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A list of about 50 names applied to species of leafbirds (family Chloropseidae) and 15 names applied to species of fairy bluebirds (family Irenidae) is presented. This list 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. Delacour (1960) placed the genus Chloropsis Jar-dine & Selby, 1826 along with the genus Irena Horsfield, 1821, within a broad family Irenidae. He also included the genus Aegithina Vieillot, 1816, which we treat in a separate contribution (Dickinson et al., 2003). The sequence of species is that of Delacour (1960) in Peters’s Check-list, modified by the changes proposed by Wells et al. (2003, this issue), but we have followed Cracraft et al. (2003) in treating the three genera as representative of three separate families. We understand that more recent molecular evidence tends to support a closer relationship between the Irenidae and the Chlorop-seidae than either has with the Aegithinidae (F.K. Barker in litt.).
The subspecies considered here differ from those recognized in Peters’s Check-list in two particulars. First, we list *Irena puella andamanica* Abdulali, 1964, which has been described since Delacour (1960) and we also include *Chloropsis kinabaluensis* Sharpe, 1887, which was omitted by Delacour (1960) as was its synonym *Chloropsis flavocincta* Sharpe, 1887. Second, we apply the decisions made in the accompanying paper on this family (Wells et al., 2003).

We stress, as in previous papers in this series, that the views we express are preliminary in nature. 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’. We found the synonymy in the genus *Chloropsis* to be complicated and a potential source of great confusion. We comment on this in an appendix to this paper, which we hope will assist future workers.

As in our reports on Asian types of the Eurylaimidae (Dekker et al., 2000), the Pittidae (Dickinson et al., 2000), the Alaudidae (Dickinson et al., 2001) and subsequent papers, we investigated all the names that we found in synonymy, and we then went on to list each name in our type table. For every such name we 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. See also 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 genus *Chloropsis* or of the genus *Irena* has been published since Delacour (1960). The zoogeography of the family Irenidae as defined by Delacour (1960) was discussed by Dunn (1974).

**The types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Chloropsis flavipennis</em></th>
<th><em>Phyllornis flavipennis</em></th>
<th>Tweeddale</th>
<th>1878</th>
<th>BMNH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Chloropsis flavipennis mindanensis</em></td>
<td>Salomonsen</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>ZMUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| *Chloropsis palawanensis* | *Phyllornis palawanensis* | Sharpe | 1876 | UMMZ |

1 Delacour (1960: 303) gave the original description as the one in Trans. Linn. Soc. (2)1: 333 (1877). In fact the description in Nature, cited in our references, appeared the previous year.

Chloropsis sonnerati

C. s. sonnerati

Turdus viridis

C. s. sonnerati

C. s. gampsorhynchus

Phyllornis mullerii

Phyllornis javensis

C. s. zosterops

Chloropsis, zosterops

Phyllornis mullerii parvirostris

Phyllornis viridis viriditectus

Chloropsis cyanopogon

Chloropsis cyanopogon septentrialis

Chloropsis cyanopogon septentrialis

Chloropsis cyanopogon septentrialis

2 Preoccupied by Turdus viridis P.L. Statius Muller, 1776, which is considered indeterminate.
3 Delacour (1960: 303) dated this from 1827. Zimmer (1926: 322-3) accepted that Part 1 appeared in 1826 although not received by Longmans until February 1827. As Sharpe (1882) had noted Jardine & Selby confirmed this date in the text to plate C. Delacour also wrote “text to pl. 5 (Syn., no. 3)”. This is almost correct. Plate V [= 5] depicted Chloropsis malabaricus (as Jardine & Selby then understood it, for they actually misunderstood it and it became C. aurifrons in part 6 in 1830); C. sonnerati appears as species No. 3 with a description in the 1826 Synopsis Specierum, the pages of which follow those relating to Pl. V; it was depicted in Plate C [= 100] in 1830.
4 This name seems to first appear in Livraison 81 in 1829. Dickinson (2001) concluded that Temminck issued his text on the ‘Genre Verdier’ and labelled these generic pages “Livr. 81” as he did the text pages for all five species. Yet Pl. 512 is shown by Temminck’s MS (RMNH archives) to have been included in Livr. 86. The detailed description of Phyllornis mullerii follows those of the two species depicted in pl. 512. But the first of these three descriptions begins on the same page as the ending of the text of P. cochinchinensis (from Pl. 484) strongly suggesting that Temminck issued all six pages (3 leaves) with Livraison 86 in 1830 and that the original text for Pl. 484 was to be discarded. Temminck no doubt wanted the generic text to precede the texts on all the species in the genus. Dickinson (op. cit.) also noted that an advance copy of some or all of Livr. 86 seems to have reached Jardine & Selby ahead of their publication in August 1830. Interestingly Selby wrote to Jardine (4 May 1830) enquiring whether the latter had yet received Livraison 81 (RSM archives; C. Jackson pers. comm., Oct. 2002); this may have triggered a letter from Jardine to Temminck and last minute revision of Jardine & Selby (1830). Selby’s letter concerned the use of the generic name Phyllornis by Temminck despite the publication of Chloropsis by Jardine & Selby (1827).
5 We have reviewed the action by Warren & Harrison (1971: 273) who considered the name a nomen nudum and thus did not concur with Sharpe (1882: 23) who had noted the presence of a type. Horsfield (1821) provided a synonymy which might serve to provide an indication validating his use of the name javensis. However, the entries in his synonymy would make javensis a junior synonym of C. cochinchinensis or C. aurifrons. Despite the fact that the latter is absent from Java, and that one might identify the 1821 name with C. cochinchinensis we note that Horsfield & Moore (1954: 260) dispensed with these synonyms and treated javensis as a prior name for C. sonnerati Jardine & Selby, 1826. We therefore consider Meliphaga javensis Horsfield, 1821, was provided with contradictory indications that were later discarded by the author, and that only when the name is reintroduced as Phyllornis javensis Horsfield & Moore, 1854, can it be taken to be validly introduced, with validity and authorship from that date.
6 Not Chloropsis cyanopogon as rendered by Delacour (1960: 304).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chloropsis cochinchinensis</strong>(^{11})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. c. chlorocephala</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phylornis chlorocephalus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochinchinensis chlorocephalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. c. kinneari</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochinchinensis kinneari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. c. auropectus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochinchinensis auropectus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. c. serithai</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochinchinensis seri-thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. c. moluccensis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phylornis malabaricus(^{12})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 This is depicted in Pl. 512 in Livr. 86 (1830); its occasional past citation from Livr. 81 (1829) is due to its inclusion in the text for ‘Genre Verdier’ which Temminck labelled ‘Livr. 81’ presumably to promote orderly arrangement of the pages prior to binding (see above, footnote 4).

8 Chasen (1935) listed flavocincta as the name of the Mt. Kinabalu population of Chloropsis cochinchinensis with kinabaluensis (named on the same page as flavocincta by Sharpe 1887), the latter being the male and kinabaluensis the female) in synonymy. This is in conflict with Sharpe (1889: 272) who selected kinabaluensis over flavocincta acting as First Reviser.

9 For reasons to associate this with C. jerdoni see Wells et al. (2003; this issue).

10 It has been argued thatTickell mis-spelled the name from Jardine & Selby (Blyth, 1843). Their name gamsorhynchus was attached to a bird from ‘India’ and Tickell’s use of it was logical. However, it is now thought that their bird was not from India (Sharpe, 1882: 24; Benson, 1999). Tickell, whose name applied to a bird from Bihar, probably used it for what has for decades been called jerdoni and Tickell’s name is best treated as a nomen oblitum. It could be considered indeterminate, except that Blyth (1843), who found it quite distinct, placed it here, as did Strickland (1847).

11 Kloss (1926) considered that this name had been neglected because Sharpe (1882: 27) had placed the name in the synonymy of C. nigricollis.

12 Preoccupied by Chloropsis malabaricus (Gmelin, 1789), see Lesson (1840). Also antedated by malabaricus Jardine & Selby (1826) misapplied or used for a composite species. They corrected this in 1830, applying the name malabaricus instead to the taxon for which Temminck used the name in his Pl. 512 (which was attached to Sumatran birds somewhat different from the bird named by Gmelin). That this was erroneous was apparently noted in a rather incoherent report by Jerdon (1845) and by Strickland (1847).

13 Delacour (1960: 305) wrongly dated this from 1829. Temminck depicted this in Pl. 512, but as regards dating the plate and the related texts see our earlier footnote 4 to mullerii. Note that Jardine & Selby (1830) adopted Temminck’s identity for the name malabaricus which they thought that they had earlier ‘confused’ with the bird named Phylornis aurifrons by Temminck (1829).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis Moluccensis</th>
<th>J.E. Gray</th>
<th>1831\textsuperscript{14}</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>9.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Phyllornis</em>, icterocephalus\textsuperscript{16}</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>RMNH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochin chinensis billitonis</td>
<td>Chasen</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>RMNH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. c. natunensis</em>\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis cochin chinensis</td>
<td>Chasen</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. c. cochin chinensis</em></td>
<td>J.F. Gmelin</td>
<td>1789\textsuperscript{18}</td>
<td>Plate.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Phyllornis viridinucha</em></td>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>1877a</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chloropsis aurifrons**

*C. a. aurifrons*

Chloropsis malabaricus | Jardine & Selby | 1826 nec 1830 | UMZC | 11. |

*Phyllornis aurifrons*\textsuperscript{19} | Temminck | 1829 | RMNH | |

*Phyllornis hodgsoni*\textsuperscript{20} | Gould | 1861 | Plate. | 13. |

*C. a. frontalis*


*Phyllornis frontalis* 'Natterer' von Pelzeln | 1856 | NMW | |

Chloropsis aurifrons davidsoni nom. nov. for malabaricus Gm. | E.C.S. Baker | 1920 | - | |

*C. a. insularis*

Chloropsis aurifrons insularis | Whistler & Kinnear | 1933\textsuperscript{22} | BMNH | |

*C. a. pridii*

Chloropsis aurifrons pridii | Deignan | 1946 | USNM | |

*C. a. inornata*

Chloropsis aurifrons inornatus\textsuperscript{23} | Kloss | 1918 | USNM | |

*C. a. incompta*

Chloropsis aurifrons incompta | Deignan | 1948 | USNM | |

\textsuperscript{14} Sharpe (1882: 30) incorrectly gave the original name as *Phyllornis moluccensis*. This combination was used by Strickland (1847), and although Salvadori (1874) thought Strickland applied the name to another form this view has not been accepted.

\textsuperscript{15} Delacour (1960: 305) dated this from 1832. Adler (1971: p. ii) has shown that the date should be 1831.

\textsuperscript{16} Not *Phyllornis icterocephala* as given by Delacour (1960: 305).

\textsuperscript{17} Of doubtful validity, see Wells et al. (2003; this issue).

\textsuperscript{18} Given as 1788 by Delacour (1960: 305). We consider Pt. 2 (pp. 501-1032) to date from 1789.

\textsuperscript{19} Sharpe (1882: 21) noted that the types in Leiden were marked "India" and inferentially accepted that as the type locality. Baker (1920) wrote that the bird Temminck depicted in pl. 484 had come from India and not from Sumatra and restricted the type locality to Cachar.

\textsuperscript{20} This name appears to have been used earlier by Gray (see comments), but it does not seem with a description.

\textsuperscript{21} This name, on p. 837, was already preoccupied within Gmelin’s work. On p. 816 he used it for what we now know as *Sturnus malabaricus* and it is thus unavailable. However, unlike its availability, its applicability to the genus *Chloropsis* when used on p. 837 is not in doubt. Note that because of its unavailability all the uses of the name *malabaricus* by Jardine & Selby (1826) and Temminck (1830) are equally invalid.

\textsuperscript{22} Cited from 1932 by Delacour (1960: 306). This is from the 1932 volume, but publication of this part was not till 1933.

\textsuperscript{23} Not *Chloropsis aurifrons inornata* where cited as original in Delacour (1960: 306).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P[hylornis]. media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis hardwickii[^24]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. h. hardwickii^{24}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis curvirostris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis chrysogaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C[loropsis], auriventris</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis curvirostris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swainson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis chrysogaster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horsfield</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis hardwickii malayana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis hardwickii malayana^{26}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis h. melliana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chloropsis hardwickii h. melliana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stresemann</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis iazulina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phyllornis iazulina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chloropsis venusta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irena puella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. p. puella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Coracias] Puella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irena puella sikkimensis[^27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistler &amp; Kinnear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. p. malayensis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Muscipica cyanea[^28]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irena malayensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. p. andamanica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irena puella andamanica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdulali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. p. criniger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irena criniger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaucymphya cyanea megacyanea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberholser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irena puella bondi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer de Schauensee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. p. turcosa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irena turcosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^24]: Correctly spelled hardwickii in Sharpe (1882: 18); the spelling hardwickei in Delacour (1960: 306) is an unjustified emendation.
[^25]: Zimmer (1926) dated the Addenda from Dec. 1830; the Addenda mentioned the earlier Pl. C which dates from August 1830.
[^26]: Not Chloropsis hardwickii malayana as given by Delacour (1960: 307).
[^27]: Wells et al. (2003) prefer to place sikkimensis in synonymy, and we follow. But this race was recognised, following discussion with C.S. Roselaar, by Dickinson (2003: 632); this, with the range given it, is consistent with the option noted by Wells et al. (2003).
[^28]: Preoccupied by Muscipica cyanea P.L. Statius Müller, 1776 = Platysteira cyanea (Statius Müller, 1776).
[^29]: Delacour (1960: 308) gave 1859 which is the date of the second volume, not this.
I. p. tweeddalei
Irena tweeddalei
Sharpe 1877b UMMZ

Irena cyanogaster
I. c. cyanogaster
Vigors 1831 ? 22.

I. c. ellae
Irena Ellae
Steere 1890 BMNH

I. c. hoogstraali
Irena cyanogaster hoogstraali
Rand 1948 FMNH

I. c. melanochlamys
Irena melanochlamys
Sharpe 1877b UMMZ

Comments

1. Horsfield (1821: 148) applied this name to a juvenile (Horsfield & Moore, 1854: 261; Sharpe, 1882: 23) and named an adult, thought to be a male, Meliphaga Javensis, but he gave no description of the latter believing it had been named earlier by Gmelin (Warren & Harrison, 1971). Although Warren & Harrison (1971: 587) listed a type, there is another specimen which may have a better claim to be the type and either we, or Michael Walters, will revert to this in due course. Warren & Harrison (1971: 273) discussed this name and noted that Sharpe (1882: 23) listed a type. However, a nomen nudum is not a basis for a type. Should the specimen in question be found an historical label should be attached which explains its status. It should also be recognised as one of the types of Phyllornis javensis Horsfield & Moore, 1854.

2. Sharpe (1882: 24) thought that this name had been given to a young bird that was either Chloropsis zosterops or P. [sic] viridis; these names imply the species C. sonnerati but with doubt as to the provenance. Benson (1999: 105) considered the surviving syntype to be an adult female. He said that the label of this had been marked by Jardine as 'loc. uncertain', but in 1826 it was given as from 'India' (yet that geographical term was then more broadly applied). India is not within the known range of C. sonnerati.

3. Horsfield & Moore (1854: 261) listed two specimens from Java, one being that listed by Sharpe. We consider these syntypes of Phyllornis javensis Horsfield & Moore, 1854. This taxon, in terms of identity and origin, is that treated by Gould (1861), who described and depicted it, and Hume (1878), even if they associated it with Horsfield (1821); see out footnote (above) for a discussion of that name. The juvenile syntype (also the holotype of Turdus viridis Horsfield, 1821) is in the BMNH and the adult syntype may yet be found as investigations are being made.

4. Although Swainson’s holotype of Chloropsis curvirostris is in Cambridge, the type material of Chloropsis mysticalis appears to be lost. For a discussion of Swainson’s collection see Benson (1999: 17).

5. Vieillot (1818) said that the ‘Verdin’ had been brought back from Cochinchina ‘ce qui indique que ces oiseaux sont répandus dans plusiers contrées de l’Inde’. Vieil-
lot believed that *Turdus cochinchinensis* of Latham (and of Gmelin) was the same species as the ‘Petit Merle de la côte de Malabar’ of Sonnerat (1782). No mention is made of Java in the description of *nigricollis* by Vieillot, nor is a type mentioned, and Vieillot’s work was ignored by Jardine & Selby (1826, 1830), Temminck (1829), and Lesson (1840). No type is known of *nigricollis*, which Vieillot did not associate with Java. It would appear that Vieillot hoped his new name could be used for a species embracing both *cochinchinensis* and *malabaricus*. Although Vieillot made clear that the oldest root of *nigricollis* was *cochinchinensis* it seems acceptable to identify his name by the plates with which he associated this name (see Wells et al., 2003).

6. Tickell’s collection went to the Zoological Society of London, which was dispersed in the period 1854-57 (Wheeler, 1997). It is not known whether a type of this taxon may survive.

7. Blyth received specimens from Jerdon (Jerdon, 1845), and in naming this taxon for Jerdon he would have used such specimens as the basis for his description. However, Blyth made no comment on their precise origin nor on whether the types belonged to the Asiatic Society or were to be returned to Jerdon. It is very likely, as Jerdon will have known of Jardine’s interest in this genus, that an early specimen was dispatched to him from Jalna in the shipment which became moth-eaten and was destroyed on arrival in Scotland (Kinnear, 1952). Curiously Blyth (1852: 213) had only specimens from Jerdon taken in 1847 to list. It is therefore almost certain that Blyth’s types were no longer in Calcutta by then. Sclater (1892) did not find it in, nor list it as missing from the Calcutta museum.

8. Although Temminck (1830) had two specimens from Palembang sent by Major Henrici, he considered that his new name also applied to the ‘Petit Merle de la côte de Malabar’ of Sonnerat (1782: 192). Temminck made no mention of Latham or Gmelin.

9. Gray’s specimen was said to come from ‘Molucca’ and to be from the collection of Captain Hay (regarding whom, see Dickinson et al., 2000: 110).

10. Gmelin (1789) based this name on the ‘Verdin de la Cochin-chine’ of Buffon (1771-1786, vol 3: 409) and on Daubenton (1765-1781: pl. no. 643, fig. 3). The depiction of *Phyllornis cochinchinensis* in pl. 484, fig. 2 of Temminck & Laugier (1829) was based on a Javan specimen. Walden (1871b) noted that Temminck reported his specimens from Java and Sumatra did not differ from ‘the type’, i.e. Buffon’s specimen. But he failed to add that Temminck had confirmed that that specimen was ‘en grande partie détérioré’ and in moult.

---

31 Jerdon (1839) mentioned seeing it “in Goossoor, and the Tapoor pass on the eastern side of India” and said it was “far from uncommon on the West Coast”.

32 It might be argued, given that the genus *Chloropsis* does not reach the Moluccas, that the name *moluccensis* was a *lapsus calami* and thus should be corrected, under the terms of Art. 35.2 of the International Code for Zoological Nomenclature (I.C.Z.N., 1999). However, we know of no evidence that Gray sought to correct this and we do not believe this Article should be applied.
11. The type was discussed by Benson (1999: 105), who mentioned Gmelin’s prior name *malabaricus* and wrote that this applied to birds from Travancore and Ceylon “now known as *C. a. insularis* Whistler & Kinnear (1933a). This is not how Whistler & Kinnear saw it. They accepted *davidsoni* Baker, 1920, as validly named to replace the name *malabaricus* Gmelin and their *insularis* was to apply to a population to the south of that which is smaller. Delacour (1960: 306) and Ripley (1961, 1982) agreed. Equally, Benson was incorrect in stating that Sharpe (“1881” = 1882) erred in his synonymy. Sharpe, in fact, recognised that Jardine & Selby used the name for one taxon in 1826 and for another in 1830. See our Appendix.

12. Temminck (1829) considered *Phyllornis aurifrons* to have not been described previously, but Jardine & Selby (1830), who had apparently seen an advance copy of Temminck’s text (marked Livr. 81, but almost certainly only issued in 1830 together with Livr. 86), associated this with the ‘Hurruwa Bee-eater’ of Latham (1823). Temminck gave the *terra typica* as Sumatra, but the type has been identified with India since Sharpe (1882: 21), on the basis of annotations he had found made to the label of the “types” in Leiden. Temminck (op. cit.) stated that the female was not known and that he had seen three males, but that only one was in Leiden. That specimen (RMNH 89128) is now considered a holotype as there is no assurance the other two were before Temminck when he described this.

13. Gould’s model for his plate and the basis of his description was material from Edward Vernon Harcourt. Sharpe (1906) mentioned Harcourt, but did not list any Asian material received from him. The name had been used by Gray, apparently as a MS name, and later appeared in Gray’s ‘Handlist’ (1869: 277) with mention of both Gray and Gould. The types of Gould’s name have not been traced.

14. Gmelin (1789) based his name on ‘Le Petit Merle de la côte de Malabar’ of Sonnerat (1782) and on the ‘Yellow-fronted Thrush’ of Latham (1783: 60). Neither of these authors provided a plate and perhaps the first to provide one was Vieillot (1802).

15. Benson (1999) correctly pointed out that this name was based on a drawing of a male by General Hardwicke.

16. Warren & Harrison (1971), like Sharpe (1882: 18), attributed the name to McClelland. Horsfield however makes no mention of McClelland in this account and the name must be attributed to him.

17. Delessert (1840) had the male depicted and mentioned what he considered the female. His specimens were said to be from Bhutan ‘dans l’Inde’. We have not been able to trace them.

18. The type was not listed by Warren & Harrison (1971) and was considered lost by Gibson-Hill (1949), but has recently been found (BMNH 1936.4.12.1690).
19. According to Walden (1870) Latham based his description on a drawing belonging to Lady Impey. The Rothschild Library at the NHM, Tring, has a bound collection of drawings thought to have been a part of Lady Impey’s collection and a drawing of *Irena puella* is included. Whether this can be shown to be by an artist who prepared it for Lady Impey is not clear.

20. It has been suggested that Lord Hay himself described this (Moore in Horsfield & Moore, 1854: 274), and this may have been what Blyth (1846) meant. However, Blyth may simply have been saying that Hay showed him specimens and made the point that Indian birds differed from Malayan ones (at this time it was apparently surmised that Lady Impey’s drawing of the nominate bird had been based on a Malayan specimen). The reference cited by Moore (op. cit.) to the ‘Madr. Journ. L. S.’ is incomplete and mention is not to be found in Hay (1845), which is the only suitable paper by Hay which appears in the collected works of the Marquis of Tweeddale. Hay’s specimens of this period seem not to have become part of the Tweeddale Collection. The Tweeddale registers, now in Tring, contain no entries that date back that far. It is conceivable that Hay gave specimens to Blyth for the museum in Calcutta and that a type might survive in the ZSI.

21. Nothing is known of Begbie’s material, although at one time it was probably in Madras.

22. Vigors described birds presented to the Zoological Society of London, but its collection was dispersed in the period 1854-57 (Wheeler, 1997) and in this case the type has not been traced.

**Summary of types of unknown whereabouts**

We would welcome information concerning the types of: *Chloropsis mysticallis* Swainson, 1838; *Philemon nigricollis* Vieillot, 1818; *Chloropsis caesmarhynchus* Tickell, 1833; *Phyllornis*, Jerdoni Blyth, 1844; *Chloropsis Moluccensis* J.E. Gray, 1831; *Phylornis hodgsoni* Gould, 1861; *Chloropsis*, auriventris Delessert, 1840; *Irena*, indica ‘A. Hay’ Blyth, 1846; *Musciapia cyanea* Begbie, 1834; and *Irena cyanogastra* Vigors, 1831.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMNH</td>
<td>American Museum of Natural History, New York.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANSP</td>
<td>Academy of National Sciences, Philadelphia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMNH</td>
<td>The Natural History Museum, Tring - formerly the British Museum (Natural History).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNHS</td>
<td>Bombay Natural History Society, Bombay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMNH</td>
<td>Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMW</td>
<td>Naturhistorisches Museum Wien.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSM</td>
<td>Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMMZ</td>
<td>University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMZC</td>
<td>University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USNM</td>
<td>United States National Museum, Washington DC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMB</td>
<td>Zoologisches Museum, Berlin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMUC</td>
<td>Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSI</td>
<td>Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Our conclusions as to the treatment of the original 1821 name, and as to the validity of *Phylornis javensis* Horsfield & Moore, 1854, with consequent effect on type recognition at the Nat. Hist. Mus., Tring, have been discussed with Michael but are our conclusions and do not commit him.
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Appendix 1

Some comments on the early nomenclature:
confusion between malabaricus and cochinchinensis

There is no disputing the author of the names malabaricus and cochinchinensis and whom he drew upon. The name cochinchinensis Gmelin, 1789, is based upon ‘Le Verdin’ of Buffon (1771-1786) and in particular on Pl. Enl. 643 fig. 3, a depiction of a black-throated male. The specimen depicted was said to be from Cochinchine (but see Wells et al., 2003; this issue).

The name malabaricus Gmelin, 1789, is based upon ‘Le Petit Merle de la Côte de Malabar’ of Sonnerat (1782: 192). Sonnerat’s description is of a bird apparently without a black throat. This was named the ‘Yellow-fronted Thrush’ by Latham (1783: 60) and drawing on Sonnerat’s name he naturally gave the coast of Malabar as the origin.

Latham (1790: 349) for his ‘thrush no. 77’ used malabaricus for the same bird as Gmelin, and for his ‘thrush no. 113’ (p. 357) used the spelling cochinsinensis for cochinchinensis [Gmelin], to which he gave the vernacular name ‘Black-chinned Thrush’.

Vieillot (1802, 1818) treated cochinchinensis and malabaricus as the same species and in 1818 lamented the fact that other authors did not do so.

Jardine & Selby (1826) provided a plate (Pl. V) of C. malabaricus ‘nobis’ from India along with a Latin diagnosis and a vernacular description. In the accompanying ‘Synopsis specierum’, following their text on the genus, they cited Vieillot (1802) in the synonymy of C. cochinsinensis45, and listed that taxon for both Cochinchina and India, but they made no comment on Vieillot’s view that cochinchinensis and malabaricus were one species. They described the chin and throat of their malabaricus as hyacinth blue (mento gulâque hyacinthinis) and no mention was made of a difference between the sexes. Through their synonymy in the ‘Synopsis specierum’ Jardine & Selby corre-

---

45 Wrongly ascribing this spelling to both Gmelin and to Latham.
lated their *malabaricus* with Latham’s ‘Yellow-fronted Thrush’, and with *Turdus malabaricus* Gmelin.

Jardine & Selby (1830) started their revised ‘Synopsis Specierum’ with *C. malabaricus‘ auctorum’ from Cochinchina and India – the ‘auctorum’ relating to Gmelin and Latham, and *C. cochinsinensis‘ auctorum’ from Cochinchina, Borneo, Sumatra and India – again giving Gmelin and Latham as the prior authors. They then wrote “these two were confounded in the Synopsis Specierum” of 1826. Next they listed *C. aurifrons* Temminck from India and Sumatra adding “this is the *C. Malabaricus* of the Synopsis Specierum” of 1826. So the name *malabaricus* Jardine & Selby, 1826, is not that of Gmelin which is indeed from Malabar.

In other words they recognised that their 1826 description was misapplied and that it belonged instead to a species described and depicted by Temminck (1829) with the specific binomen *aurifrons*. And in 1830, they gave Sumatra and India as the range of Temminck’s *aurifrons* which they recognised as the same bird they had depicted as their *malabaricus*.

Temminck gave the range of *Phyllornis aurifrons* as Palembang in Sumatra based on three males of which one was then held in Leiden, the female being unknown. In fact Sumatra was not where Temminck’s specimen had come from and its origins were later corrected to North India (Sharpe, 1882: 21). Our present understanding, see the type tables above, is of a polytypic species *aurifrons*, with two races in India, these are Temminck’s nominotypical form in northern India and the subspecies *frontalis* further south. *Turdus malabaricus* Gmelin is a synonym of *frontalis*; it is in fact an unavailable name in this family as Gmelin (1789) used *Turdus malabaricus* twice. With his first use of this binomen he described a starling and that name has been given priority. The name *Turdus malabaricus* Gmelin is thus applicable and available in the Sturnidae, but not in the genus *Chloropsis*.

Sharpe (1882) revised the genus and provided the extensive synonymy typical of the Catalogue of Birds of the British Museum. He accepted a northern *Chloropsis aurifrons* and a southern *Chloropsis malabarica* [sic] (Gmelin) which he listed from Ceylon.

---

46 Temminck’s text on the genus, which carries the information that it belonged to his Livraison 81, published in Oct. 1829 (Dickinson, 2001), seems to have begun as a short text dealing with the two species in plate 484. It was quite evidently revised and extended in the context of plate 512. This plate can be shown (Dickinson, 2001) to have been part of Livraison 86. Most of the evidence suggests that Livraison 86 appeared in September, 1830. However, the revision by Jardine & Selby appeared in August 1830, and these authors referred to Temminck’s plate 512. This leaves one with a choice of conclusions: either the publication sequence of these must be reversed or it must be presumed that Temminck provided advance information to Jardine. There is some evidence that Jardine visited Temminck at about this time (Jackson & Davis, 2001) so that the latter is possible, and this was the conclusion reached by Dickinson (2001). The extended text could easily have appeared with any of the livraisons 82 to 85 if Temminck issued it without waiting for plate 512, and the knowledge of Jardine & Selby’s coming issue could easily have spurred him to publish. Indeed Temminck could well have agreed with them to do this in order that they might cite him. We accept that we lack the facts to settle the issues beyond dispute, but we respect Sherborn’s research on the dating of both books (Sherborn, 1894, 1898). Dickinson (2001) considered that Jardine must have had advance sight of Temminck’s work and in the absence of proof that either of the purported dates is wrong this is perhaps better than ‘correcting’ a date without evidence upon which to do so.
and Travancore. Some pages later he used the name *Chloropsis nigricollis* (Vieillot, 1818) for what Gmelin had called *Turdus cochinchinensis*. At this point the previously widely used name *Chloropsis cochinchinensis* drops out of use over 40 years.

To confuse matters further, the name *Chloropsis malabaricus* was also used by Blyth (1843), whose description of the male Sharpe considered to relate to *icterocephala* [sic], but he noted that this was not the case of the female Blyth described. But Sharpe did not give any determination as to what taxon Blyth’s description of the female did relate. Blyth himself made clear he was using the name in a manner distinct from Temminck and presumably therefore believed he was using it in the sense it had been used by Gmelin. Blyth’s *malabaricus* would not appear to be based upon new type material and Sharpe (1882: 22) indicated that in later work Blyth (1845) used the name as Gmelin did.

By now readers will have understood that the use of the names *malabaricus* and *cochinchinensis* throughout the older literature needs to be put into context to be interpreted correctly. It is always necessary to know whether the source is Gmelin, Temminck or Jardine & Selby. Gmelin’s *malabaricus* is *C. aurifrons frontalis*, Temminck’s *malabaricus* is *C. cochinchinensis moluccensis* and the *malabaricus* of Jardine & Selby, 1826 is *Chloropsis aurifrons aurifrons*.

Sharpe (1882) did not explain why he thought that Buffon’s Indochinese origin was wrong and Java was right, but he had recently advised Nicholson (1881) to employ Vieillot’s name for the Javan population (Wells et al., 2003, this issue).

Kloss (1926) deplored the fact that the name *cochinchinensis* had given way to the more recent ‘and now better known’ *Chloropsis chlorocephala* and argued that Gmelin’s name should be restored to use. He gave reasoned arguments for doing so starting from Sharpe’s placement of it in the synonymy of *C. nigricollis* in 1882 and continuing with information drawn from Montbeillard (Buffon’s editor). His arguments have been reviewed and commented upon by Wells et al. (2003).

If one seeks to understand why Sharpe associated the name *cochinchinensis* with Javan birds the explanation seems to lie in the words of Walden (1871b). Walden wrote, first, that Gmelin’s name was based on Pl. Enl. 643 fig. 2 in the works of Buffon (authored by Montbeillard), and second that “Montbeillard affirms that it [the type] most certainly came from Cochin China”. Walden then adds that Temminck had compared Buffon’s type specimen in Paris with examples from Java and Sumatra, which Temminck found did not differ. In this judgement Walden concurred (however Temminck had also remarked that the original specimen was delapidated). Thus Walden seems to have believed, with Temminck, that there was a single taxon found in Cochinchina, Java and Sumatra and he said that he had not yet met this from the Malay peninsula. Sharpe (1882) seems to have taken Walden to be implying that the origin of the specimen depicted in Buffon’s work was not Cochin China. But Walden did not say this, nor did Temminck.

Sharpe (1882: 29) identified a pair from Saigon with Burmese birds and accepted the name *chlorocephala* Walden, 1871, for these which was founded on birds from Tounghoo in Burma. By then Buffon’s type was probably no longer extant, and with fair series of Burmese birds and of the closely related Malay population (then called *icterocephalus*, now *moluccensis*) it was perhaps logical for Sharpe to believe that Walden had been correct in believing Javan material to match Buffon’s type. This belief would
have implied that Buffon’s specimen could not have come from Cochinchina. Sharpe
however did not explain this. The nearest he came was in his communciation with
Nicholson (1881) who reported that Sharpe had informed him that “the Javan species
is really the Turdus cochinchinensis of Gmelin but he considers that the name should be
suppressed on account of its misleading tendency and that C. nigricollis of Vieillot is
the next in order of date”.

Kloss (1926) however believed that ‘northern’ birds were distinct from those of Java
and Sumatra and in his view the former matched the original figure and description
of cochinchinensis. Walden’s name chlorocephala was, Kloss thought, a synonym of
cochinchinensis. The resurrection of the name cochinchinensis and its association with an
Indochinese type locality has been followed ever since, but Hall & Deignan (1956)
found that there was greater variation than Kloss admitted and that chlorocephala
should be recognized. Their arrangement of northern populations was accepted by
Delacour (1960: 304). But readers will have noted that most relevant literature between
1881 and 1926 will yield no trace of the name cochinchinensis.