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A list of about 35 names applied to species of iora (family Aegithinidae) is presented. This list also provides information on the whereabouts of a type. Where our information does not include reliable data we provide notes to explain the deficit and to stimulate others to offer additional data or sources of information.

Introduction

In ‘Systematic notes on Asian birds. 3. Types of the Eurylaimidae’ (Dekker et al., 2000) we explained the rationale for this comprehensive set of articles on the types of Asian birds. Readers are referred to that paper for a fuller introduction and for more details on methodology.

Methodology

Our table shows the names applied to the taxa, with author(s) and date (the relevant publications being reported in the ‘References’). Where a type or types have been located the acronym of the museum is given. The final column gives the number of a comment. The numbered comments follow the table. The arrangement of the list is by species and within that by subspecies. The sequence of species is that of Delacour (1960) in Peters’s Check-list, but we have followed Cracraft et al. (2003) in recognizing a monophyletic family Aegithinidae. Delacour (1960) placed the genus Aegithina Vieillot, 1816, within a broad family Irenidae.

The subspecies recognized here differ from those recognized in Peters’s Check-list in two particulars. First, we include all subsequent names of which we are aware:
Aegithina tiphia djungkulanensis Hoogerwerf, 1962, and Aegithina tiphia trudiae Prescott, 1970. Second, we apply the decisions made in the accompanying paper on this family (Wells et al., 2003; this issue).

We repeat that the views we express in these papers are preliminary. Additional information and suggestions received before the ‘Synopsis’ may lead to modified treatment therein, see Introduction to ‘Systematic notes on Asian birds’ (Dickinson & Dekker, 2000).

All names have been checked to the original citation and original spellings are used. In the case of unusual spellings we add the adjunction ‘sic’.

As in our reports on Asian types of the Eurylaimidae (Dekker et al., 2000), the Pitytidae (Dickinson et al., 2000), the Alaudidae (Dickinson et al., 2001) and others in this series, we have investigated all the names that we have found in synonymy, and we listed each such name in our type table. For each one we have explored what was known about the types.

A list of acronyms appears before the list of References.

Published type catalogues and data provided as part of the original description have remained our main sources, but an increasing community of interested museum curators and collection managers is providing a growing amount of help that is very welcome. In our personal searches for types, which one cannot safely describe as exhaustive, even for the few museums that we have visited, we have been privileged to be able to access and examine type material, as detailed under Acknowledgements. It should not be assumed however that we have re-examined any particular type. We have examined some where we had a particular reason to do so.

No significant review of the family or of the genus Aegithina has been published since Delacour (1960). The zoogeography of the family Irenidae sensu Delacour has been examined by Dunn (1974).

The types

\[
\begin{array}{llll}
\text{Aegithina tiphia} & \\
A. t. multicolor & [Fringilla] multicolor & J.F. Gmelin & 1789 \\
\text{Motacilla zeylonica} & J.F. Gmelin & 1789 \\
\text{Ægithina quadricolor} & Vieillot & 1816 & \text{Plate 3.} \\
\text{J[ora]. melaceps} & Swainson & 1837 & \text{Plate 4.} \\
A. t. deignani & \\
\text{Aegithina tiphia deignani} & Hall & 1957 & \text{BMNH} \\
A. t. humei & \\
\text{M[otacilla]. Suboridis} & Tickell & 1833 & \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^1\) First reviser in relation to priority over zeylonica: Hume (1877: 432); see also Robinson & Kloss (1923: 563).

\(^2\) The generic name was spelled Jora by Horsfield (1821) and corrected by him to Iora in 1824.

\(^3\) Apparently not preoccupied, but by now a nomen oblitum. Baker (1930: 70) considered it a synonym of nominate tiphia in spite of its type locality (Bhorabhúm and Dholbhúm [India]) and the range he associated with humei. Hume (1877: 433, 438) did not recognise geographical forms but had, despite admitting uncertainty about the ranges of potential forms, treated suboridis as pertaining “to the tiphia type”.

\[\]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Repository</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina tiphia humei</em></td>
<td>E.C.S. Baker</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. tiphia</em></td>
<td>[Motacilla] Tiphia</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>Plate 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sylvia leucoptera</em></td>
<td>Vieillot</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Plate 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. septentrionalis</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia septentrionalis</em></td>
<td>Koelz</td>
<td>1939 UMMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. philipi</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina Philipi</em></td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>MNHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. cambodiana</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia cambodiana</em></td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>MCZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. horizoptera</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia horizoptera</em></td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. micromelaena</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia micromelaena</em></td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. singapurensis</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia singapurensis</em></td>
<td>Chasen &amp; Kloss</td>
<td>1931 BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. djungkulanensis</em></td>
<td>Hoogerwerf</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>RMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. scapularis</em></td>
<td><em>Iora scapularis</em></td>
<td>1821</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. viridis</em></td>
<td><em>Iora</em>, viridis</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>RMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia danicra</em></td>
<td>Oberholser</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia zophonota</em></td>
<td>Oberholser</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. t. aequaninis</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia aequaninis</em></td>
<td>Bangs</td>
<td>1922 MCZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia chaseni</em></td>
<td>Stresemann</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>ZMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina tipia traudae</em></td>
<td>Prescott</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>UMMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina nigrolutea</em></td>
<td>G.F.L. Marshall</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina nigrolutea sulfurea</em></td>
<td>Koelz</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>UMMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina viridissima</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. v. viridissima</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Iora chloroptera</em></td>
<td>Salvadori</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>Lost 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aegithina viridissima nesiotica</em></td>
<td>Oberholser</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>USNM 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A. v. thapsina</em></td>
<td><em>Aegithina viridissima thapsina</em></td>
<td>Oberholser</td>
<td>1917 USNM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4 Hume (1877) argued, on the basis of Stephens’ translation from Vieillot (1807), that *Sylvia leucoptera* could not be an iora. Sharpe (1882) wrote that ‘no one, however, examining the plate can doubt that this is *Iora tiphia* …..’ and sustained the generic name *Aegithina* Vieillot (1816) over *Iora* Horsfield (1821).

5 Bonaparte here used a MS name that Temminck had attached to a specimen in the museum at Lugduni (the old Latin name of Leiden).

6 Not 1851 as given by Delacour (1960: 302).

7 Given as *zaphonota* by Delacour (1960: 302). An emendation to *nigrilutea* has not come into prevailing usage.

8 Not 1851 as given by Delacour (1960: 302).
**Aegithina lafresnayei**

**A. l. lafresnayei**


**Phœnicomanes iora**

10 Originally thought to have come from Jamaica. Sharpe (1875) explained the story and why he had found it necessary to correct this.

**A. l. innotata**

*Iora innotata* Blyth 1847 ZSI ? 11.

**A. l. xanthotis**

*Aethorhynchus xanthotis* Sharpe 1882 BMNH

---

**Comments**

1. Gmelin’s name *multicolor* was given to the “Green-rumped Finch” of Latham (1783a: 320), whose description Hume (1877) considered ‘an absolute photograph of the Southern breeding males …’ and Ceylon was mentioned. In later work Latham (1790, 1821-28) united, or appeared to unite, the ioras of India and Ceylon. Despite this Latham’s earlier descriptions need to be consulted as the details, especially on the geographic origins of the birds, are determinant in conclusions as to their applicability.

2. Gmelin (1789) based his second name, *zeylonica*, on the “Ceylon Black cap” which was depicted by Brown (1776: 36, pl. 15) and on the “Ceylon Warbler” of Latham (1783b: 474). The descriptions of these two authors, according to Hume (1877), left him in ‘no doubt as to the race which this name was intended to typify’. We are aware of ongoing work by Lex Raat that relates to the drawings of Gideon Loten (which are in the NHM, South Kensington); it is very possible that there is a connection here, but we are not yet in a position to report upon it.

3. Vieillot’s name is based on “le Quadricolor” in Levaillant (1802: Pl. 141).

4. Swainson (1837) gave no description, nor type locality, but gave the ‘indication’ of “O. d’Af. Pl. 141.” It is thus based on the same plate as Vieillot’s name (see comment 3). Swainson’s name was subsequently spelled *meliceps* by Horsfield (1841).

5. Tickell’s material from India seems to have been presented to the Zoological Society of London whose collection was dispersed in 1854-57 (Wheeler, 1997). This type has not been traced. It will be noted that Tickell’s name is older than *humei* Baker, 1922; this has been discussed in footnote 2 above.

6. Linnaeus based his name on the Green Indian Flycatcher, well described by Edwards (1747), but based not on a black-tailed male. As Hume (1877) pointed out...
the figure “like the description entirely fails to fix the race” to which the bird depicted belonged. Edwards (1747) mentioned Bengal, and also that a Mr. Dandridge had received the specimen from there. However, as Hume said, this did not satisfactorily prove the origin of the specimen, as the term Bengal was often used very generally. Hume (op. cit.) considered that Latham (1783b: 474) established the validity of Calcutta as the type locality of his Green Indian Warbler, which is *tiphia* Linnaeus, and thus the same as Edwards’s Green Indian Flycatcher. Latham achieved this by providing descriptions of both sexes and reporting the Bengalese name ‘Chatuck’. This has been taken as corroboration of Bengal as the type locality of *tiphia* and also as a valid restriction of it to Calcutta. Care should be taken over the description of *tiphia* given in Sharpe (1882); his skins came from Khandala. This is “approximately 110 km SE of Bombay on the main road and rail link to Pune; this is towards the northern end of Western Ghats, and also called Shahyadri Hills” at “18°38’N, 73°30’E” (Kanwar Singh, pers. comm.) and these specimens ought to represent *deignani* Hall, 1957, not the nominate form.

7. There seems to be no likelihood that Vieillot’s type is extant. In witness of this, all previous discussion about *Sylvia leucoptera* has focussed on the plate.

8. The holotype, a female (No. 449) collected in July 1865, is believed to have been in the parcel sent to Lord Walden which was lost (see note 38 in Passerini d’Entrèves et al., 1986: 167).

9. The type locality given as Tana Batu Island by Delacour (1960: 302) is a lapsus for Tana Bala Island.

10. The type was once in Bremen where it carried the number A 5458. It is thought lost following World War II, but a fresh search might reveal it as some other types have been rediscovered (C. Hinkelmann pers. com.).

11. The holotype was a female taken by Capt. Phayre. Blyth (1852: 213) listed such a specimen as in bad order, but Sclater (1892) did not report on a type of this name. No doubt by then the specimen had been discarded.

**Summary of types of unknown whereabouts**

We would welcome information concerning the types of: *Fringilla multicolor* Gmelin, 1789; *Motacilla zeylonica* Gmelin, 1789; *M. subviridis* Tickell, 1833; *Iora Lafresnayei* Hartlaub, 1844; and *Iora innotata* Blyth, 1847.

---

14 It is generally considered that Gmelin did not examine specimens; types for his name thus derive from the works that he cites and it will rarely be possible to be certain that such very old specimens were actually those before the authors or artists concerned. However, in some cases further research will be rewarded.
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Acronyms

BMNH The Natural History Museum, Tring - formerly the British Museum (Natural History).
MCZ Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard.
UMMZ University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.
USNM United States National Museum, Washington DC.
ZSI Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.
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