

Systematic notes on Asian birds. 37.

Types of the Chloropseidae and Irenidae

E.C. Dickinson, R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta

Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 37. Types of the Chloropseidae and Irenidae.

Zool. Verh. Leiden 344, 12.ix.2003: 43-61.— ISSN 0024-1652/ISBN 90-73239-88-5.

Edward C. Dickinson, c/o The Trust for Oriental Ornithology, Flat 3, Bolsover Court, 19 Bolsover Road, Eastbourne, East Sussex, BN20 7JG, U.K. (e-mail: asiaorn@ftech.co.uk).

René W.R.J. Dekker, National Museum of Natural History, P.O. Box 9517, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands. (e-mail: dekker@naturalis.nnm.nl).

Siegfried Eck, Staatliche Naturhistorische Sammlungen Dresden, Museum für Tierkunde, A.B. Meyer Bau, Königsbrücker Landstrasse 159, D-01109 Dresden, Germany. (e-mail: siegfried.eck@snsd.smwk.sachsen.de).

Soekarja Somadikarta, Dept. of Biology, Faculty of Science and Mathematics, University of Indonesia, Depok Campus, Depok 16424, Indonesia. (e-mail: soma30@indo.net.id).

Keywords: Chloropseidae; leafbirds; Irenidae; fairy bluebirds; types; type species; lectotype designations.

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* Jardine & 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 Chloropseidae 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 Pitidae (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

<i>Chloropsis flavipennis</i>			
<i>Phyllornis flavipennis</i>	Tweeddale	1878	BMNH
<i>Chloropsis flavipennis mindanensis</i>	Salomonsen	1953	ZMUC
<i>Chloropsis palawanensis</i>			
<i>Phyllornis palawanensis</i>	Sharpe	1876 ¹	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***

<i>Turdus viridis</i> ²	Horsfield	1821	BMNH	1.
<i>C[hloropsis]. sonnerati</i>	Jardine & Selby	1826 ³	UMZC	
<i>C[hloropsis]. gampsohynchus</i>	Jardine & Selby	1826	UMZC	2.
<i>Phyllornis mullerii</i>	Temminck	1830 ⁴	RMNH	
<i>Phyllornis javensis</i> ⁵	Horsfield & Moore	1854	BMNH	3.

C. s. zosterops

<i>Chlor[opsis]. zosterops</i>	Vigors in Vigors & Horsfield	1830	BMNH	
<i>Chloropsis zosterops parvirostris</i>	Hartert	1898	AMNH	
<i>Chloropsis viridis viriditectus</i>	Hartert	1902	AMNH	

Chloropsis cyanopogon***C. c. septentrionalis***

<i>Chloropsis cyanopogon septentrionalis</i> ⁶	Robinson & Kloss	1918	BMNH	
---	------------------	------	------	--

² Preoccupied by *Turdus viridis* P.L. Statius Müller, 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).

C. c. cyanopogon

<i>Phyllornis cyanopogon</i>	Temminck	1830 ⁷	RMNH	
<i>Chloropsis mysticalis</i>	Swainson	1838	?	4.

Chloropsis kinabaluensis

<i>Chloropsis flavocincta</i>	Sharpe	1887	AMNH	
<i>Chloropsis kinabaluensis</i> ⁸	Sharpe	1887	AMNH	

Chloropsis jerdoni

<i>Philemon nigricollis</i> ⁹	Vieillot	1818	?	5.
<i>Chloropsis caesmarhynchus</i> 'Jardin.' ¹⁰	Tickell	1833	?	6.
<i>Ph[yllornis]. jerdoni</i>	Blyth	1844	ZSI?	7.

Chloropsis cochinchinensis*¹¹**C. c. chlorocephala***

<i>Phyllornis chlorocephalus</i>	Walden	1871a	BMNH	
<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis chloreus</i>	Koelz	1954	UMMZ	

C. c. kinneari

<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis kinneari</i>	Hall & Deignan	1956	BMNH	
--	----------------	------	------	--

C. c. auropectus

<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis auropectus</i>	Wells, Dickinson & Dekker	2003	BMNH	
--	---------------------------	------	------	--

C. c. serithai

<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis seri-thai</i>	Deignan	1946	USNM	
---	---------	------	------	--

C. c. moluccensis

<i>Phyllornis malabaricus</i> ¹²	Temminck	1830 ¹³	RMNH	8.
---	----------	--------------------	------	----

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 that Tickell mis-spelled the name from Jardine & Selby (Blyth, 1843). Their name *gampsorhynchus* 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 *Phyllornis aurifrons* by Temminck (1829).

<i>Chloropsis Moluccensis</i> ¹⁴	J.E. Gray	1831 ¹⁵	?	9.
<i>P[hylloornis]. icterocephalus</i> ¹⁶	Lesson	1840	RMNH	
<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis billitonis</i>	Chasen	1937	RMNH	
<i>C. c. natunensis</i> ¹⁷				
<i>Chloropsis cochinchinensis natunensis</i>	Chasen	1938	BMNH	
<i>C. c. cochinchinensis</i>				
[<i>Turdus</i>] <i>cochinchinensis</i>	J.F. Gmelin	1789 ¹⁸	Plate.	10.
<i>C. c. viridinucha</i>				
<i>Phyllornis viridinucha</i>	Sharpe	1877a	BMNH	
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons</i>				
<i>C. a. aurifrons</i>				
<i>Chloropsis malabaricus</i>	Jardine & Selby	1826 nec 1830	UMZC	11.
<i>Phyllornis aurifrons</i> ¹⁹	Temminck	1829	RMNH	12.
<i>Phyllornis hodgsoni</i> ²⁰	Gould	1861	Plate	13.
<i>C. a. frontalis</i>				
[<i>Turdus</i>] <i>malabaricus</i> ²¹	J.F. Gmelin	1789	-	14.
<i>Phyllornis frontalis</i>	'Natterer' von Pelzeln	1856	NMW	
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons davidsoni</i>				
nom. nov. for <i>malabaricus</i> Gm.	E.C.S. Baker	1920	-	
<i>C. a. insularis</i>				
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons insularis</i>	Whistler & Kinnear	1933a ²²	BMNH	
<i>C. a. pridii</i>				
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons pridii</i>	Deignan	1946	USNM	
<i>C. a. inornata</i>				
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons inornatus</i> ²³	Kloss	1918	USNM	
<i>C. a. incompta</i>				
<i>Chloropsis aurifrons incompta</i>	Deignan	1948	USNM	

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.

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

¹⁶ Not *Phyllornis icterocephala* as given by Delacour (1960: 305).

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

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

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.

²⁰ This name appears to have been used earlier by Gray (see comments), but not it seems with a description.

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.

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

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

Chloropsis media

<i>P[hyllornis]. media</i>	"Mull. Mus. Lugd." Bonaparte	1850	RMNH	
----------------------------	------------------------------	------	------	--

Chloropsis hardwickii*²⁴**C. h. hardwickii***

<i>[Chloropsis] Hardwickii</i>	Jardine & Selby	1830 ²⁵	Plate	15.
<i>Chloropsis curvirostris</i>	Swainson	1838	UMZC	
<i>Chloropsis chrysogaster</i>	Horsfield	1840	BMNH	16.
<i>C[hloropsis]. auriventris</i>	Delessert	1840	?	17.

C. h. malayana

<i>Chloropsis hardwickii malayana</i> ²⁶	Robinson & Kloss	1923	BMNH	18.
---	------------------	------	------	-----

C. h. melliana

<i>Chloropsis hardwickii melliana</i>	Stresemann	1923	ZMB	
---------------------------------------	------------	------	-----	--

C. h. lazulina

<i>Phyllornis lazulina</i>	Swinhoe	1870	BMNH	
----------------------------	---------	------	------	--

Chloropsis venusta

<i>P[hyllornis]. venusta</i>	'Temm. Mus. Lugd.' Bonaparte	1850	RMNH	
------------------------------	------------------------------	------	------	--

Irena puella***I. p. puella***

<i>[Coracias] Puella</i>	Latham	1790	Plate	19.
<i>I[rena]. indica</i>	'A. Hay' Blyth	1846	?	20.
<i>Irena puella sikkimensis</i> ²⁷	Whistler & Kinnear	1933b	BMNH	

I. p. malayensis

<i>Muscicapa cyanea</i> ²⁸	Begbie	1834	?	21.
<i>Irena malayensis</i>	Moore, in Horsfield & Moore	1854 ²⁹	BMNH	

I. p. andamanica

<i>Irena puella andamanica</i>	Abdulali	1964	BNHS	
--------------------------------	----------	------	------	--

I. p. criniger

<i>Irena criniger</i>	Sharpe	1877b ³⁰	BMNH	
-----------------------	--------	---------------------	------	--

<i>Glaucnympha cyanea megacyanea</i>	Oberholser	1917	USNM	
--------------------------------------	------------	------	------	--

<i>Irena puella bondi</i>	Meyer de Schauensee	1940	ANSP	
---------------------------	---------------------	------	------	--

I. p. turcosa

<i>Irena turcosa</i>	Walden	1870	BMNH	
----------------------	--------	------	------	--

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 hardwickei 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 *Muscicapa 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.

³⁰ Delacour (1960: 308) cited Sharpe (1877b), Cat. Bds. 3, p. 267. Storer (1988) cited Sharpe (1877c), Trans. Linn. Soc. (2) 1: 333. Dickinson & Kennedy (2000) reported on their investigation of the parallel case of *Oriolus steerii* and found evidence that the Cat. Bds. appeared in October 1877 or earlier and that the Trans. Linn. Soc. appeared in November. We have since found that Sherborn (1934) dated Cat. Bds. 3 from 14 July 1877.

<i>I. p. tweeddalei</i>				
<i>Irena tweeddalii</i>	Sharpe	1877b	UMMZ	
<i>Irena cyanogaster</i>				
<i>I. c. cyanogaster</i>				
<i>Irena cyanogastra</i>	Vigors	1831	?	22.
<i>I. c. ellae</i>				
<i>Irena Ellae</i>	Steere	1890	BMNH	
<i>I. c. hoogstraali</i>				
<i>Irena cyanogaster hoogstraali</i>	Rand	1948	FMNH	
<i>I. c. melanochlamys</i>				
<i>Irena melanochlamys</i>	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 plusieurs 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 origin³¹ 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)³².
10. Gmelin (1789) based this name on the 'Verdin de la Cochinchine' 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 Goomsoor, 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 mysticalis* Swainson, 1838; *Philemon nigricollis* Vieillot, 1818; *Chloropsis caesmarhynchus* Tickell, 1833; *Ph[yllornis]*. *Jerdoni* Blyth, 1844; *Chloropsis Moluccensis* J.E. Gray, 1831; *Phyllornis hodgsoni* Gould, 1861; *C[hloropsis]*. *auriventris* Delessert, 1840; *I[rena]*. *indica* 'A. Hay' Blyth, 1846; *Muscicapa cyanea* Begbie, 1834; and *Irena cyanogastra* Vigors, 1831.

Acknowledgements³³

As in our previous work on Asian types we acknowledge a considerable debt to those who have published relevant type catalogues (for references other than those cited as references here see Dickinson et al., 2001) and to those working on current drafts for type catalogues that have been shown to us.

Special thanks are due to Robert Prys-Jones, Michael Walters, Burkhard Stephan, Sylke Frahnert, George Barrowclough, Mary LeCroy, Paul Sweet, Sammy Degrave,

³³ We have provided very full Acknowledgements with the early numbers in this series and must now economise on space but our thanks remain heartfelt.

Victoria Kitchener and Pavel Tomkovich for their help when we have been in their institutions.

We are grateful to Richard Schodde for his advice on the best way to approach the problematic issue of the nomenclature of the Javan form of *Chloropsis cochinchinensis*. However, we have proceeded down a different path and the steps needed to resolve this are taken in the associated preliminary review (Wells et al., 2003, this issue). Michael Walters also helped us to clarify the several issues attaching to the name *Meliphaga javensis* Horsfield, 1821, and later uses of that name³⁴.

We are most grateful for the help and patience of Mrs F.E. Warr and Alison Harding of The Natural History Museum, Tring with our library work there and also to Mrs Ann Datta and her colleagues at the Zoology Library, The Natural History Museum, London. In addition we have received helpful information from Anita Gamauf (NMW), and Mrs. Janneke Rozier-Schaap kindly verified that Leiden (RMNH) does not hold any correspondence from Jardine to Temminck in the museum archives. Further valuable bibliographic help came from Rémy Bruckert (MNHN). Murray Bruce kindly reviewed our list of references and offered helpful suggestions in respect to the text as well. Following a helpful introduction by Ann Datta, Christine Jackson most kindly provided information from Jackson & Davis (2001), and from correspondence which she had examined. We are extremely grateful to Mary LeCroy and Christoph Hinkelmann who have refereed this paper and provided helpful comments.

Acronyms

AMNH	American Museum of Natural History, New York.
ANSP	Academy of National Sciences, Philadelphia.
BMNH	The Natural History Museum, Tring - formerly the British Museum (Natural History).
BNHS	Bombay Natural History Society, Bombay.
FMNH	Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
NMW	Naturhistorisches Museum Wien.
RMNH	National Museum of Natural History, Leiden - formerly Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie.
RSM	Royal Scottish Museum, Edinburgh.
UMMZ	University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.
UMZC	University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge.
USNM	United States National Museum, Washington DC.
ZMB	Zoologisches Museum, Berlin.
ZMUC	Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen.
ZSI	Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.

³⁴ Our conclusions as to the treatment of the original 1821 name, and as to the validity of *Phyllornis 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.

References

- Abdulali, H., 1964. Four new races of birds from the Andaman and Nicobar islands.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 61(2): 410-417.
- Adler, K., 1971. Editor's Note.— In: J.E. Gray, 1971. *The Zoological Miscellany*: i-viii, 1-86. Facsimile reprint with Introduction by Arnold G. Kluge. Athens, Ohio.
- Baker, E.C.S., 1920. [New names for certain birds on the Indian list and new subspecies].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 41: 8-9.
- Begbie, P.F., 1834. *The Malayan Peninsula*: i-xvii, 1-523 [appendices i-xix].— Madras.
- Benson, C.W., 1999. Type specimens of bird skins in the University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge, United Kingdom.— B.O.C. Occ. Publ. 4: i-xiv, 1-221.
- Blyth, E., 1843. Mr. Blyth's monthly Report for December Meeting 1842, with addenda subsequently appended.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 12(143): 925-1011.
- Blyth, E., 1844. Mr. Blyth's monthly Report for December Meeting 1842, with addenda subsequently appended (Cont.).— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 13(149): 361-395.
- Blyth, E., 1845. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 14(164): 546-602.
- Blyth, E., 1846. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 15(172): 280-315.
- Blyth, E., 1852. Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum [of the] Asiatic Society: i-xxxiv, 1-403.— Calcutta.
- Bonaparte, C.L., 1850. *Conspectus generum avium*. 1: 1-543.— Lugduni Batavorum.
- Buffon, G.-L.L., 1771-1786. *Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux*. 10 vols.— Paris.
- Chasen, F.N., 1935. A Handlist of Malaysian Birds.— Bull. Raffles Mus. 11: i-xx, 1-389.
- Chasen, F.N., 1937. The birds of Billiton Island.— Treubia 16: 205-238.
- Chasen, F.N., 1938. Vier neue Vögelrassen aus Malaysia.— Orn. Monatsber. 46: 5-8.
- Cracraft, J., F.K. Barker & A. Cibois, 2003. Avian higher-level phylogenetics and the Howard & Moore checklist of birds: 16-21.— In: E.C. Dickinson (ed.). *The Howard & Moore complete checklist of birds of the world* (third edition): 1-1040. London.
- Daubenton, E.L., 1765-1781. *Planches Enluminées*. 1008 plates.— Paris.
- Deignan, H.G., 1946. Descriptions of two new leafbirds from Siam.— Smithsonian Misc. Coll. 106(12): 1-3.
- Deignan, H.G., 1948. A miscellany of new birds from Eastern Asia.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 61: 13-16.
- Dekker, R.W.R.J., E.C. Dickinson, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2000. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 3. Types of the Eurylaimidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 77-88.
- Delacour, J., 1960. Family Irenidae: 300-308.— In: E. Mayr & J. Greenway Jr. (eds). *Check-list of Birds of the World*. IX. Cambridge, Mass.
- Delessert, A., 1840. Text to Pl. 17.— Mag de Zool. (2)2: Pl. 17; text pp. 1-2.³⁵
- Dickinson, E.C., 2001. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 9. The "Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées" of Temminck & Laugier (1820-1839).— Zool. Verh. Leiden 335: 7-53.
- Dickinson, E.C. (ed.) 2003. *The Howard & Moore complete checklist of the birds of the world* (third edition): 1-1040.— London.
- Dickinson, E.C. & R.W.R.J. Dekker, 2000. Introduction to Systematic notes on Asian birds.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 5-9.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2000. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 5. Types of the Pittidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 101-119.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2001. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 12. Types of the Alaudidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 335: 85-126.

³⁵ Delessert published his new name within 'Oiseaux nouveaux provenant du Botton ou Boutan, au nord du Bengale' in the Rev. Zool. (1840: 100-106) where the editors dispensed with a description on the grounds that it would be depicted and described in the Mag. de Zool. It is the latter journal then that, as here, should be cited as the source of this name.

- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2003. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 35. Types of the Aegithinidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 344: 17-24.
- Dickinson, E.C. & R.S. Kennedy, 2000. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 6. A re-examination of the application of the name *Oriolus steerii* Sharpe, 1877.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 127-130.
- Duncan, F.M., 1937. On the dates of publication of the Society's "Proceedings", 1859 -1926.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 71-83.
- Dunn, D.F., 1974. Zoogeography of the Irenidae (Aves: Passeres).— Biotropica 6(3): 165-174.
- Gibson-Hill, C.A., 1949. Bird and mammal type specimens formerly in the Raffles Museum Collections.— Bull. Raffles Mus. 19: 133-198.
- Gmelin, J.F., 1789. Systema Naturae, per regna tria Natura: secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, Differentiis, Synonymis, Locis. 1, Pars 2 (13th edition): 501-1032.— Lyon.
- Gould, J., 1861. Birds of Asia. Part 13³⁶.— London.
- Gray, G.R., 1869. Handlist of genera and species of birds distinguishing those contained in the British Museum: i-xx, 1-404.— London.
- Gray, J.E., 1831. Description of five new species of Indian birds.—[Gray's] Zoological Miscellany [1]: 33-34.³⁷
- Hall, B.P. & H.G. Deignan, 1956. A new race of leafbird from Indochina.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 76: 96.
- Hartert, E., 1898. Einiges über Vögel von der Insel Nias.— Orn. Monatsber. 6(6): 89-94.
- Hartert, E., 1902. Aus den Wanderjahren eines Naturforschers. II. Abschnitt. Reise nach Sumatra, Malakka und Indien. II. Kapitel (Fortsetzung). Naturgeschichtliches aus Sumatra.— Novit. Zool. 9: 193-221.
- Hay, Lord A., 1845. Descriptions of some supposed new, or imperfectly described, species of birds.— Madras J. Lit. Sci. 13(2): 145-164 (1844).
- Horsfield, T., 1821. A systematic arrangement and description of birds from the island of Java.— Trans. Linn. Soc., Lond. 13: 133-200.
- Horsfield, T., 1840. List of Mammalia and Birds collected in Assam by John McClelland, Esq., Assistant-Surgeon in the service of the East India Company, Bengal Establishment, Member of the late Deputation which was sent into that country for the purpose of investigating the nature of the Tea Plant.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 146-167 (1839).
- Hume, A.O., 1878. A revised list of the birds of Tenasserim. With notes by W.R. Davison.— Stray Feathers 6(1/6): i-viii, 1-524.
- I.C.Z.N., 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
- Jackson, C.E. & P. Davis, 2001. Sir William Jackson. A life in natural history: 1-xii, 1-244.— London.
- Jardine, W. & P.J. Selby, 1826-1828. Illustrations of Ornithology. 1: pl. 1-50 and unpaginated texts.³⁸— Edinburgh.
- Jardine, W. & P.J. Selby, 1828-1830. Illustrations of Ornithology. 2: pl. 51-100 and unpaginated texts.³⁹— Edinburgh.
- Jardine, W. & P.J. Selby, 1830-1835. Illustrations of Ornithology. 3: pl. 101-151 and unpaginated texts.⁴⁰— Edinburgh.
- Jerdon, T.C., 1839. Catalogue of the birds of Peninsular India. Pt. 2.— Madras J. Lit. Sci. 10(25): 234-269.
- Jerdon, T.C., 1845. Second supplement to the catalogue of the birds of peninsular India.— Madras J. Lit. Sci. 13(31) (1844): 116-144.

³⁶ The two birds described appeared as Pls. 13 and 15; plates and texts are bound in Vol. 3.

³⁷ This was incorrectly cited as pp. 3-4 by Deignan (1946).

³⁸ Plate V and Synopsis Specierum published Feb. 1827 (Sherborn, 1894); but 1826 in footnote in Zimmer (1926). The way in which the plates have been bound differs widely and as given here relates to a set in the Rothschild Library, Tring.

³⁹ Plate C and corrected Synopsis Specierum published Aug. 1830 (Sherborn, 1894; Zimmer, 1926).

⁴⁰ Addenda re *Phytotoma* and *Chloropsis* published Dec. 1830 (Zimmer, 1926).

- Kinney, N.B., 1952. The history of Indian mammalogy and ornithology. Part II. Birds.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 51(1): 104-110.
- Kloss, C.B., 1918. On birds recently collected in Siam.— Ibis (10)6: 76-114, 189-234.
- Kloss, C.B., 1926. Two neglected bird names: *Eucichla guajana* (P.L.S. Mull.) and *Chloropsis cochinchinensis* (Gm.).— J. Malay. Br. Roy. Asiat. Soc. 4: 161-163.
- Koelz, W.N., 1954. Ornithological studies. I. New birds from Iran, Afghanistan and India.— Contr. Inst. Reg. Explor. 1: 1-32.
- Latham, J., 1783. A general synopsis of birds. 2. Pt. 1: 1-366.— London.
- Latham, J., 1790. Index ornithologicus, sive systema ornithologiae; complectens avium divisionem in classes, ordines, genera, species, ipsarumque varietates: adjectis synonymis, locis, descriptionibus, & c. 1: i-xviii, 1-500.— London.
- Latham, J., 1823. A general history of birds. 4: 1-362.
- Lesson, R.P., 1840. Note sur les genres *Phyllornis* et *Petrocossyphus*, avec des espèces nouvelles.— Rev. Zool. 3: 164-166.
- Meyer de Schauensee, R., 1940. The birds of the Batu islands.— Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philad. 92: 23-42.
- Moore, F., 1854.— In: T. Horsfield & F. Moore, 1854. A catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East India Company: i-xxx, 1-752. London.
- Nicholson, F., 1881. List of birds collected by Mr. H.O. Forbes on the island of Java.— Ibis (4)5: 138-156.
- Oberholser, H.C., 1917. Diagnosis of a new pycnonotine family of the Passeriformes.— J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 7(17): 537-541.
- Rand, A.L., 1948. Five new birds from the Philippines.— Fieldiana, Zool. 31(25): 201-205.
- Ripley, S.D., 1961. A synopsis of the birds of India and Pakistan together with those of Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Ceylon: i-xxxvi, 1-703.— Bombay.
- Ripley, S.D., 1982. A synopsis of the birds of India and Pakistan together with those of Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka (second edition): i-xxvi, 1-653.— Bombay.
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1918. On a collection of birds from the Province of Puket, Peninsular Siam.— J. Nat. Hist. Soc. Siam 3(2): 87-119.
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1923. Eleven new Oriental Birds.— J. Fed. Mal. St. Mus. 11: 53-57.
- Salomonsen, F., 1953. Miscellaneous notes on Philippine birds.— Vidensk. Medd. Dansk naturh. For. 115: 205-281.
- Salvadori, T., 1874. Catalogo sistematico degli uccelli di Borneo.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova 5: 1-429.
- Scater, W.L., 1892. On the Indian Museum and its collection of birds.— Ibis (6)4: 65-87.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1876. Prof. Steere's expedition to the Philippines.— Nature 14 (Aug 3): 297-298.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1877a. Contributions to the ornithology of Borneo. Part II.— Ibis (4)1: 1-25.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1877b. Catalogue of the birds in the British Museum⁴¹. III: i-xiii, 1-344.— London.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1877c. On the birds collected by Professor J.B. Steere in the Philippine Archipelago.— Trans. Linn. Soc., Lond., 2nd. Ser. 1(6): 307-355.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1882. Catalogue of the birds in the British Museum⁴². VI: i-xiii, 1-421 (1881).⁴³— London.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1887. Notes on a collection of birds made by Mr. John Whitehead on the Mountain of Kina Balu, in Northern Borneo, with descriptions of new species.— Ibis (5)5: 435-454.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1889. On the ornithology of northern Borneo.— Ibis (6)1: 63-85, 185-205, 265-283, 409-443.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1906. History of the Collections of the British Museum (Nat. Hist.). 2: 1-782.— London.

⁴¹ The second title page reads: Catalogue of the Passeriformes, or perching birds, in the collection of the British Museum. Coliomorphae, containing the families Corvidae, Paradiseidae, Oriolidae, Dicruridae and Prionopidae.

⁴² The second title page reads: Catalogue of the Passeriformes, or perching birds, in the collection of the British Museum. Cichlomorphae: Part III. Containing the first portion of the family Timeliidae (Babbling-Thrushes).

⁴³ Vol. 6, dated 1881, appeared on 25 Mar. 1882 (Sherborn, 1934).

- Sherborn, C.D., 1894. Dates of publication of Jardine and Selby's Illustrations of Ornithology.— *Ibis* (6)6: 326.
- Sherborn, C.D., 1934. Dates of publication of catalogues of Natural History (post 1850) issued by the British Museum.— *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (10)13: 308-312.
- Sherborn, C.D., 1898. On the dates of Temminck and Laugier's "Planches coloriées".— *Ibis* (7)4: 485-488.
- Sonnerat, P., 1782. Voyage aux Indes Orientales et à la Chine, fait par ordre du Roi, depuis 1774 jusqu'en 1781: dans lequel on traite des Mœurs, de la Religion, des Sciences et des Arts des Indiens, des Chinois, des Pégouins et des Madéagasses; suivi d'Observations sur le Cap de Bonne-Espérance, les Iles de France et de Bourbon, les Maldives, Ceylan, Malacca, les Philippines et les Moluques et des Recherches sur l'Histoire Naturelle de ces Pays. 2: i-viii, 1-298.— Paris.
- Statius Müller, P.L., 1776. Linne's Natursystems: Supplements und Register Band: 1-536.— Nurnberg.
- Steere, J.B., 1890. A list of the birds and mammals collected by the Steere Expedition to the Philippines. 30.— *Ann Arbor, Michigan*.
- Storer, R.W., 1988. Type specimens of birds in the collections of the University of Michigan Museum of Zoology.— *Misc. Publ. Mus. Zool. Univ. Michigan* 174: i-iv, 1-69.
- Stresemann, E., 1923. Neue Formen aus Süd-China.— *J. f. Orn.* 71(2/3): 362-365.
- Strickland, H.E., 1847⁴⁴. Notes on certain species of birds from Malacca.— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 14: 99-105.
- Swainson, W., 1838. Animals in Menageries *in* Lardner's Cabinet Cyclopaedia. 98: i-viii, 1-373.— London.
- Swinhoe, R., 1870. On the ornithology of Hainan.— *Ibis* (2)6: 77-97, 230-256, 342-367.
- Temminck, C.J. 1829. Livr. 81, pl. 484. See Temminck, C.J. & M. Laugier de Chartreuse, 1820-1839.
- Temminck, C.J. 1830. Livr. 86, pl. 512. See Temminck, C.J. & M. Laugier de Chartreuse, 1820-1839.
- Temminck, C.J. & M. Laugier de Chartreuse, 1820-1839. Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées d'oiseaux, pour servir de suite et de complément aux planches enluminées de Buffon: 102 livr., 600 pls.— Paris.
- Tickell, S.R., 1833. List of birds collected in the jungles of Borabhum and Dholbhum.— *J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal* 2: 569-583.
- Tweeddale, A., Marquis of, 1878. Contributions to the ornithology of the Philippines, No. II. On the collection made by Mr. A.H. Everett in the Island of Zebu.— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.*: 755-769 (1877).
- Vieillot, L.P., 1802.— In: J.B. Audebert & L.P. Vieillot, 1802. Oiseaux dorés ou a reflet métalliques. 2. ['Histoire naturelles des Grimpereaux et soui mangas' (pp. 1-128) and 'Histoire naturelle des oiseaux de paradis' (pp. 1-40 including a combined index)]. Paris.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1816. Analyse d'une nouvelle ornithologie élémentaire: i-iv, 1-70.— Paris.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1818. 'POLOCHION' pp. 422-432.— In: J.J. Virey, 1818. Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle. 27. PLA - POR: 1-586. Paris.
- Vigors, N.A., 1830.— In: N.A. Vigors & T. Horsfield, 1830. Catalogue of zoological collections: 633-697. In: S. Raffles, 1830. Memoir of the life and public service of Sir Thomas Stamford Raffles, FRS: i-xvi, 1-723. London.
- Vigors, N.A., 1831. A collection of birds presented to the Society by H.H. Lindsay.— *Proc. Commit. Sci. Corresp. Zool. Soc. Lond.* : 96-98.
- von Pelzeln, A., 1856. Neue und wenig gekannte Arten der kaiserlichen ornithologischen Sammlung.— *Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-Nat. classe* 20: 153-166, pl. I-II.
- Walden, A., Viscount, 1870. Descriptions of some new species of birds from Southern Asia.— *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (4)5: 416-418.
- Walden, A., Viscount, 1871a. Descriptions of three new species of Asiatic birds.— *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (4)7: 241-242.
- Walden, A., Viscount, 1871b. Observations on Dr. Stoliczka's 'Contributions to Malayan Ornithology'.— *Ibis* (3)1: 158-177.
- Warren, R.L.M. & C.J.O. Harrison, 1971. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 2: i-vi, 1-628.— London.

⁴⁴ Often wrongly dated 1846 but see Duncan (1937).

- Wells, D.R., E.C. Dickinson & R.W.R.J. Dekker, 2003. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 36. A preliminary review of the Chloropseidae and Irenidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 344: 25-42.
- Wheeler, A., 1997. Zoological collections in the early British Museum: the Zoological Society's Museum.— Arch. Nat. Hist. 24(1): 89-126.
- Whistler, H. & N.B. Kinnear, 1933a. The Vernay Scientific Survey of the Eastern Ghats (Ornithological section) II.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 35(4): 737-760 (1932).
- Whistler, H. & N.B. Kinnear, 1933b. The Vernay Scientific Survey of the Eastern Ghats (Ornithological section) V.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 36(3): 561-590.
- Zimmer, J.T., 1926. Catalogue of the Edward E. Ayer Ornithological Library.— Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Zool. 16(1): i-x, 1-364.

Received: 9.v.2003 (first draft); 1.vii.2003 (final draft)

Accepted: 24.vii.2003

Edited: C. van Achterberg

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. cochinsinensis*⁴⁵, 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*.⁴⁶ 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 communication 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*.

