

Primary homonymy versus secondary homonymy: a correction

Edward C. Dickinson

In *Systematic notes on Asian birds, 50. Types of the families Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae* a lapse in concentration led to incorrect information being given in the table and in two accompanying footnotes. The purpose of this brief paper is to rapidly put the record straight.

In the Editorial, with David Wells, some remarks were included on the subject of homonymy and in particular we noted that the Code (ICZN, 1999) makes clear that primary homonyms are “permanently invalid” [Art. 57.2] and that they have no types. The first part of this was perfectly correct, but the second part was not. Art. 81.2.1 of the Code clarifies that total suppression means “suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy” but add that a species-group name which has been “totally suppressed” remains an available name [Art. 10.6] and may still denote the type species of a genus or subgenus. This we take to mean that such a name is still entitled to its type material.

The same mistaken understanding of the Code caused certain inaccurate notes in the Corrigenda and Addenda pages (pp. 315-318).

The mistakes in Note 50 arose partly due to an exaggerated focus on the need to date two pairs of apparently competing 1855 names. The table given on pp. 68-81 contained these pairs:

- Under *Aegithalos caudatus glaucogularis*:
Orites (?) *glaucogularis* Moore, 1855 and [*Mecistura glaucogularis*] Gould, 1855
- Under *Aegithalos niveogularis*:
Orites (?) *niveogularis* Moore, 1855 and [*Acanthiparus niveogularis*] Gould, 1855

It will be clear to every reader that as lead author I should have registered the fact that within these pairs one becomes a secondary homonym when the two are brought together. In fact Gould, who knew that Moore had read his paper to the Zoological Society of London at its Meeting of June 27, 1854, did not agree with the use of the genus *Orites* and did not consider the two species congeneric.

The real issue is whether the later name in each pair is just a new combination as if that were clear the names used would not have their own types. For exactly this reason the practice, in the tables in the types papers in this series, has been to disregard new combinations.

That we included these two pairs reflects a continuing lack of certainty about whether Moore really did publish before Gould. Duncan (1937) reported that the relevant pages from the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* were delivered to the Society on April 11, 1855; we do not know how soon after that they were actually distributed, i.e. published. As regards Gould’s *Birds of Asia, Part VII*, is dated April and Art. 21.3.1 of the Code requires that we date this April 30th.

It is perhaps best that while the relevant footnotes must be corrected where homonymy is mentioned, the entries in the table remain unchanged. In the way we have

set out both names in each pair, selected one and put forward a consistent judgement of priority we have acted as First Reviser. In passing it is therefore proper to note that Snow (1967: 55, 58) did not act in that capacity: he credited *Aegithalos caudatus glaucogularis* to Moore, 1855, and *Aegithalos iouchistos niveogularis* to Gould, 1855.