changed his data to take account of this. It is thought that Sherborn originally grouped his cards in sets *per publication* so as to be consistent, but it is evident that for publication in the *Index Animalium* they needed to be in alphabetical order and Sherborn in the period just prior to the publication of this 1922 footnote must have spent weeks arranging his cards in that order. His inserted afterthought would have meant that searching for the cases affected would have seemed an unacceptable delay and an almost insuperable task.
• *Ducula oceanica* had Lesson & Garnot as authors; this was corrected to Desmarest.
• *Ducula zoeae* had Lesson alone as author; this was corrected to Desmarest.
• *Ptilinopus m. puella* Lesson alone as author; this was changed to Lesson & Garnot.
• *Hemiprocnce mystacea* was corrected from Lesson to Lesson & Garnot (and from the Bulletin not the Atlas)
• *Sephanoides sephanoides* was corrected to *Sephanoides sephanoides* and its author from Lesson to Lesson & Garnot
• The author of *Amazilia amazilia* was corrected to Lesson & Garnot and the source was from the *Manuel* to the *Atlas*
• *Thaumastura cora* and *Zonerodius heliosylus* both had Lesson alone as author; this was corrected to Lesson & Garnot
• *Larosterna inca* had Lesson alone as author; this was corrected to Lesson & Garnot
• *Henicoternis longicauda* had Garnot as sole author; this was corrected to include Lesson
• *Todiramphus s. vagans* had been attributed to the text of the *Voyage* but was corrected to the *Manuel*
• *Psittaculirostris desmarestii* had had Desmarest as author; this was changed to Dumont
• *Muscisaxcila maclovianus* had been attributed to the text in the *Voyage* but was corrected to the *Annales* three years earlier
• *Edolisoma melasena* was corrected to *melas.*
• *Peltops blainvillii* had had Garnot alone as author; this was corrected to include Lesson
• *Melloria quoyi* had had Lesson alone as author; this was corrected to Lesson & Garnot
• *Myiagra a. chalybeocephala* had been attributed to Garnot from the plate this was changed to Lesson
• *Arses telescophthalmus* was corrected to *telescophthalmus,* authorship was corrected from Garnot alone to Lesson & Garnot
• *Symposiachrus guttula* had been attributed to the plate and to Garnot alone as author; this was changed first by attribution to the *Manuel* and second by treating Lesson as sole author, but see below
• *Carterornis chrysomela* had had Garnot alone as author; this was corrected to Lesson & Garnot
• *Pomarea pomarea* had been attributed to the plate and to Garnot alone as author; the authorship was corrected to Lesson & Garnot
• *Monarcha c. inornatus* had been attributed to the plate and to Garnot alone as author; this was changed first by attribution to the *Manuel* and second by treating Lesson as sole author
• *Petroica longipes* authorship was corrected from Garnot to Lesson & Garnot as from the plate caption
• *Dicaeum erythrothorax* was corrected from Lesson to Lesson & Garnot as from the plate caption.
Of the above this study has shown the following two cases now need to be corrected:

- *Psittaculirostris desmarestii* Desmarest should not have been changed to give Dumont as the author\(^94\)
- *Myiagra a. chalybeocephala* citation then being thought to come from the plate should have had Lesson & Garnot as authors (but see below for source correction)

If we now compare what was relied upon by Dickinson & Remsen (2013) and Dickinson & Christidis (2014) as modified by the corrections above, with the results of this study, we see the following corrections to be needed:

1. *Radjah radjah* – previously ascribed to Lesson but becomes Garnot & Lesson based on Lesson’s explicit note regarding Garnot’s role and the evidence of Lesson’s own involvement.
2. *Pelecanoides garnotii* is revealed to require joint authorship by Lesson & Garnot\(^95\).
3. *Phalacrocorax guimardi* – was ascribed to the plate caption in the *Voyage* and thus to Lesson & Garnot, but the evidence for the date of publication of the *Manuel* puts that first and in there the description is by Garnot in Lesson and not by both of them.
4. *Myzomela eques* was first published in the plate caption (*Atlas*) but the joint authorship is unchanged.
5. The following five taxa (a) *Myiagra alecto chalybeocephala*, (b) *Symposiachrus guttula*, (c) *Pomarea pomarea*, (d) *Monarcha cinerascens inornatus* and (e) *Petroica macrocephala toitoi* must be treated alike as all are from the *Manuel*, by a matter of a few days, in addition the text therein shows these all deserve joint authorship by Lesson & Garnot rather than by Lesson alone – only *P. pomarea* had joint authorship in Dickinson & Christidis (2014) where two of these five were still based on the *Atlas* plate dates.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The evidence we present repeats what is well known, namely that Lesson was involved with numerous parallel projects, and makes the point that these provided the background wherein new names are particularly subject to questions about which source came first.

We believe we have fully addressed this for the period from 1826 to early 1830.

The evidence also shows that Sherborn was not infrequently mistaken (an ‘error’ rate of 42.2 %)\(^96\) in the source he considered to be the earliest for a given name\(^97\) and that subsequent authorities have also been very inconsistent. This is particularly the case in respect of assigning authorship to the new scientific names included on the plates where we commend the views of Zimmer (1926): these should be attributed to both authors (except for *Columba*

---

\(^94\) A case where the breach of etiquette in “naming something after oneself” is caused by a strict interpretation of Art. 50 of the Code.

\(^95\) A case where Lesson must have intended to name this for his colleague but where consistent application of Art. 50 finds cause to add Garnot’s own name to the authorship.

\(^96\) Based on 90 listings (there were 4 omissions) 38 cited the wrong source.

\(^97\) Which implies that ZooBank must not accept the content of Sherborn’s *Index Animalium* without careful validation; and we hope that this report will greatly facilitate that validation (it being essential to consider works in toto rather than take each name in isolation).
zoae because the plate caption for that gave Lesson as the author – but Desmarest’s account in the Dictionnaire appeared before the plate).
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APPENDIX I:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livr. (part)</th>
<th>Pagination per Sherborn &amp; Woodward (1901a) and Mengel (1983)</th>
<th>Bracketed Page Numbers</th>
<th>Bird plates per Mathews (1913) and Mengel (1983)</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Dates of issues of the Bibl. de la France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-48</td>
<td></td>
<td>13, 20, 28</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1 Nov 1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>49-88</td>
<td></td>
<td>11, 34, 36, 43</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>17 Jan 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>89-112</td>
<td>12, 19, 26, 32, 47</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>18 Apr 1827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>113-116</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>18 Apr 1827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>117-128</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>18 Apr 1827</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>129-168</td>
<td>129-176</td>
<td>31, 37, 40, 41, 42, 50</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>25 Jul 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>169-216</td>
<td>177-224</td>
<td>18, 22, 25, 35, 45</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>17 Oct 1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>217-256</td>
<td>225-264</td>
<td>21, 21 bis, 27, 33, 39</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>22 Mar 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>257-296</td>
<td>265-304</td>
<td>10, 17, 30, 44, 48</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>21 Jun 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>297-352</td>
<td>305-360</td>
<td>15, 24, 38, 46, 49</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>29 Nov 1828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>353-408</td>
<td>361-416</td>
<td>14, 16</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>28 Feb 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>409-456</td>
<td>417-464</td>
<td>23, 29, 35 bis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>4 Apr 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>457-504</td>
<td>465-512</td>
<td>31 bis</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>30 May 1829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>505-506</td>
<td>513-562</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>4 Jul 1829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>507-560</td>
<td></td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>4 Jul 1829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>561-600</td>
<td>563-608</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>21 Nov 1829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>601-612</td>
<td>609-612</td>
<td>Garnot</td>
<td>9 Jan 1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>613-648</td>
<td>613-656</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>9 Jan 1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>649-696</td>
<td>657-706</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>3 Apr 1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>697-743</td>
<td>707-743</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1 May 1830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following information can be gleaned from these volumes as displayed by the Biodiversity Heritage Library (BHL). Volume title pages are present; apart from a few wrappers (shown on BHL) month dates have to be found in the tables of contents or deduced from these where the notes on errors being corrected refer to particular months of issue and certain pages therein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD I (1824-1828): 3 VOLS. PER YEAR, 4 ISSUES PER VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PERIOD II (1829-1831): 4 VOLS. PER YEAR, 3 ISSUES PER VOLUME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vol. 16</th>
<th>Vol. 17</th>
<th>Vol. 18</th>
<th>Vol. 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>January 1-160</td>
<td>April 1-160</td>
<td>July 1-144</td>
<td>October 1-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 161-344</td>
<td>May 161-320</td>
<td>August 145-320</td>
<td>Nov/Dec 153-416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 345-480</td>
<td>June 321-480</td>
<td>September 321-480</td>
<td>Index/year Unseen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>January 1-192</td>
<td>April 1-192</td>
<td>July 1-160</td>
<td>October 1-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 193-368</td>
<td>May 193-336</td>
<td>August 161-352</td>
<td>November 161-286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 369-480</td>
<td>June 337-480</td>
<td>September 353-480</td>
<td>Index/year 1-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>January 1-128</td>
<td>April 1-144</td>
<td>July 1-112</td>
<td>October 1-112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February 129-248</td>
<td>May 145-256</td>
<td>August 113-208</td>
<td>November 113-208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March 249-384</td>
<td>June 257-368</td>
<td>September 209-304</td>
<td>Index/year 1-38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** We have not seen any wrappers for the monthly issues. Some evidence that the month dates are dates of collation rather than publication is available from the *Bibliographie de la France*, 1828, issue 8 of 23 February which, in an entry set out the rates of subscriptions to the *Bulletin*, states that the January 1828 issues of the eight different parts have been printed. Férussac’s original, and later overarching, title – *Bulletin Général et Universel des annonces et des nouvelles scientifiques* – provides proof, set out in our footnote 15, that the April-June issue (Vol. II, Nos 4, 5 & 6) should have been published in the first week of July. We believe this was Férussac’s standard policy and that he maintained this approach when the journal was subdivided.
**APPENDIX III:** New names: a comparison of original combinations with those used in the Howard and Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World, 4th. edition (2013-14) and corrections to be made to the latter (the eleven listed synonyms do not appear in the Checklist).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original combinations</th>
<th>Combinations used by Dickinson &amp; Remsen 2013, and Dickinson and Christidis, 2014</th>
<th>Corrections needed</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anas radjah Garnot &amp; Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Radjah radjah radjah (Lesson, 1828) (Garnot &amp; Lesson)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Talegallus cuvieri Less. 1828</td>
<td>Talegalla cuvieri cuvieri Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Podiceps chilensis 'Garnot' MS, Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Rollandia rolland chilensis (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Podiceps americanus Lesson &amp; Garnot in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Podiceps occipitalis occipitalis Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Podiceps kalpareus [calipareus]</td>
<td>Pelicanus occipitalis occipitalis Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Columba araucana [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Patagioenas araucana (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Columba oceanica 'Lesson &amp; Garnot' MS, Desmarest, 1826</td>
<td>Duculula oceanica oceanica (Desmarest, 1826)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Columba zoeae 'Lesson' MS, Desmarest, 1826</td>
<td>Duculula zoeae (Desmarest, 1826)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Columba puella Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td>Ptilinopus magnificus puella (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cypselus mystaceus Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td>Hemiprocne mystacea mystacea (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orthorynchus sephanioides [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Sephanoides sephanioides (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Orthorynchus amazilia [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Amazilia amazilia amazilia (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Orthorynchus cori [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Thaumastura cori (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Centropus ateralbus, Lesson, 1826,</td>
<td>Centropus ateralbus Lesson, 1826</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Centropus menbeki [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1828</td>
<td>Centropus menbeki menbeki Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1828</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cuculus rufiventris Less. 1830</td>
<td>Eudynamys orientalis rufiventris Lesson, 1830</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Procellaria Lessonii Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>Pterodroma lessonii Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:178</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Puffinaria garnotii Lesson &amp; Garnot in Lesson, 1828,</td>
<td>Pelecanoides garnotii (Lesson, 1828) (Lesson &amp; Garnot)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:181</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ardea heliosyls [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1828</td>
<td>Zonerodius heliosyls (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pelecanus gaimardi Garnot in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Phalacrocorax gaimardi (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1828) (Garnot)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Haematopus [sic] leucopodus Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>Haematopus leucopodus Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ostralega leucopus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original combinations</td>
<td>Combinations used by Dickinson &amp; Remsen 2013, and Dickinson and Christidis, 2014</td>
<td>Corrections needed</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Psittacus desmarestii 'Lesson &amp; Garnot' MS, Desmarest, 1826</td>
<td>Psittaculaurostrix desmarestii desmarestii (Dumont, 1826)</td>
<td>(Desmarest)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 1:383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sylvia macloviana Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>Muscisaxicola maclovianus maclovianus (Garnot, 1826)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Certhia antarctica Garnot, 1826</td>
<td>Cinclodes antarcticus antarcticus (Garnot, 1826)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 122</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Furnarius fuliginosus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Furnarius chilensis 'Lesson et Garn.' MS, Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Cinclodes patagonicus chilensis (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Furnarius lessonii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Cinnrys eques [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Myzomela eques eques (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Cinnrys rubrater Lesson, 1827</td>
<td>Myzomela rubrata rubrata (Lesson, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Myzomela flaviventer Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Xanthotis flaviventer flaviventer (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Phileodon chrysotis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Pomatorhinus isidorei Lesson, 1827</td>
<td>Garridornis isidorei isidorei (Lesson, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Dicrornis niger Less., 1830,</td>
<td>Melanocharis niger niger (Lesson, 1830)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Cinnrys novaeguineae Lesson, 1827</td>
<td>Toxorhamphus novaeguineae novaeguineae (Lesson, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Icterus rufusater Less., 1828</td>
<td>Philesturnus carunculatus rufusater (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Fringilla albicilla Less., 1830</td>
<td>Mohoua ochrocephala albicilla (Lesson, 1830)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Lanius melas 'Less. et Garnot' MS, Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Edolisoma melas melas (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Lanius karu [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Lalaque leucomele karu (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Lanius kirhocephalus [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Pilolui kirhocephalus kirhocephalus (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Eurylaimus blainvillii [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Peltops blainvillii (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Baritia quysi Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td>Melloria quysi quysi (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Corvus tristis Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td>Corvus tristis Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Corvus senex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Muscicapa chalybeoccephala 'Less et Garn.', in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Myiagra affecta chalybeoccephala (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td>(Lesson &amp; Garnot)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Muscicapa telecopthalmus [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Arses telecopthalmus telecopthalmus (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>invariable</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Muscicapa enado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Muscicapa guttula 'Less. et Garn.' in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Symposiachrus guttula (Lesson,1828)</td>
<td>(Lesson &amp; Garnot)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Muscicapa chrysomela [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td>Carterorhitis chrysomela chrysomela (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Muscicapa pomarea Less. et Garn. in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td>Pomarea pomarea pomarea</td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Muscicapa maupitiensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td><em>Muscicapa inornata</em> Less. et Garn. in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td><em>Monarcha cinerascens inornatus</em> (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td><em>(Lesson &amp; Garnot)</em></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td><em>Barita keraudrenii</em> Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1826</td>
<td><em>Phonygammus keraudrenii keraudrenii</em> (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1826)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td><em>Muscicapa totoi</em> Less. et Garn. in Lesson, 1828</td>
<td><em>Petroica macrocephala totoi</em> (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td><em>(Lesson &amp; Garnot)</em></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td><em>Muscicapa longipes</em> [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1827</td>
<td><em>Petroica longipes</em> (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td><em>Dicaeum erythrothorax</em> [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1828</td>
<td><em>Dicaeum erythrothorax erythrothorax</em> (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1828)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris aspasia</em> [Lesson &amp; Garnot], 1828</td>
<td><em>Leptocoma aspasia aspasia</em> (Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1828)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris sericeus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris clementiae</em> Lesson, 1827</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris jugularis clementiae</em> Lesson, 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>Cinnyris zenobia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td><em>Pyrhula telasco</em> ‘Less. et Garn.’ MS, Lesson, 1828</td>
<td><em>Sporophila telasco</em> (Lesson, 1828)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td><em>Mainatus dumontii</em> Lesson in Lesson &amp; Garnot, 1827</td>
<td><em>Mino dumontii</em> (Lesson, 1827)</td>
<td></td>
<td>H&amp;M4; 2: 580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>