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Keywords: Horsfield; Moore; Hodgson; types; authorship; priority; dates. Ornithological literature has been extremely inconsistent in assigning authorship for the new names proposed in ‘A Catalogue of the Birds in The Museum of the Hon. East-India Company’ by Horsfield & Moore, or by Moore in parallel to it. The corrected dates of separate publications by Moore and the ICZN Code allow all assignments to be resolved. Hodgson should never be cited for a new name in this work. All but six taxa are attributable to Moore alone, five to Horsfield & Moore and one taxon, Acanthis flavirostris brevirostris although described by Moore, was described by Bonaparte a few months earlier. The contents are set out to show which families were covered by this unfinished work. Evidence is also presented to show that volume 2 appeared as a single part in 1858, not in two parts (in 1856 and 1858) as suggested by the title page and some recent writers.

Introduction

This paper is essentially bibliographic. The book discussed here, which, when referring to the whole, is cited as Horsfield & Moore (1854-58), is historically very important. The synonymy it provided is vital for understanding the dawn of ornithology in India.

One of the questions faced by the user of this work is: what are its dates of publication? On this, the evidence of the book itself is examined. A second issue arising is the authorship of new names. Although the authors of the work are given as Horsfield & Moore, Moore was responsible for the text (Sharpe, 1906: 396), and indeed his name appears alongside almost all of the new names. However, some valid new names in this work are not obvious in the text. Finally, a table is included giving current nomenclature and a report on the types now in The Natural History Museum (BMNH), Tring, that were once included in the East India Museum (HEI Co. Mus.); in this context some errors in the printed edition of the BMNH type catalogue (Warren, 1966 and Warren & Harrison, 1971) are corrected.

The scope and structure of the book

This book is an incomplete work (Dickinson, 2003b). The “Rasores, Grallatores and the Natatores” (see Horsfield & Moore, 1854: v) were apparently never completed and published. The reasons that may be suggested for its non-completion include the loss of the East-India Company’s rights in 1858 (or its abolition), after the Indian Mutiny the year before, the death of Horsfield in 1859, and the move of the museum in September 1860 from the Leadenhall Street building (sold and demolished in 1861)
to Fife\textsuperscript{1} House, Whitehall, followed by deposit in the new India Office in King Charles Street in 1869 (Archer, 1962). Kinnear (1952) said the museum was closed, but did not give a date and he may have referred to its final closure rather later. Archer reported further moves, final closure seems to have occurred in 1879\textsuperscript{2}. There were already plans afoot to incorporate the collection into that of the British Museum so that a separate catalogue must have seemed redundant, and in these smaller premises continued cataloguing would have been difficult as the birds that remained to be done included many of the largest.

The book is not a bare list. Extracts from various works by Blyth, Gould, Hodgson, Hutton, Jerdon, McClelland, Pearson, Raffles, Royle, Sykes and Tickell, from various MS reports (e.g. Finlayson, Griffiths, Helfer, Roth and C.W. Smith who all presumably deposited papers with the Museum), from Buchanan Hamilton’s unpublished “Notes on Indian birds” and from various works from farther afield, such as those of Horsfield on Java, provide comments on habits and habitat.

Although much of the collection originated from the Indian subcontinent it should be recalled that the Company had interests in Malaya, Sumatra and Java and to a lesser extent in China. The book set out to list the entire bird collection including specimens from beyond the areas under the control or influence of the East-India Company and 1095 taxa are listed. Appendix 1 shows how the book was arranged (and it will be apparent that many families were never reached).

The dates of publication

The title page of volume 1 is dated 1854. Its Appendix II deals with additional material, of listed species, received by the museum during the printing and this includes a few dates of acquisition. These reveal that manuscript material must have begun to flow to the printers before September 1853 and that the latest acquisitions seem to date from April 1854 (which is consistent with the details of accessions given in the Introduction). The Introduction is dated September 15\textsuperscript{th}, 1854. Cowan (1975) had evidence for a publication date of November 8\textsuperscript{th}, 1854.

After the title pages and some introductory remarks comes a ‘systematic list of the genera and species’. As originally printed this was for the first volume alone and would have comprised pp. vii-xx. My copy has, here, an undated table of contents for the entire work (pp. vii-xxx)\textsuperscript{3}.

The rest of the volume\textsuperscript{4} comprises the main list (pp. 1–380), Appendix I (pp. 381-413),

\textsuperscript{1} I have also seen this spelled Fyfe.
\textsuperscript{2} This date correlates with the first substantial transfer to the BMNH which was accessioned in 1879 (Sharpe, 1906: 395).
\textsuperscript{3} The title page through to p. viii seem to make up signature ‘a’ (although this is not marked). Signature ‘B’ (not ‘b’) (pp. ix-xvi), and a short signature ‘c’ (originally of three and a half pages) completed the original systematic list. The signatures reveal that pp. xxi-xxx were printed in 1858 (preceded by reprinted pp. xix-xx) for signature d begins on p. xix after a truncated short signature of just two pages. Signatures d (complete with pp. xix-xx, the latter now a full page) and e also appear at the beginning of volume 2 exactly as one might expect.
\textsuperscript{4} The eight page signatures are lettered b-i, k-u, x-z, 2a-i (f unlabelled), k-u, x-z, 3a-c, this last continuing into Appendix I. From the beginning of Appendix I to the end of the indices involves signatures 3d-i, k-m, this last (3m) being a half signature.
Appendix II (pp. 414-423) and indices (pp. 425-451). The basis is eight page signatures. Dates, no doubt those of type setting or printing, are shown in four places with the signature marks, and two dates appear in the body of the appendices: Appendix I is dated July 27th, 1854 and Appendix II, August 19th, 1854. These are probably the dates these were completed by the editor or editors. The three indices (native names, generic names and specific names) bear no dates. No evidence has been found to suggest that this volume was issued in parts.

The second volume has a title page dated ‘1856-8’, suggesting that this may have been issued in parts. The volume comprises the continuation of the main list (pp. 453-752) directly followed by three indices. There are no appendices. Dates in volume 2 appear at the ends of discrete sections, not in with the signature numbers. These dates seem likely to be dates when MS was completed. The gap of a year between the last two dated parts seems likely to be connected to the effects of the Indian Mutiny in May 1857 and to the fact that minds and finances in India House were probably focussed on the events unfolding there. The dates offer no clear support for publication in parts.

Had there been two parts to this volume the most logical break would have been between pages 580 and 581. A new family starts at the top of the facing page. It begins a new signature and there is a double line across the centre of the page. However p. 606 ends in a similar way, though without the double line across the page and without beginning a new signature. No direct evidence of issuance in two parts has been found, but several earlier authors (e.g. Warren, 1966; Paynter & Rand, 1968; Ripley, 1982) have accepted 1856 for some taxa. However, the card file in the United States National Museum of Richmond (1992) provided a lead to a report in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1858: 390) of the receipt of this volume (apparently as a complete work), and Zimmer (1926: 308) implied a similar receipt of the whole volume by the Boston Society of Natural History. Cowan (1975) gave reasons to accept 30 June 1858 as the date of publication.

**Taxa newly described in the Catalogue and the authorship of these names**

It has seemed helpful to divide the issues of attribution of authorship into three categories. First, there are taxa that Moore described in the Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London (PZS) but which generally appeared first in the Catalogue due to delays in the publication of the Proceedings. Second, there are taxa that Moore described in the Catalogue with no indication of a description in the Proceedings.

---

5 On the first pages of four signatures: Aug. 11th, 1853 (on z), March 18th, 1854 (on 2s), April 19th, 1854 (on 2y) and May 2nd, 1854 (on 3a).
6 The eight page signatures are marked b-i, k-u, x-z, 2a-i, k-u, this last being a single printed page from a half signature. If there was any more to signature [a] than the title pages then it is missing from my copy.
7 On p. 521 (Jan. 18th, 1856) at the end of Fringillidae; on p. 547 (Feb. 12th, 1856) at the end of the Sturnidae; on p. 580 (Mar. 17th, 1856) at the end of the Cisticolidae; on p. 606 (Apr. 26th, 1856) at the end of the Musophagidae; on p. 633 (June 16th, 1856) at the end of the Psittacidae; on p. 649 (July 5th, 1856) at the end of the barbets (the first subfamily in the Picidae); on p. 681 (Oct. 1st, 1856) at the end of the Picidae (here the date is in mid-page and the text begins again with the Cuculidae); on p. 716 (Jan. 31st, 1857) at the end of the Trogonidae; on p. 752 (Jan. 30th, 1858) at the end of the Nectarinidae and of the list.
Third, there are taxa that were described on the basis of earlier *nomina nuda*.

Subsequent writers have been inconsistent, especially in the volumes of Peters’s “Check-list of birds of the world”, in how they have assigned credit for these names. It is time to set the record straight and apply appropriate consistency. Dickinson (2003a) tried to make all the corrections needed (missing one) but had insufficient footnote space to explain the reasons for change. To help with consistency the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999) provides the necessary rules.

The first two categories (tables 1 and 2) are governed by Art. 50.1.1 (ICZN, 1999: 52). Here it is clear, from the well-placed inclusion of Moore’s name, that just the one author was responsible. In the third category (table 3) the term *nomen nudum* as defined in the Code’s Glossary (ICZN, 1999: 111) is vital to its understanding. In the Code it is made clear that such a ‘naked name’ (*nomen nudum*) is not ‘available’, i.e. it is invalid as proposed, but that the same name, in accordance with the provisions for validity, may be made available by its re-use and that it will then take its authorship and date from when such re-use with a description first occurs.

Table 1 provides detailed evidence that the 1854 publication of volume 1 of Horsfield & Moore antedated all the names that Moore proposed in it, where he indicated that publication in the PZS was in hand and, usually, provided a space for the later inclusion of a relevant page number, which he presumably hoped to enter in proof. And, for volume 2 shows that publication in the PZS occurred before the 1858 volume of Horsfield & Moore.

Table 1 also shows whether Moore considered himself the author. For 12 names, all in volume 1, he considered Hodgson the author. For three names, all in volume 2, he considered Gould the author. Of the 12 ‘Hodgson’ names, one is cited to Gray’s ‘Zoological Miscellany’, 10 refer instead to Hodgson’s Catalogue numbers (on specimens in the HEI Co. collection) and the last has no clear indication. Of the three ‘Gould’ names, one mentions a specimen in Gould’s collection, a second a specimen presented to the HEI Co. Museum by Gould, and the last a prior reference to the listing of Gould’s name by Bonaparte (1838), where it is accepted that it was a *nomen nudum*. In this last case, although Moore named and described it, Bonaparte, who discovered this when visiting London in 1855 introduced the name before him (probably thinking Moore’s name would have appeared first).

The influence of Hodgson’s names has been mentioned (Dickinson et al., 2001: 115-116). A few general observations about them are needed here. Hodgson (1844, a

---

8 These numbers are likely to be in line with the drawing numbers referred to by Hodgson (1844).
9 The facts here are curious and require some comment. Bonaparte (1855a) reported to the French Academy of Science on his visit to England and in particular exhibited and praised Gray’s *Catalogue of the genera and subgenera of birds contained in the British Museum*. The title page of this work bears the date 1855 and Bonaparte clearly had a copy, or had proofs. Sherborn (1934) gave ‘14 April, 1856’ as the date of publication, which may have been the official release date, which could have been later than release began! Bonaparte (1855b), just a few pages later, reported on new species seen during his visit to Scotland and England. Here (on p. 658), referring to his ‘A geographical and comparative list of the birds of Europe and North America’ (which he dated 1837; it is later dated 1838, see Zimmer, 1926: 67), he described *Linota brevirostris* mentioning the mountainous surroundings of ‘Erzeroum’ and Afghanistan. These localities tally with the two specimens in the HEI Co. Mus.
list sometimes attributed to Gray), is essentially a list without descriptions. The many *nomina nuda* in this list began to become available, under current rules, due to the descriptions appended in Gray & Gray (1846). Since then other Hodgson MS names, sometimes with reference to the 1844 ‘Catalogue’, sometimes with reference to the ‘Catalogue numbers’ in there\(^{10}\), have been described. These later descriptions, like those in Horsfield & Moore (1854), validate a particular name from the date of publication and the name is then accredited to the describer. Hodgson’s drawings, as long as they remained unpublished, did not qualify to provide validation for his names.

So although Moore is to be credited with these names due to his role (Sharpe, 1906: 396), understanding how they have been treated subsequently must be based on knowledge of the attribution given by Moore. Baker (1930) consistently credited to Horsfield & Moore all the new names in Volume 1\(^{11}\) (of the 11 that he included he mentions Hodgson as a source in seven cases, ignoring him in the other four). Those in the second volume having been published first in the PZS he credited to Moore alone\(^{12}\). Ripley (1982), evidently preferring not to follow Baker, seems to have drawn on volumes of Peters’s Check-list, both published and in preparation, for the 19 names he needed to cite\(^{13}\).

Dealing first with names from Volume 1, Ripley ascribed 10 names to ‘Moore in Horsfield & Moore’ *Ruticilla phoenicuroides*, *Ruticilla hodgsoni*, *Ruticilla vigorsi*, *Pnoepyga longicaudata*, *Nemura hodgsoni*, *Suya atrogularis*, *Horeites major* (although a ‘Hodgson’ name), *Accentor huttoni*, *Orites leucogenys*, and *Ixulus castaniceps*. One evidently inconsistently. Four other names (*Brachypteryx nipalensis*, *Prinia cinereocapilla*, *Pyctorhis longirostris*, and *Abrornis affinis*) Ripley attributed to ‘Hodgson in Horsfield & Moore’, and three more (*Delichon nipalensis*, *Abrornis atrogularis*, and *Accentor rubeculoides*) he credited to ‘Hodgson = Moore in Horsfield & Moore’. The two that he might have cited from volume 2 (*Otocoris longirostris* and *Emberiza stracheyi*) he rightly credited, as had Baker, to Moore in PZS.

Ripley (1982) used the date 1857 for a name appearing on p. 703. This has evidently been drawn from page 716 and is, I believe, the date that this was set in type.

As Baker (1930) never credited Moore with the names from volume 1, and Ripley (1982) played ‘blind man’s buff’ by following ‘Peters’, it should be no surprise that current literature is confused. Baker (1930) was writing before the first truly international Code (ICZN, 1961), where Art. 50 made clear that ‘the contents of the publication’ can make authorship of a name attributable to one of those responsible for the publication. Ripley (1961) was in step with this and made only two slight changes in

---

\(^{10}\) Hodgson (1844) made clear that these were drawing numbers. He had first placed these on his specimen labels and later on his drawings (Sharpe, 1906: 386).

\(^{11}\) Except *Drymoica nipalensis* which he omitted.

\(^{12}\) Including 2 of the three (*Emberiza castaniceps* is extralimital to Baker’s scope), and in one case he mentions Gould.

\(^{13}\) Comments in the paper in this issue on Blyth’s Catalogue describe how Ripley took dates of publication from Peters’s Check-list. This seems to have been routine; no checks for internal consistency seem to have been made. This should not be construed as a criticism of Ripley alone. It is actually unusual to find a work that makes clear that names have been checked back to the original publication, and checks for data consistency are even rarer.
1982\textsuperscript{14}, both probably flowing from intervening work on volumes of Peters's Checklist.

Warren (1966) and Warren & Harrison (1971) achieved a reasonable level of accuracy and consistency, but, as shown in footnotes to table 4, they made several errors. Where, for certain names, their attributions to author differed from those in Peters's Check-list Ripley (1982) took no notice.

Some of this confusion is to be found in the various volumes of Peters's Check-list. Dickinson (2003a) twice followed Peters's Check-list mistakenly. In one case he retained the misattribution of the authorship of *Abrornis affinis* now *Seicercus affinis* citing ‘(Hodgson, 1854)’, which should be ‘(Moore, 1854)’, and in another, although correcting the authorship, he copied the date of *Lonchura leucogastroides* where the date wrongly used was 1856; as shown here it should be 1858. Finally, one additional correction is needed: *Carduelis flavistrostris brevirostris* (F. Moore, 1856), should be *Carduelis flavistrostris brevirostris* (Bonaparte, 1855) as previously reported by Kumerloewe (1967).

Table 4 brings together all the names proposed by Moore alone or attributable to both Horsfield & Moore and groups them in date order according to the publication and authors, thus providing a single accurate ‘authority’ for both authorship and date. The table also serves to support the following section.

**Types from the East-India Museum**

Sharpe (1906: 395-398) listed the bulk of the contents of the museum based on material incorporated between 1860 and 1880. More recently additional material has been uncovered and entered in the BMNH register (pers. observ.). Sharpe wrote that the ‘Horsfieldian types’ had ‘unfortunately nearly all perished’ and that the ‘the specimens obtained by Colonel Sykes and Dr. McClelland were all preserved in a rough and ready manner, so that they have not withstood the ravages of time’. As regards the McClelland material this more a matter of specimen quality than survival, and indeed Sharpe went on to list the receipt of many of the types, as he did most of Sykes’s types. McClelland’s types have been discussed (Dickinson, 2003b), and where Sharpe (1906) found one type lacking I therein reported two to be missing now.

I concluded that most McClelland specimens listed by Horsfield & Moore (1854-58) were probably safely incorporated. Horsfield’s Javan types also survive, though some are very frail and lacking in feathers. So too do some Sumatran types from Raffles despite the loss of part of his collection when a merchantman sank off northern Sumatra. Sharpe (1906) also listed Moore’s types, and table 4 combines his listing with those in Warren (1966) and Warren & Harrison (1971), where the listing of the Moore types is complete (although not always correct). In discussing the East-India Museum Sharpe (1906) made no mention of the material supplied to by that museum by the

\textsuperscript{14} In 1961 he had attributed to *Pnoepyga longicaudata* to Horsfield & Moore and *Accentor rubeculoides* had been attributed to ‘Hodgson = Horsfield & Moore’. Both these names should have been sorted out for Peters Vol. X (1964). In there Ripley dealt with the Prunellidae and, curiously, used a second form of attribution for *Accentor rubeculoides* ‘Moore (ex Hodgson MS)’ with no mention of Horsfield & Moore. Deignan (1964) attributed *Pnoepyga longicaudata* to Moore, 1854, in Horsfield and Moore’. Ripley (1982) follows Deignan in this, but for *Accentor rubeculoides* he moves on to his third rendering of the attribution!
Asiatic Society of Bengal. It was probably all thought to be duplicate material, but it is now apparent that there were Jerdon types included, and probably Blyth types as well, and that some of these specimens have been exchanged, when their status as types was not realised, and that these now reside in other collections (Dickinson et al., 2001: 95-97).
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Table 1. New names proposed by Moore in Horsfield & Moore (1854-1858) for which Moore had sent descriptions to the Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London where he had expected them to appear first (including one nomen novum). In column 2, “H” means that Moore attributed the name to Hodgson, “G” means he attributed it to Gould.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Page in Horsfield &amp; Moore</th>
<th>Proceedings of the Zoological Society, London</th>
<th>Publication date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla phœnicuroïdes</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>1854 page 25</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla nipalensis</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1854 page 26</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla hodgsoni</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>1854 page 26</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla vigorsi</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>1854 page 27</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla rufogularis</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1854 page 27</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruticilla nigrogularis</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1854 page 29</td>
<td>Jan. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachypteryx nipalensis</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>1854 page 74</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pnoepygga longicaudata</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>1854 page 74</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemura hodgsoni</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1854 page 76</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ Tarsiger superciliaris</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1854 page 76</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prinia cinereoapilla</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>1854 page 77</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suya atrogularis</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>1854 page 77</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ Drymoica nipalensis</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1854 page 77</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§ Orthotomus flavoviridis</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>1854 page 79</td>
<td>Feb. 10, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delichon nipalensis</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>1854 page 104</td>
<td>Apr. 5, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pycrorhis longirostris</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1854 page 104</td>
<td>Apr. 5, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horeites major</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1854 page 105</td>
<td>Apr. 5, 1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrornis albogularis</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1854 page 106</td>
<td>Apr. 5, 1855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 If there is no footnote beside a name in this column, authorship was credited to Moore alone by Ripley (1982). Names preceded by §¶ were not included by Baker (1930) or Ripley (1982); there are three such cases (Drymoica nipalensis, Alcippe cantori and Emberiza castaniceps – the last two being extralimital). Names preceded by § were not included by Ripley (1982), but were included by Baker (1930), there are nine of these. For current nomenclature see table 4.
21 The citation must be based on whichever of these two columns gives the earlier date. All names in Horsfield & Moore (1854) have priority over their descriptions in the PZS. The name in Horsfield & Moore (1858) appeared in the PZS first.
22 Dates from Waterhouse (1893) as reproduced in Duncan (1937). All names in the PZS were proposed by Moore alone (Moore 1855a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, 1856).
23 In the 1854 volume of the Proceedings publication of the parts did not follow page order (Duncan, 1937).
25 This name does not appear in the Catalogue of Birds in the British Museum. It was listed by Gray & Gray (1863: 35) with Tarsiger chrysaeus Hodgson, 1844: 70 (a nomen nudum), in its synonymy but with no mention of Tarsiger chrysaeus Hodgson, 1845 (the valid citation). However, judging by Moore’s description Baker (1930: 111) rightly considered it a synonym of Ianthia indica (Vieillot, 1817), which Ripley (1964: 49) treated as Erithacus indicus (Vieillot, 1817).
### Table 2. New names proposed by Moore in Horsfield & Moore (1854-1858) but with no indication of publication in the Proceedings. (n/a = not applicable). (H&M = Horsfield & Moore).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collocalia linchii</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>not given</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microtarsus olivaceus</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criniger ochraceus</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Gray in [H&amp;M], 1854</td>
<td>n/a&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypsipetes nicobariensis nom. nov.</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1854)</td>
<td>Moore (1854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irena malayensis</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1854)</td>
<td>Moore (1854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abrornis hodgsoni</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1854)&lt;sup&gt;35&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Moore (1854)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munia leucogasteroides</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a&lt;sup&gt;36&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus tenuirostris</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Moore ‘apud Jerdon, Birds of India, 1863’</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalaima mcclellandi</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuculus horsfieldi</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858)</td>
<td>Moore (1857)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysococcyx hodgsoni</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachnothera temminckii</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>30</sup> Ripley (1982) listed the author as ‘Hodgson in Horsfield & Moore, 1854’.

<sup>31</sup> Ripley (1982) listed the author as ‘Hodgson = Moore, 1854’.

<sup>32</sup> This was proposed as new by Moore. He was evidently unaware that Bonaparte had published Gould’s name before either Gould or himself.

<sup>33</sup> See Dickinson et al. (2002: 126). The name is absent from Rand & Deignan (1960).

<sup>34</sup> Burmese, and thus outside Ripley’s scope.

<sup>35</sup> Erroneously given as 1954.

<sup>36</sup> Javan, and thus outside Ripley’s scope.

<sup>37</sup> Rendered macclellandi by Baker (1930: 323).

<sup>38</sup> This name was attached to a specimen from the collection of a Mr. Middleton. No type locality was given, and no other mention of Middleton or his collection has been discovered. But Gadow (1884: 102) identified this as A. crassirostris.
Table 3. New names introduced in Horsfield & Moore (1854, 1858); Moore apparently being unaware that they were new. (n/a = not applicable). (H&M = Horsfield & Moore).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Suya fuliginosa</em></td>
<td>326</td>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>H&amp;M, 1854, ex Hodgson</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Propasser pulcherrimus</em></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>Hodgson, Moore, 1844</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Corvus sinensis</em></td>
<td>556</td>
<td>Gould MS</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858) ex Gould MS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picus scindeanus</em></td>
<td>671</td>
<td>Gould MS</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858) ex Gould MS</td>
<td>'Gould MS' = H&amp;M, 1858 (1856-58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Upupa nigripennis</em></td>
<td>725</td>
<td>Gould MS</td>
<td>H&amp;M (1858) ex Gould MS</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Verified citations (based on publication priority); nomenclature and availability of the Horsfield & Moore (1854-58) types. Bold type subheadings show the correct authorship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name given in the original description</th>
<th>'Current' nomenclature taken from Peters’s Check-list</th>
<th>Type mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Moore in Horsfield & Moore (1854)**

- *Microtarsus olivaceus*
- *Criniger ochraceus*
- *Hypsipetes nicobariensis*
- *Irena malayensis*
- *Nemura hodgsoni*
- *Ruticilla phoenicuroides*
- *Ruticilla nipalensis H*
- *Ruticilla hodgsoni*
- *Ruticilla vigorsi*

---

39 Listed on p. 85 but a nomen nudum. By using this name with a description the name becomes *Propasser pulcherrimus* Moore, 1856. Now *Carpodacus pulcherrimus* (Moore, 1856).
40 Described from China. David & Oustalet (1877: 367) listed this and date the name ‘1852-53’. Sharpe (1877: 39), noting that this name is preoccupied by *Corvus sinensis* Latham, 1790, considered it a synonym of *Corvus levaillanti* (i.e. a form of *Corvus macrorhynchos*). The type locality was Shanghai so this name is a synonym of *Corvus macrorhynchos colonorum* Swinhoe, 1864.
41 The exact orthography is not used. Names almost all appeared in upper case letters in Horsfield & Moore (1854, 1858).
42 A nomen novum proposed for *Iiocincla virescens* Blyth, 1845, preoccupied in *Hypsipetes* by *Ixos virescens* Temminck, 1825. Moore’s name is represented by the types of *Iiocincla virescens* Blyth. Sharpe (1906), who may not then have realised this, listed receipt of type material of *Hypsipetes nicobariensis*. As the East-India Museum had three specimens that had been received from the Asiatic Society of Bengal, these may indeed have been from Blyth’s type series. See Dickinson et al. (2002: 143, comment 75).
43 See Baker (1930: 106).
44 See Baker (1930: 106).
Ruticilla rufogularis Synonym of Phoenicurus erythronotus\textsuperscript{45} x x
Ruticilla nigrogularis H Synonym of Phoenicurus schisticeps\textsuperscript{46} - x
Tarsiger superciliaris H Synonym of lanthia indica indica\textsuperscript{47} - x
now Erithacus indicis indicus
Orthotomus flaviovaridis Synonym of Orthotomus atrogularis atrogularis x x
Prinia cinereocapilla H Prinia cinereocapilla\textsuperscript{48} - x
Horeites major\textsuperscript{49} H Cettia major major x x
Suya atrogularis Synonym of Prinia subflava fusca\textsuperscript{50} x x
Drymoica nipalensis H Abroscopus alboalbigularis\textsuperscript{52} x x
Abroscopus affinis H Seicercus affinis affinis\textsuperscript{53} x x
Accentor huttoni Prunella atrogularis huttoni x x
Accentor rubeculoides H Prunella rubeculoides rubeculoides x x
Orites (?) leucogenys Aegithalos leucogenys\textsuperscript{54} x x
Delichon nipalensis\textsuperscript{55} H Delichon nipalensis nipalensis\textsuperscript{56} - x
Brachypteryx nipalensis H Brachypteryx leucophrys nipalensis\textsuperscript{57} x x
Pnoepgga longicaudata\textsuperscript{58} Spelaornis longicaudatus x x
Alcippe cantori\textsuperscript{59} Synonym of Malacopteron affine affine x x
Alcippe magnirostris Malacopteron magnirostre x x
Pycnorhynchos longirostris H Turdoides longirostris - x
Microtarsus cantori\textsuperscript{60} Synonym of Pycnonotus eutilotus x x
Criniger cantori\textsuperscript{61} Synonym of Criniger phaeocephalus phaeocephalus - x
Ixulus castaniceps\textsuperscript{62} Yuhina castaniceps castaniceps x x
Abrornis (?) hodgsoni Tickellia hodgsoni hodgsoni x x

Horsfield & Moore (1854, Catalogue)

Collocalia linchi Collocalia linchi x x

\textsuperscript{45} See Baker (1930: 105).
\textsuperscript{46} See Baker (1930: 105).
\textsuperscript{47} See Baker (1930: 111).
\textsuperscript{48} Watson et al. (1986: 133) wrongly credited this name to Hodgson in Horsfield & Moore.
\textsuperscript{49} Warren & Harrison (1971: 324) erred in attributing this name to Horsfield & Moore and were followed by Watson et al. (1986: 13).
\textsuperscript{50} Mistakenly attributed to Horsfield & Moore by Watson et al. (1986: 143).
\textsuperscript{51} Misspelled albigularis by Sharpe (1906).
\textsuperscript{52} Watson et al. (1986: 264) wrongly credited this name to Hodgson in Horsfield & Moore.
\textsuperscript{53} Watson et al. (1986: 259) wrongly credited this name to Hodgson in Horsfield & Moore.
\textsuperscript{54} Snow (1967: 56) wrongly credited this name to Horsfield & Moore.
\textsuperscript{55} Warren & Harrison (1971: 386) erred in citing this from the Proceedings as the article appeared in 1855. Peters (1960: 125) wrongly credited this name to Horsfield & Moore; Warren & Harrison (1971: 386) cited the 1854 volume of the Proceedings of which this part appeared in April 1855; the Catalogue appeared first.
\textsuperscript{56} Misspelled longicauda in Warren & Harrison (1971: 307).
\textsuperscript{57} Warren & Harrison (1971: 91) cited the 1854 volume of the Proceedings of which this part appeared in April 1855; the Catalogue appeared first.
\textsuperscript{58} Warren & Harrison (1971: 91) wrongly credited the name to Horsfield & Moore.
\textsuperscript{59} Warren & Harrison (1971: 91) cited the 1854 volume of the Proceedings of which this part appeared in April 1855; the Catalogue appeared first.
\textsuperscript{60} Misspelled castaneiceps by Sharpe (1906) and by Warren & Harrison (1971: 96).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Synonym</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suya fuliginosa</td>
<td>Prinia crinigera crinigera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bonaparte (1855, Oct.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linota brevirostris</td>
<td>Acanthis flavirostris brevirostris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moore (1856, Feb., PZS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propasser pulcherrimus H</td>
<td>Carpodacus pulcherrimus pulcherrimus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otocoris longirostris G</td>
<td>Eremophila alpestris longirostris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberiza stracheyi</td>
<td>Emberiza cia stracheyi</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emberiza castaneiceps</td>
<td>Emberiza coides castaneiceps</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moore (1858, Catalogue)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munia leucogastroïdes</td>
<td>Lochura leucogastroïdes</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A[cridotheres]. grandis</td>
<td>Acridotheres grandis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus tenuirostris</td>
<td>Synonym of Corvus enca compilator</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>which was a new name proposed to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replace this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalaima mcclelland</td>
<td>Megalaima zeylanica hodgsoni</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuculus horsfield</td>
<td>Cuculus saturatus horsfieldi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysococcyx hodgsoni</td>
<td>Synonym of Chalcites maculatus</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arachnothera temmincki</td>
<td>Synonym of Arachnothera crassirostris</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Horsfield &amp; Moore</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1858, Catalogue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corvus sinensis</td>
<td>Synonym of Corvus macrorhynchos</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>colonorum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picus scindeanus</td>
<td>Synonym of Dendrocopos assimilis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upupa nigripennis G</td>
<td>Synonym of Upupa epops ceylonensis</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 Paynter & Rand (1968: 253) erroneously attributed priority to Moore, 1856.
66 Correctly spelled castaneiceps by Sharpe (1906) and by Warren & Harrison (1971: 95); the spelling castaniceps in Horsfield & Moore (1858) must be considered an emendation.
67 Not earlier than Jan. 30th, 1858.
68 Mayr et al. (1968: 374) wrongly attributed this name to Horsfield & Moore and wrongly dated it 1856.
69 Misspelled maclellandi by Sharpe (1906); wrongly attributed to Horsfield & Moore by Warren (1966: 180) with the date 1856.
70 Since Peters (1948: 33) the ‘species’ zeylanica has been split and Ripley (1982: 222) treated this as Megalaima lineata hodgsoni.
71 Warren (1966: 130) wrongly credited this name to Horsfield & Moore and wrongly dated it 1857.
72 It has since been observed that the name optatus Gould, 1845, is applicable and has priority (Schodde & Mason, 1997).
73 Moore marked Gmelin’s name (maculatus) as ‘quite inapplicable’. Baker (1930: 331) explained that Moore’s name is a nomen novum. Moore also mentioned smaragdinus Blyth, 1846. It is not clear for which of these names Moore’s was a replacement.
74 Because of Moore’s imprecision, the type material may be that of maculatus Gmelin, 1788, or that of smaragdinus Blyth, 1846!
75 Identified as this by Sharpe (1906: 397).
76 Preoccupied by Corvus sinensis Latham, 1790.
77 For identification with this race see Baker (1930: 361).
Appendix 1

The arrangement of the contents and the taxa included (numbers in brackets)

Volume 1.

Ordo I. Raptore, Vigors
Accipitres, Linn.

Fam. I. Vulturidae 10 taxa (1-10)
Fam. II. Falconidae 67 taxa (11-74, 616-618)
Fam. III. Strigidae 29 taxa (75-103)

Ordo II. Insessores

Tribe I. Fissirostres

Fam. I. Meropidae 8 taxa (104-111)
Fam. II. Hirundinidae78 26 taxa (112-130, 619-625)
Fam. III. Caprimulgidae 13 taxa (131-139, 626-629)
Fam. IV. Todidae79 11 taxa (140-148, 630-631)
Fam. V. Halcyonidae 21 taxa (149-167, 632-633)

Tribe II. Dentirostres

Fam. I. Muscicapidae80 28 taxa (168-192, 634-636)
Fam. II. Laniidae81 [sic] 49 taxa (193-236, 637-641)
Fam. III. Merulidae82 221 taxa (237-421, 642-677)
Fam. IV. Sylviidae83 [sic] 160 taxa (422-579, 678-679)
Fam. V. Pipridae84 36 taxa (580-615)

In the above table numbers 616-679 are dealt with in Appendix I (pp. 381-413) of Horsfield & Moore.

Volume 2.

Tribe III. Conirostres

Fam. I. Fringillidae85 115 taxa (680-794)
Fam. II. Sturnidae86 26 taxa (795-820)
Fam. III. Corvidae87 44 taxa (821-864)
Fam. IV. Buceridae88 20 taxa (865-884)
Fam. V. Musophagidae89 6 taxa (885-890)

---

78 Including the swifts as a subfamily.
79 Including the broadbills and the roller genus *Eurystomus*; with the waxwing and cochoa added in the Appendix.
80 Including the minivets and monarchs.
81 Including the drongos, swallow-shrikes, cuckoo-shrikes and allies, and the genera *Gampsorhynchus*, *Pteruthius* and African *Dryoscopus*.
82 Including thrushes, wren, tesias, pittas, babblers, bulbuls, leafbirds, white-eyes, ioras, orioles and fairy-bluebirds.
83 Including chats, flycatchers, warblers, wagtails, pipits and accentors.
84 Including whistlers, tits, parrotbills and some babblers.
85 Including a tanager, larks, buntings and weavers.
86 Including an oxpecker.
87 Including a bird-of-paradise and all rollers (except *Eurystomus*).
88 Including a ground hornbill.
89 Tauracos and colies.
Tribe IV. Scansores

| Fam. I      | Psittacidae | 27 taxa (891-917) |
| Fam. II     | Ramphastidae| 2 taxa (918-919)  |
| Fam. III    | Picidae$^{90}$ | 78 taxa (920-997) |
| Fam. IV     | Cuculidae   | 37 taxa (998-1034) |
| Fam. V      | Trogonidae  | 7 taxa (1035-1041) |

Tribe V. Tenuirostres

| Fam. I      | Certhiidae$^{91}$ [sic] | 12 taxa (1042-1053) |
| Fam. II     | Upupidae    | 4 taxa (1054-1057)  |
| Fam. III    | Nectarinidae$^{92}$ | 38 taxa (1058-1095) |

Amongst those never covered were the Gallinacei (bustard quails, sandgrouse, pheasants and allies, and pigeons), the Grallatores (herons, storks, ibises, rails, bustards and waders) and the Natatores (ducks, geese, swans, grebes, flamingos and seabirds).

$^{90}$ Including barbets and a honeyguide.
$^{91}$ Including Rimator, treecreepers, wallcreeper and nuthatches.
$^{92}$ Including sunbirds and flowerpeckers.