

Correspondence



urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:DDEE80CD-BAB3-423F-BF91-271F44D90B3C

The correct name for the Siberian Black-billed Capercaillie is *Tetrao urogalloides* (Aves: Tetraonidae)

JIŘÍ MLÍKOVSKÝ

Department of Zoology, National Museum, Václavské náměstí 68, CZ-115 79 Praha 1, Czech Republic. E-mail: jiri_mlikovsky@nm.cz

The Black-billed Capercaillie is a widespread species of north-eastern Asia, being almost endemic to Russia, but also occurring in northern Mongolia and northernmost China (Potapov 1985, 1987; De Juana 1994; Madge & McGowan 2002; Storch 2007). Two different names are in current use for this species in the scientific literature: *Tetrao urogalloides* Middendorff, 1853 (e.g. Buturlin 1901: 66, 1935: 185; Kirikov 1952: 103; Hjort 1970: 307; Walters 1980: 34; Potapov 1985: 361, 1987: 186; Haffer 1989; Klaus *et al.* 1989; Andreev 1991; Grant & Grant 1997: 7773; Klaus & Andreev 2001; Meserve 2005: 77; Klement'ev 2011) and *Tetrao parvirostris* Bonaparte, 1856 (e.g. Dresser 1903: 697; Hartert 1917: 292, 1921: 1884; Štegman 1926: 229; Peters 1934: 26; Vaurie 1965: 260; Stepanân 1990: 136; Inskipp *et al.* 1996: 27; Madge & McGowan 2002: 373; Dickinson 2003: 46; Zheng 2005: 47; Koblik *et al.* 2006: 106; Brazil 2010: 30). This situation is untenable. Thus, I restudied the nomenclatural history of this species to determine which name is correct, with the following results.

The species was first described by Middendorff (1853: 195) as *Tetrao urogalloides*. Shortly thereafter, Bonaparte (1856: 880) created for Middendorff's *urogalloides*, without explanation, *Tetrao parvirostris* as a new replacement name (*sensu* ICZN 1999; hereafter the Code). In spite of that, Middendorff's *urogalloides* was in prevailing use (see Ogilvie-Grant 1893: 66 for references) until Ogilvie-Grant (1893: 66) suggested that it is preoccupied by *urogalloides* Nilsson (no citation given; see also Hartert 1917: 292, 1921: 1884) and should be abandoned in favor of *parvirostris* Bonaparte. Buturlin (1935: 185) argued that Nilsson (no citation given) applied his *urogalloides* to hybrids and that this name thus cannot compete for priority with *urogalloides* of Middendorff.

Neither Ogilvie-Grant (1893), Hartert (1917, 1921) nor Buturlin (1935) referred to a code of zoological nomenclature, which left their arguments unsupported. This might have been the reason, together with the limited accessibility of Buturlin's (1935) work to non-Russian readers, that the species continued to be called in scientific literature both *Tetrao urogalloides* Middendorff and *Tetrao parvirostris* Bonaparte (see above for references).

Nilsson (1824: xxxii) explicitly created the name *Tetrao T[etri]x urogallides* [sic] for hybrids between the Western Capercaillie *Tetrao urogallus* Linnaeus, 1758, and the Black Grouse *Tetrao tetrix* Linnaeus, 1758. Names based on hybrid specimens as such are excluded from the provisions of the Code (Art. 1.3.3) and thus do not compete for priority. Provisions of Art. 23.8 of the Code do not apply, because Nilsson (1824) explicitly created the name for a hybrid as such.

Nilsson (1835: 72) emended his own *urogallides* to *urogalloides*, which would be an unsubstantiated emendation and *urogalloides* would thus be available from Nilsson (1835) if *urogallides* were available for nomenclatural purposes. However, because *urogallides* Nilsson, 1824, is not available for nomenclatural purposes, *urogalloides* Nilsson, 1835, is also not available. Note that the spelling *urogalloides* (with reference to Nilsson) was used already by Ekström (1830: 83), but there is no indication in Ekström's paper that he intended to emend the spelling, so his *urogalloides* is just an incorrect subsequent spelling of *urogallides* Nilsson, 1824, and has no standing in zoological nomenclature.

Middendorff's (1853) *urogalloides* is thus not preoccupied. Also, there is no reason for the reversal of precedence under the provisions of Art. 23.9 of the Code, because *urogalloides* Middendorff was used for the Black-billed Capercaillie after 1899 (Art. 23.9.1.1 of the Code; see above for references).

Hence, the Black-billed Capercaillie should be called *Tetrao urogalloides* Middendorff, 1853, not *Tetrao parvirostris* Bonaparte, 1856.

Acknowledgments

The preparation of this paper was supported by grant 10/300/PM/ 2012 from the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic.