

Systematic notes on Asian birds. 47. Blyth's 'Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum Asiatic Society' and his 1849 Supplemental Note, with historical comments

E.C. Dickinson

Dickinson, E.C. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 47. Blyth's 'Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum Asiatic Society' and his 1849 Supplemental Note, with historical comments.

Zool. Verh. Leiden 350, 26.xi.2004: 167-181.— ISSN 0024-1652/ISBN 90-73239-95-8.

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@tiscali.co.uk).

Keywords: Blyth; Hodgson; catalogue; corrections; dates; citations; *Dumetia*; *Dinopium benghalense dilutum*; lectotype; *Cisticola exilis tytleri*.

Blyth's Catalogue is sometimes cited from 1849 and sometimes from 1852. Both dates can be found in Peters's Check-list, each, in different volumes, appearing to be accepted. Consequently and inconsistently both are found in other works. The cover is dated 1849. The evidence, however, shows that while much was printed in 1849 publication was not before September 1852. Meanwhile Blyth's 'Supplemental Note' appeared in 1849. Most of the new taxa described in that were described then to ensure that Blyth's names, already in his proof sheets for his Catalogue, obtained priority. In Peters's Check-list most of these names have been cited correctly, i.e. from his Supplemental Note. However, a few exceptions need attention and their dates need to be corrected in works of reference. In two instances the source cited should be changed. These cases and a few others are discussed. Blyth's honest intent to give credit to his correspondents for their new names that he gave to new taxa is explained.

Introduction

Edward Blyth (1810-1873) arrived in Calcutta in September 1841 to take up the post of Curator of the Museum of the Asiatic Society of Bengal. His 'Catalogue of the birds in the Museum Asiatic Society' (Blyth, 1852a), which has a cover date of 1849, reflected the great success of his first years in India, when many able naturalists were delighted to help endow the collection that was now benefiting from his experience, enthusiasm and attention to detail. From 1842 until 1863 many articles by Blyth appeared in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (J.A.S.B.¹) (Grote, 1875)². The catalogue listed all the avian materials held in 1849, including the mass of comparative material brought together from around the world, and its value is greatest where it deals with taxa that Blyth had named. Here we learn which of his own names he had since found to be synonyms, for example because he had given the names to immature specimens of taxa already known. And here we gain assurance about whether specimens likely to be types (but not specifically signalled as such) were in the museum.

Blyth was always conscious of his limited library resources and it was undoubtedly this that led him to despatch proofs of his Catalogue to internationally renowned

¹ Abbreviated to 'J.A.S.' by Blyth in his Catalogue.

² This is not just an introduction to a book but also a tribute to Blyth with a rather complete bibliography.

ornithologists. The result of this process was that although the main body of the work was proofed, or even perhaps printed, in 1849 there are 34 pages inserted at the front that are dated (p. xxviii) 'June 20th 1852'. It is not obvious when the various appendices at the back were printed, but see below.

The conflict between the 1849 cover date and the internal date of 1852 has naturally led to some confusion. Although 1849 is sometimes cited as the publication date there has never been any evidence to show publication before 1852³. By contrast it is certainly clear that proofs were available to a few other ornithologists by late 1849 and that birds mentioned in the proof pages were occasionally named by others before 1852 (Mathews, 1925: 10).

Mathews stated 'The complication is that so many names are quoted by Gray and Bonaparte in 1849, 50, 51, which must date from these writers.' This statement is perhaps too sweeping. At the level of specific names the significance of the 'Supplemental Note' (Blyth, 1849) must be mentioned (see below), but as regards generic names Mathews seems to be right; Mathews & Iredale (1921) observed that Gray (1849) had included the generic names *Blagrus* and *Pseudastur* citing 'Blyth (1849)' and that these must be ascribed to Gray not Blyth⁴.

It has been noted by Zimmer (1926: 63) that it could be argued that the circulation of the proofs could be taken to constitute publication. In favour it may be argued that the pages sent out were numbered consecutively with their final numbers and that, as far as we can tell, no changes were made to these pages at a later date. Most new names that appear are associated with mention of 'J.A.S. XVIII', and an indication that pagination would be entered⁵. This essentially refers to the 'Supplemental Note' discussed below. Blyth's evident intention to add page numbers supports the idea that these were just proofs, but the fact that these additions were not inserted undermines this view.

The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999) is clear that proof sheets do not themselves constitute publication (Art. 9.3)⁶. The Code also provides for instances where an author distributes separates or preprints (Art. 21.8). This must be read in conjunction with the definition of 'Preprint' in the glossary of the Code. It would appear that the distribution of proof sheets, even if sent with a copy of a cover dated 1849, does not sufficiently meet the requirements laid down for a preprint. In this instance there was no separate date on the proof sheets. There is no evidence that the

³ Mathews (1925: 10) employed the date 'after Sept. 1st 1852'.

⁴ Reasonably careful perusal of Blyth's Catalogue suggested he used 46 names for genera or subgenera that he thought to be his own (and in one of these cases - *Clamator* - he was mistaken). Appendix 2 to this paper provides additional information on generic names.

⁵ The footnote on p. 800 in Blyth (1849) explained Blyth's intentions.

⁶ But see Opinion 212 (ICZN, 1954) by which an exception has been authorised. One referee of this paper would have preferred that the author accept 1849 as a publication date. I take the position that such a choice is not available to me. 'There is no "case law" in zoological nomenclature. Problems in nomenclature are decided by applying the Code directly, and never by reference to precedent.' (Ride, 1999: xx). Therefore, other cases involving names taken from proof sheets must be judged on their merits and if necessary the Commission should be applied to for a ruling on the cases. Those who disagree with the treatment here of the dating of Blyth's Catalogue may, of course, make the appropriate application.

title page accompanied these. If it did, with the date of 1849, which was maintained when the Catalogue was issued in 1852, the date is not 'its own specified date' (i.e. the date with the proofs would not be distinct from the date on the final work).

Having taken the view that Blyth's circulation of the proofs does not qualify as publication, this paper nonetheless reviews the evidence for publication in 1852 and for 1849. After that it examines, in some detail, the quite separate publication that Blyth entitled 'A Supplemental Note to the Catalogue of the Birds in the Asiatic Society's Museum' (Blyth, 1849). Study shows that this was of supreme importance to Blyth as his insurance against the potential that someone else, on reading his proof sheets, might give a description to a taxon named but not described within the proof sheets. But it would not protect him where he described a taxon but did not actually name it.

Evidence from the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*

It is in the Supplemental Note (Blyth, 1849) that footnoted evidence⁷ first appears. This evidence turns out to be misleading. Later in the same volume of the J.A.S.B., on p. 859, it is reported that the Council, in August 1849, examined the Catalogue and went on to discuss making copies available to the author and pricing (McClelland & Laidlay, 1849). As the price would be influenced by the cost, as a function of the print run, this suggests that perhaps stocks had been printed. However, the form in which the catalogue was laid before the meeting is not specified, nor is mention made of a price being set.

Later still in a telling minute in the J.A.S.B. for 1852 (p. 546), dated 1st September, 1852⁸, the Curator is shown to have exhibited "in sheets, a copy of his catalogue of birds the publication of which has been delayed by his desire to consult references which have only lately become available" (Colville, 1852). That in 1852 the catalogue was in sheet form makes clear that it can only have been in sheet form in August 1849 (at this point we lack precise knowledge about whether the sheets seen in August 1852 now included all the appendices). The date printed within the preface⁹ suggests that they could have been included and that their delivery from the printer was the reason for the exhibition.

Zimmer (1926) reported that Blyth distributed proofs and concluded that these were what were shown in August 1849. This seems logical and likely, but the evidence mentioned here does not prove this. It is possible that a rather greater print run had in fact taken place.

The set of proofs received by G.R. Gray is held bound in the Rothschild Library at the Natural History Museum (NHM), Tring. This has been examined carefully and compared to a copy of the complete final work, although not line for line. On this more is reported below.

Zimmer (1926) concluded, drawing on Mathews (1925) but apparently unaware of the content of p. 546 in the 1852 journal, that 1852 should be treated as the date of pub-

⁷ Footnotes on p. 800 and p. 812 refer to the printed catalogue.

⁸ It is from here that Mathews obtained his earliest date for publication.

⁹ June 1852.

lication. He evidently retained some doubt and signalled this by mentioning that the distribution of sheets 1-311 "may be considered as constituting publication" as may be concluded from the four lines of the minute printed in the J.A.S.B. in 1852 (attributed to Colville above). The Society, responsible for the publication, clearly considered that the catalogue had not yet been published.

Our knowledge of Blyth's distribution of proof sheets

The structure of the published catalogue shows that the main body of the list covers pages 1-311. After this come a series of appendices, and addenda to those, and an index. Ahead of the list appear two pages of prefatory remarks followed by yet more addenda to the appendices and a six-page index to the 28 pages of preface: a total of 34 pages. In total we have i-xxxiv, 1-403. With this information and with Gray's set in hand it is apparent that by October 1849 Blyth had sent Gray the whole of his original list¹⁰, but, apart from page 312 none of the appendices (the first of which page 312, received by Gray, shows he had begun). It may be anticipated that when he sent proofs to others he sent these same pages.

An annotation in this set, which must be attributed to museum staff, states that Gray received the proofs in five batches (pp. 1-40; 41-80; 81-192; 193-240; and 241-312). Note that there is no mention of a title page. It is also evident that Blyth wrote a note on the first sheet of each batch. Usually this was just to address it to Gray, but in the case of the final batch the date Oct. 1849 also appears in Blyth's hand.

Having set up the type the printers were no doubt required to produce proofs. The full set amounts to 39 eight-page signatures. This many pages could well have required a considerable part of the printer's stock of type and the lengthy retention of so much set type would have been problematic. The evidence seems to suggest, but does not prove, that the printers and the Society decided to allow a print run in late 1849 and at that date had the title page set up for this purpose.

Probably neither Blyth nor the Society's Council foresaw the lengthy delay in response¹¹ to the circulated proofs. The flavour of the Society's four line 'minute' in 1852 is consistent with, but does not quite display, anger over the funds tied up in the printing.

It is apparent that virtually all the appendices that follow the list must have been set up in type by the time Blyth wrote his 'Supplemental Note'. The evidence for this can be found on p. 801 of the latter in the reference to *Strix pusilla*. Here Blyth linked his description to the 'very small' specimen from Ceylon dealt with as No. 171 in the 'Addenda to Appendix No. 2'. This he gave as p. 340. It is in fact on p. 341 so this is either a typographical error or there must have been slight adjustments (perhaps due to proofreading of the appendices). These, i.e. pages 313-403 (signa-

¹⁰ Gray (1855: 3, 88) dated two names 'Blyth, 1848'; these are *Loriculus* from p. 8 of the Catalogue and *Pseudastur* from p. 24. This may demonstrate that the first 80 pages of proofs reached Gray in 1848 or the date may be a *lapsus*. The actual dates of publication of *Loriculus* Blyth and *Pseudastur* Gray are not affected.

¹¹ And apparently very minimal response; the appendices have little to show for it.

tures 2 s onwards), must all have been proofed and perhaps printed in late 1849.

The further appendices included with the Preface¹² include citations of page numbers from the Supplemental Note, which pages 313–403 do not¹³.

Prince Bonaparte who was engaged in preparing his *Conspectus Generum Avium*, of which the first volume appeared in 1850, was another recipient of Blyth's proof sheets. The evidence is to be found in Bonaparte (1850: 383). He made clear there that he named *Pica bactriana* of 'Persia orientale' at least partly on the evidence of Blyth's Catalogue (p. 91), where Blyth explained the distinctions of a Kandahar (Afghanistan) specimen presented to the Asiatic Society Museum by Capt. Hutton in 1849¹⁴.

In addition to Gray and Bonaparte, Strickland definitely received a set of proofs¹⁵. Mathews (1925) counted Jardine as a recipient. This seems likely, but has not been verified¹⁶.

The content of the proof sheets

The importance of the Catalogue as a measure of Blyth's work is such that one would like to begin by mentioning how many birds listed in it had been named by Blyth. This is difficult, Blyth sometimes described birds for Hodgson, Jerdon, Layard, Tickell and others¹⁷. In addition there are instances when he attached the name

¹² The pages of which do not carry signature numbers.

¹³ On several pages there are references to pages in J.A.S.B. 20 (the 1851 volume), with page numbers as high as 523. On p. v is reference to the description of *Caprimulgus kelaarti* Blyth, 1851a, on page 175, and on p. vii reference to the descriptions of *Garrulax merulinus* Blyth, 1851, and *Garrulax ruficapillus* Blyth, 1851b, both on p. 521; on p. viii there is reference to a discussion of *Sibia gracilis* on p. 521; on p. xiii there is reference to a discussion of *Spizixos canifrons* Blyth, 1851b, on p. 520 and to the description of *Pycnonotus penicillatus* Blyth, 1851a, on p. 178 and on p. xxvii there are references to descriptions of *Cyornis aequalicauda* Blyth, 1851b, and *Cisticola erythrocephala* Blyth, 1851b, on p. 523. There is also an extensive note on p. ix on the review of the Tanagers by Bonaparte (1851) in the Rev. Zool. On page xv one finds *Haematornis spilogaster* n.s.; this is a nomen nudum. It foreshadows the publication of a description by Blyth (1852b) in J.A.S.B. 21: 351. When the introductory pages are considered these demonstrate publication in 1852 or later. There is a note on p. xviii dated 20th June 1852. Mathews (1925) stated that this asked 'those who possess catalogues to insert the corrections'. This is inaccurate; Blyth wrote 'those who will possess copies of the catalogue'. It is known from Hartlaub's annual reviews of ornithological literature that the Catalogue was on sale in London in 1853.

¹⁴ Bonaparte (1850) also takes priority as author of the name *Parus spilnotus* since Blyth's mention of it on p. 103 of the proofs was not published till later (Blyth, 1852a: 103 refers to J.A.S. XVIII; there seems to be no mention of the proposal of the new name in the 1849 Supplemental Note, but it is just possible that it is elsewhere in the volume and remains overlooked).

¹⁵ This may be inferred from line 4 on page xxi of the final Catalogue where the asterisk leads to a very late footnote containing further feedback from Strickland.

¹⁶ M. Bruce (in litt.) suggested that clues point to either Cabanis or Hartlaub having had a set of proofs.

¹⁷ In these cases he gave their names after the new taxon name when publishing the description in articles that were under his authorship. Under the rules currently applied to zoological nomenclature such names, being manuscript names supplied by such individuals, are credited to Blyth as author of the publication, unless there is evidence within the published work to show that such individuals were directly involved in the publication or in the published description. This modern rule has left us with a less than fair impression of the labours of these workers, and especially of Hodgson, but the blame for this lies mainly at the door of those drafting and approving the modern rules and not with Blyth.

Buchanan Hamilton¹⁸ to a bird, probably based on the MS name that appeared on one of Buchanan Hamilton's drawings¹⁹.

However, while I have skimmed through the whole Catalogue seeking Blyth's name I have made no attempt to look into the names that Blyth attributed to others²⁰ (which we to-day attribute to him; e.g. *Mirafraya Hayii*, *Mirafraya affinis* and *Mirafraya erythroptera* all credited to 'Jerdon'; see Dickinson et al., 2001: 94). This same problem may have been one that beset Sclater (1892), when he attempted to inventory Blyth's surviving type material, for his survey listed types for just under 180 Blyth names and reported the types to be missing for a further 39 names. By contrast the Catalogue written in 1849 mentions some 265 Blyth specific names²¹, including about 60 that Blyth here catalogued as synonyms²², and this some years before Blyth returned to England with more productive years and more new names behind him.

A listing of the birds he described with synonyms and indications as to which he placed rightly or wrongly in synonymy, and which are to-day in synonymy, is not necessary for the purposes of this paper, but it would be interesting and useful to compile a comprehensive list of all Blyth's names, including those that he then credited to others, to annotate the list with any modifications he made in later papers, and especially in the Catalogue, and to compare this with the very limited findings of Sclater (1892)²³.

Examination of these proofs shows two areas of risk for Blyth. First, there are new names that he introduced without descriptions. Second, there are cases where a

¹⁸ Buchanan (1762-1829) left India in 1815. He used this, his father's name, during his years in India. Later in life he became Buchanan Hamilton; not 'Francis (Buchanan) Hamilton' as given by Horsfield & Moore (1854: iii).

¹⁹ It is thought that Blyth examined Buchanan Hamilton's drawings in London at the museum of the Hon. East India Company before leaving for Calcutta.

²⁰ As in earlier papers this practice was followed in Blyth (1849) where some names were attributed to Layard, to Tickell and to Hutton. The case of *Palaeornis calthrapae* 'Layard' on p. 340 of the Catalogue demonstrates that Blyth's intention was not to take credit from Layard. Here he listed the name with no mention of his own. This comment serves to rebut the assertions made by Cocker in Cocker & Inskipp (1988: 37). Cocker made specific mention of *Myzornis pyrrhura* suggesting that this name appeared in June 1844 as Blyth's discovery. In fact this name appeared a year earlier in Blyth (1843: 984) as is cited by Deignan (1964a). Blyth (1843) introduced the name by saying 'Mr. Hodgson styles it ...' then used the name and, a few lines earlier, he made clear that Hodgson sent the specimen to him. Hodgson certainly had cause to complain that it took Blyth a long time to publish his novelties, but the manner in which they were treated was, I believe, wholly consistent with the conventions of the day (he used the names supplied by others unless he considered them inapt, which was rare and most often affected the generic name, and when introducing new names of his own he usually signalled these with the conventional 'nobis'). *Myzornis pyrrhura* is credited to Hodgson in the Catalogue, as I suspect, are all the other Hodgson names. The lack of any ambiguity here may reflect Hodgson's reported complaint, mentioned yet not cited by Cocker; but I suspect that Blyth had no need to correct his text.

²¹ This count does not include his generic and subgeneric names.

²² Many of which are not today in synonymy.

²³ Such a list would be of use to the Zoological Survey of India (ZSI), which has care of such collections as survive. In determining whether the types survive elsewhere it will be necessary to examine what material Blyth sent to the India Museum in London and when it was sent. Certainly some type material was shared in this way (Dickinson et al., 2001: 94-97).

'variety' is explained in words that suffice for a description, but where no name is provided. In both instances it might be supposed that openings existed for others to benefit. In the first case using the name and adding a description would ensure that authorship would today be credited to the author of the first published description. Had this occurred, it would almost certainly have been accidental for normally etiquette would have dictated the mention of Blyth as the author²⁴. It would thus be the later requirement of the rules on zoological nomenclature that transferred the authorship. In the second case providing a name was legitimate: the author would have been within his rights to consider that Blyth had passed up his opportunity to give a name.

The foundations of much of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature can be traced to the proposals put forward by Strickland and others (1841). Blyth and Strickland were regular correspondents and there can be no doubt that Blyth was well aware of the importance of priority. Undoubtedly this is one reason why Blyth wrote his Supplemental Note.

Some 20 names in the proof sheets and in the final work make reference to 'J.A.S. XVIII' and leave space for a page number to be added. A few of the notes that relate to these amplify information relating to earlier descriptions by Blyth, but most are newly described taxa which Blyth clearly anticipated describing in the J.A.S.B. before the Catalogue appeared.

The importance of the Supplemental Note in 1849 (Blyth, 1849)²⁵

The present paper was stimulated by irritation over the different dates cited for names that appear to relate to Blyth's Catalogue. Peters's Check-list of Birds of the World ('Peters') contains at least 11 citations to Blyth's Catalogue: Vol. 1 (Peters, 1931) used '1849 (1852)' but in its 2nd edition (Mayr & Cottrell, 1979) used '1852 (1849)', Vols. 2 (Peters, 1934) and 4 (Peters, 1940) used '1849 (1852)', Vol. 6 (Peters, 1948) used '1849', and Vols 9 (Mayr & Greenway, 1960), 11 (Mayr & Cottrell, 1986) and 14 (Paynter, 1968) used '1852'; but it is now apparent that in some instances the context is a page in an appendix to the Catalogue²⁶. The way different volumes of 'Peters' cited these dates²⁷ relates, it seems, partly to a change of opinion by Peters (1948) as to the date of the Catalogue and then later to changes in editorial policy as to the treatment to be followed when giving two dates in the context of doubt and, where just one date was used, the apparent acceptance of the 1852 date from 1960 onwards (unless this was a further change in editorial policy).

When the confusion was exposed, Dickinson (2003) was examined and 22 taxa are listed there with the authorship of the name given as 'Blyth, 1849' (see first 22 names listed in Appendix 1). To complement the discussion one preoccupied 1849 name

²⁴ As did Bonaparte (1850): see mention above of *Pica bactriana*.

²⁵ Schulze & Küenthal (1931) dated this from 1850. The dating of the parts in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal presents a long-standing challenge. In several cases it is apparent from dates at the end of articles or dates in footnotes that there was a delay. No comprehensive review of the problem seems to have been published. When, as in past instances, authors cite a date differing from that on the issue or in a table of contents, they should explain their reasons for doing so.

²⁶ For names in the pages of Blyth's appendices 1849 should never have been in consideration.

noticed in synonymy and eight names associated with 1852 have been added to the appendix. Citation details from the different volumes of Peters's Check-list were extracted and tabulated. These data were compared with data given by Ripley (1982). The simple conclusion of this comparison is that Ripley (1982) essentially followed the dates given in 'Peters' (as was done in Dickinson, 2003, except in the case of *Coracina melaschistos avensis*, which is discussed in more detail below), so Appendix 1 has been kept simple, not including the data from Ripley (1982).

A conclusion from studying what was cited in Peters's Check-list is that, almost without exception, publication of the 'Supplemental Note' (hereafter called the Supplement) has been judged to have preceded the Catalogue, and rightly so. Two exceptions were discovered. One is the name added from synonymy: *Drymoica robusta* is cited from the Catalogue in Watson et al. (1986: 139) when it should have been cited from the Supplement retaining the date 1849 (wrongly used for the Catalogue by Watson et al.). The other is *Dendrocopos maculatus validirostris* cited from the Catalogue by Peters (1948: 203), but first published in the Supplement.

Only three of the 22 names used by Dickinson (2003) are cited, in Peters, from the Catalogue and one of these should have been cited from the Supplement. The synonym *Drymoica robusta*, as explained above, should also have been cited from the Supplement not from the Catalogue. The other 20 are all from the Supplement and for all these 1849 is correct.

The two not from the Supplement are *Dinopium benghalense dilutum* (taken from *Brachypternus dilutus* on page 56 in the Catalogue)²⁸ and the generic name *Dumetia* (on page 140 in the Catalogue). The first was ascribed to the Catalogue (and dated 1849) in Peters (1948: 144). The second was similarly ascribed and dated by Deignan (1964b: 317). Neither of these names appears in the Supplement and both must be dated from 1852. Databases holding citation details should be corrected. Appendix 1 summarises the information and flags the changes.

It should also be observed that protecting names given in the Catalogue was not Blyth's only reason for writing the Supplement. Blyth had evidently received fresh material from Layard in Ceylon and used new material from this source to name *Palaeornis Calthrapae* [sic]²⁹ 'Layard' Blyth, 1849, *Strix pusilla* Blyth, 1849, *Alcippe nigrifrons* Blyth, 1849, *Drymocapthus fuscicapillus* Blyth, 1849, and *Hypsipetes concolor* Blyth, 1849. These names from the Supplement all appear again in 1852 in the appendices to the Catalogue. But strangely *Batrachostomus moniliger* described here is absent from the 1852 appendices.

²⁷ And many others, such as names published in the Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London.

²⁸ This name, which appeared as a 'variety' of *Brachypternus aurantius*, warrants some explanation. In the Catalogue (p. 56) where Blyth (1852a) mentioned this he referred to p. 550 of Blyth (1845). There Blyth noted his discovery that the 'Scindian representative' of this '*Picus* (Br.) *aurantius*' differed and gave its characters without providing a name. The name *dilutum* - *Brachypternus* is neuter in gender - is cited from 1849 by Peters (1948: 144) and this is followed by Ripley (1961, 1982). Readers may wish to know that the name *Picus aurantius* Linnaeus, 1766, dropped out of use when it became acceptable to cite names from the 10th edition of *Systema Naturae*. The name *Picus benghalensis* Linnaeus, 1758, is considered to have applied to the same species.

²⁹ For a view on the spelling that should be used for this today see Dickinson (2003: 193, footnote 6). That view however is being re-examined.

Some other names requiring special comments

Campephaga avensis Blyth, 1852 = *Coracina melaschistos avensis* (Blyth, 1852a)

This was a nomen novum introduced in Appendix 3 of the Catalogue (p. 327) to replace *Campephaga melanoptera*, which was preoccupied. This name was correctly referenced and dated 1852 by Deignan (1960: 194) and 1852 was followed by Dickinson et al. (2002: 39) and Dickinson (2003: 470).

Drymoica robusta Blyth, 1849 = *Prinia sylvatica valida* (Blyth, 1851)

The name is preoccupied by *Drymoica robusta* Rüppell, 1845, and it was renamed *Drymoica valida* by Blyth (1851a). This is considered a subspecies of *Prinia sylvatica* Jerdon, 1840. Watson et al. (1986) cited *robusta* from p. 142 of the Catalogue, as noted above. The name *robusta* appeared first in the Supplement and should be cited from J.A.S.B. XVIII: 812 and dated 1849.

Cisticola omalura Blyth, 1851 = *Cisticola juncidis omalura* Blyth, 1851³⁰

Watson et al. (1986: 115) cited this from J.A.S.B. XX: 176 with the date 1851. This appears to be correct. The name appears (later) in the Catalogue on page 145 with a short descriptive note and a reference to J.A.S.B. XVIII where this name has not been located.

Cisticola tytleri Blyth, 1852a = *Cisticola exilis tytleri* Jerdon, 1863³¹

Lynes (1930: 202, 669) attributed this name to Jerdon ('1873': 176)³². Ripley (1982: 409) and Watson et al. (1986: 123) both correctly attributed the name to Jerdon (1863). These authors also indicated that Jerdon attributed the name to Blyth and apparently believed that Jerdon was employing a manuscript name. This is not so. The name appears in the Catalogue on p. xxvii. It is, however, a nomen nudum. Two specimens are referred to in the Catalogue: one that was presented by Jerdon, for which Blyth gave no locality and a second that was an 'albinoid young' from near Dacca, presented by Capt. Tytler. Lynes (1930: 669) took an undated specimen collected by Tytler at Dacca to be the 'Type' having examined this in the 'Indian Museum' (Calcutta) and judged it to be an adult male in summer dress. Lynes did not mention albinism, but one may either conclude that the type was not Blyth's 'albinoid young' from Tytler or that Blyth misunderstood the bleaching occurring in late summer. It is clear that Lynes did not comment on the one procured at Dacca by Jerdon, although Jerdon (1863: 176) referred to this as 'the only good specimen I secured'. Jerdon (1863) attributed the name to Blyth, seemingly thinking that it had been formally described, but the types

³⁰ Not in Appendix 1 as not dated 1849 or 1852.

³¹ Not in Appendix 1 as a nomen nudum in 1852.

³² This appears, on both pages, to be a simple lapsus for '1863: 176'. There is a reprint edition of 1877.

of the name when this is attributed to Jerdon must be judged from what Jerdon wrote. His comments would make type material of his own specimens and Tytler's material, which may or may not have been just the one listed by Blyth. Lynes (1930: 669) selected an adult male in summer dress collected by Tytler at Dacca as the type and thus made this the lectotype. Whether this is the same as Blyth's 'albinoid young' is unclear.

Pernis brachypterus Blyth, 1852a³³ = *Pernis ptilorhynchus ruficollis* Lesson, 1830

On page xxviii of the Catalogue Blyth provided a name for a specimen from Mergui and included an extensive description. This name, not included by Sharpe (1874), was identified by Baker (1930: 426) with *Pernis ptilorhynchus ruficollis*. The type may still exist in Calcutta and should be re-examined as the wing-measurement given is very small for this taxon.

Acknowledgements

Grateful thanks are extended to Murray Bruce for his advice last year about the need to correct a date in Dickinson (2003) and for earlier discussion both about the Catalogue and about the general subject of the circulation of proofs, and to Carol Inskipp for discussions about Hodgson. The designation of the lectotype by Lynes (1930) was discussed with Michael Walters. Library help, going beyond the facilitation of access, was generously given by Alison Harding, NHM, Tring, on several occasions, and further valuable help was received from NHM librarians in South Kensington. Aasheesh Pittie and Michael Walters kindly read an early draft. The knowledgeable comments of the referees, Murray Bruce and Steven Gregory, also led to some important additions including the appendix.

References

- Anon. [= Strickland, H.E. et al.], 1841. Proposed plan for rendering the nomenclature of zoology uniform and permanent. 15 pp. [Printed and circulated among zoologists, being the basis of the proposed report of the Committee on Zoological Nomenclature for submission in May 1842 to the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Copy held in Zoology Library, NHM, South Kensington].
- Baker, E.C.S., 1930. The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Birds. 7: i-viii, 1-484.— London.
- 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. 1845. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 14(164): 546-602.
- Blyth, E., 1849³⁴. A supplemental note to the Catalogue of the Birds in the Asiatic Museum.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 18: 800-821.

³³ Not in Appendix 1 as in synonymy and thus not in Dickinson (2003).

³⁴ As footnoted earlier this may have appeared in 1850.

- Blyth, E., 1850³⁵. Conspectus of the Ornithology of India, Burma and the Malayan Peninsula, inclusive of Sindh, Asâm, Ceylon and the Nicobar islands.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 19: 229-239, 317-342, 499-515.
- Blyth, E., 1851a. Report on the Mammalia and more remarkable species of birds inhabiting Ceylon.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 20(2): 153-185.
- Blyth, E., 1851b. Notice of a collection of Mammalia, Birds, and Reptiles, procured at or near the station of Cherra Punji in the Khasia hills, north of Sylhet.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 20(6): 517-524.
- Blyth, E. 1852a. Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum [of the] Asiatic Society: i-xxxiv, 1-403.— Calcutta.
- Blyth, E., 1852b. Report of Curator, Zoological Department.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 21(4): 341-358.
- Bonaparte, C.L., 1850. Conspectus generum avium. 1:1-543.— Lugduni Batavorum.
- Bonaparte, C.L., 1851. Note sur les Tangaras, leurs affinités, et descriptions d'espèces nouvelles.— Rev. Mag. Zool. (2)3: 129-145.
- Cocker, M. & C. Inskipp, 1988. A Himalayan ornithologist: i-xii, 1-87.— Oxford.
- Colville, J.W., 1852. Minutes of the meeting of the Asiatic Society held on 4th August, 1852.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 20: 542-546.
- Deignan, H.G., 1960. In: J.L. Peters, E. Mayr & H.G. Deignan. Family Campephagidae: 167-221.— In: E. Mayr & G.W. Cottrell (eds), 1960. Check-list of Birds of the World. IX: i-xii, 1-506. Cambridge, Mass.
- Deignan, H.G., 1964a. Genera sedis incertae: 427-429.— In: E. Mayr & R.A. Paynter, Jr. (eds). Check-list of Birds of the World. X: i-ix, 1-502. Cambridge, Mass.
- Deignan, H.G., 1964b. Subfamily Timaliinae: 240-427.— In: E. Mayr & R.A. Paynter, Jr. (eds). Check-list of Birds of the World. X: i-ix, 1-502. Cambridge, Mass.
- Dickinson, E.C. (ed.), 2003. The Howard & Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World: 1-1039.— London.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck and S. Somadikarta, 2001. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 12. Types of the Alaudidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 335: 85-126.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck and S. Somadikarta, 2002. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 23. Types of the Campephagidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 340: 31-74.
- Gray, G.R., 1849. The genera of birds: comprising their generic characters, a notice of the habits of each genus, and an extensive list of species referred to their several genera. 3. Index.— London.
- Gray, G.R., 1855. Catalogue of the genera and subgenera of birds contained in the British Museum. [i], 1-192.— London.
- Grote, A., 1875. Introduction: iii-xvii.— In: E. Blyth, 1875. Catalogue of the mammals and birds of Burma. I-xxiv, 1-167. Hertford.
- Horsfield, T. & F. Moore, 1854. A catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East India Company. 1: i-xxx, 1-451.— London.
- I.C.Z.N., 1954. Opinion 212. Designation of the dates to be accepted of the several volumes of Pallas (P.S.) 'Zoographia Rosso-Asiatica'.— Opinions and Decl. 4: 15-24.
- I.C.Z.N., 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
- Jerdon, T.C., 1863. The Birds of India being a natural history of all the birds known to inhabit continental India; with descriptions of the species, genera, families, tribes, and orders, and a brief notice of such families as are not found in India, making it a manual of ornithology specially adapted for India. 2(1): i, 1-439.— Calcutta.
- Kaup, J.J., 1829. Skizzirte Entwicklungs-Geschichte und natürliches System der Europäischen Thierwelt: Erster Theil welcher die Vogelsäugethiere und Vögel, nebst Andeutung der Entstehung der letzteren aus Amphibien enthält. i-xii, 1-203.— Darmstadt.
- Lesson, R.P., 1830. Traité d'Ornithologie ou Tableaux Méthodique des ordres, sous-ordres, familles, tribus, genres, sous-genres et races d'oiseaux. 1: 1-80³⁶.— Paris.
- Lynes, H., 1930. Review of the genus *Cisticola*.— Ibis (12)6 (Suppl.): i-ii, 1-673, i-vii.

³⁵ At least the third part of these three parts has been cited from 1851 (Schulze & Kükenthal, 1929 re *Glaux*), but the evidence for this has not yet been discovered.

³⁶ Part 1, published February, 1830; the volume (659 pp.) was completed by part 8 in 1831.

- Mathews, G.M., 1925. The Birds of Australia. Supplements 4 and 5. Bibliography of the Birds of Australia. Books used in the preparation of this work with a few biographical details of authors and collectors: i-viii, 1-149³⁷.— London.
- Mathews, G. M. & T. Iredale, 1921. Notes of interest.— Austral. Av. Rec. 4(6): 139-164.
- Mayr, E. & G.W. Cottrell (eds.), 1979. Check-list of Birds of the World. I. (2nd edition): i-xvii, 1-547.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Mayr, E. & G.W. Cottrell (eds.), 1986. Check-list of Birds of the World. XI: i-xii, 1-638.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Mayr, E. & J.C. Greenway, Jr. (eds.). 1960. Check-list of Birds of the World. IX: i-xii, 1-506.— Cambridge, Mass.
- McClelland, J. & J.W. Laidlay, 1849. Minutes of the meeting of the Asiatic Society held on Wednesday, 1st August, 1849.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 18: 858-859.
- Paynter, R.A., Jr., 1968. Check-list of Birds of the World. XIV: i-x, 1-433.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Peters, J.L., 1931. Check-list of Birds of the World. I: i-xviii, 1-345.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Peters, J.L., 1934. Check-list of Birds of the World. II: i-xvii, 1-401.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Peters, J.L., 1940. Check-list of Birds of the World. IV: i-xii, 1-291.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Peters, J.L., 1948. Check-list of Birds of the World. VI: i-xi, 1-259.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Ride, W.D.L., 1999. Introduction: xix-xxix.— In: International Code of Zoological Nomenclature: i-xxix, 1-306. London.
- 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: i-xxvi, 1-653.— Bombay.
- Rüppell, E., 1845. Systematische Uebersicht der Vögel nord-ost-Afrikas nebst Abbildung und Beschreibung von fünfzig theils unbekannten, theils noch nicht bildlich dargestellten Arten: I-vii, 1-140.— Frankfurt am Main.
- Rylands, P., 1836. On the quinary or natural system of McLeay, Swainson, Vigors etc.— Mag. Nat. Hist. 9: 175-182.
- Schulze, F.E. & W. Küenthal (eds), 1926-1954. Nomenclator Animalium Generum et Subgenerum. Im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. 5 Vols (26 Lieferungen). I-CCCXLIV, 1-3716.— Berlin.
- Slater, W.L., 1892. On the Indian Museum and its collection of birds.— Ibis (6)4: 65-87.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1874. Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum. I. Catalogue of the Accipitres, or diurnal birds of prey in the collection of the British Museum: i-xiii, 1-479.— London.
- Watson, G.E., M.A. Traylor & E. Mayr, 1986. Family Sylviidae: 3-294.— In: E. Mayr & G.W. Cottrell, 1986. Check-list of Birds of the World. XI: i-xii, 1-638. Cambridge, Mass.
- Zimmer, J.T., 1926. Catalogue of the Edward E. Ayer Ornithological Library.— Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Zool. 16(1): i-x, 1-364.

Received: 27.ii.2004

Accepted: 18.vii.2004

Edited: C. van Achterberg

³⁷ Supplement 4 has a wrapper dated 6th April 1925 and apparently held pp. 1-96; Supplement 5 has a wrapper dated 22nd June (A. Harding, in litt.); in Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 87 the two supplements were combined, but not mentioned; in Zool. Verh. Leiden. 340: 171 the information was correct for Supplement 4 alone. Sometimes bound in Vol. XII, sometimes bound as a separate publication.

Appendix 1

Names of avian taxa proposed by Blyth in 1849 or 1852 which have been verified to source publication.
All names as given in Dickinson (2003) except *Drymoica robusta*.

Dickinson (2003)		Peters's Checklist		Comments			
page	date cited	vol. & page	date cited	cited from			
Names dated 1846 in Peters's Checklist							
Names cited from the 'Supplement'							
1	<i>Batrachostomus monileger</i>	237	1849	IV: 178	1846	JASB 18: 806	1846 in Peters is a lapsus; spelled <i>moniliger</i> in the original; omitted from Blyth's Catalogue
Names dated 1849 in Peters's Checklist							
Names cited from the 'Supplement'							
2	<i>Rallus aquaticus indicus</i>	121	1849	II: 161	1849	JASB 18: 820	Originally spelled <i>calthrapae</i> , but reputedly a lapsus for <i>calthropae</i>
3	<i>Ducula aenea pusilla</i>	178	1849	III: 46	1849	JASB 18: 816	
4	<i>Psittacula calthorpae</i>	193	1849	III: 246	1849	JASB 18: 800	
5	<i>Centropus chlororhynchos</i>	216	1849	IV: 69	1849	JASB 18: 805	Originally spelled <i>calthrapae</i> , but reputedly a lapsus for <i>calthropae</i>
6	<i>Rhaphidura leucopygialis</i>	250	1849	IV: 237	1849	JASB 18: 809	
7	<i>Apus nipalensis subfurcatus</i>	254	1849	IV: 252	1849	JASB 18: 807	
8	<i>Dendrocopos moluccensis gymmophthalmum</i>	318	1849	VI: 203	1849	JASB 18: 804	
9	<i>Dendrocopos atratus</i>	319	1849	VI: 193	1849	JASB 18: 803	
10	<i>Dendrocopos assimilis</i>	320	1849	VI: 188	1849	JASB 18: 803	
11	<i>Rhipidura aureola compressirostris</i>	494	1849	XI: 536	1849	JASB 18: 815	
12	<i>Parus rufonuchalis</i>	526	1849	XII: 89	1849	JASB 18: 810	
13	<i>Cecropis daurica hyperthya</i>	537	1849	IX: 116	1849	JASB 18: 814	
14	<i>Hypsipetes l. concolor</i>	575	1849	IX: 297	1849	JASB 18: 815	
15	<i>Acrocephalus dumetorum</i>	586	1849	XI: 65	1849	JASB 18: 815	
16	<i>Pellorneum fuscicapillus</i>	599	1849	X: 245	1849	JASB 18: 816	
17	<i>Rhopocichla a nigrifrons</i>	608	1849	X: 318	1849	JASB 18: 815	
18	<i>Cyornis banyunus magnirostris</i>	696	1849	XI: 364	1849	JASB 18: 814	
19	<i>Carpodacus grandis</i>	755	1849	XIV: 280	1849	JASB 18: 810	

Names cited from the 'Catalogue'					See footnote ³⁸ Must be dated 1852 Must be dated 1852
20	<i>Dinopium b. dilutum</i>	329	1849	VI: 144	
21	<i>DUMETIA</i>	608	1849	X: 317	
Names cited from the Catalogue that should have been cited from the Supplement					Correctly: JASB 18: 805 (1849) Correctly: JASB 18: 812 (1849); pre-occupied and now in the synonymy of <i>Prinia sylvatica valida</i> (Blyth, 1851) See footnote ³⁸
22	<i>Dendrocopos maculatus validirostris</i>	317	1849	VI: 203	
23	<i>Drymoica robusta</i>	n/a		XI: 139	
Names dated 1849 (1852) in Peters's Checklist; all must be dated 1852					In a footnote in Dickinson (2003) Originally spelled <i>castanotum</i> See footnote ³⁸
Names cited from the 'Catalogue'					
24	<i>GALLICREX</i>	125	1852	II: 202	
	<i>PORPHYRULA</i>	126	n/a	II: 206	
25	<i>Turnix suscitator bengalensis</i>	130	1852	II: 146	
26	<i>LAROSTERNA</i>	153	1852	II: 344	
27	<i>Glaucidium castanonotum</i>	232	1852	IV: 134	
Names dated 1852 (1849) in Peters's Checklist; must be dated 1852					In the appendices In the appendices
Names cited from the 'Catalogue'					
28	<i>BUTORIDES</i>	86	1852	I: 215 (s)	
Names correctly dated 1852 in Peters's Checklist					In the Catalogue this appears in the Preface (p. xv), but only as a nomen nudum
Names cited from the 'Catalogue'					
29	<i>Coracina m. avensis</i> nom.nov.	470	1852	IX: 194	
30	<i>Lonchura malacca sinensis</i>	735	1852	XIV: 380	
Names dated from JASB (post Supplement)					In the Preface of the Catalogue as are two or three other names from JASB 20.
31	<i>Spilornis cheela spilogaster</i>	103	1852	I: 312	
Names dated 1851 (1852) in Peters's Checklist					
32	<i>Caprimulgus indicus kelaarti</i>	242	1852	IV: 204	

³⁸ Blyth's correspondents might have employed these names before he did. The same may be true for a few names that are now in synonymy and were not in Dickinson (2003). See also Appendix 2.

Appendix 2

Generic names and the Catalogue

Steven Gregory³⁹

Most of the 46 generic names that Blyth (1852a) attributed to himself can be traced to Blyth's actual publications up till 1849, although the Catalogue gave no sources. However, in the light of the objectives of this paper and of the comments by Mathews & Iredale (1921) about names introduced by Gray (1849), all were traced and each case examined to see which names in the proofs might have been used by others between 1849 and 1852.

There appear to be 12 names that are from 1849 or later. Seven of these, *Dumetia* (p. 140), *Clamator* (p. 250), *Scleroptila* (p. 250), *Butorides* (p. 281), *Porphyrula* (p. 283), *Gallicrex* (p. 283), *Seena* (p. 291) and *Larosterna* (p. 293) do not seem to have been introduced earlier than the Catalogue.

Two generic names were introduced by Blyth in contemporary papers antedating the Catalogue: *Drymocataphus* Blyth, 1849, in the Supplement, a name found on p. 340 in the Catalogue, and *Loriculus* Blyth, 1849, which is on p. 9 in the Catalogue.

The three others are *Pseudastur* (p. 24), *Glaux* (p. 42) and *Clamator* (p. 250). The first of these was mentioned by Mathews & Iredale (1921), who noted that this must be attributed to Gray. The second, *Glaux*, has been cited from Blyth (1850); however Blyth's name was preoccupied by *Glaux* Rylands, 1836; the third, *Clamator*, used for a phasianid by Blyth, was used for a cuckoo by Kaup (1829).

One other name needs comment. Mathews & Iredale (1921) believed that *Blagrus* (p. 30 in the Catalogue) must also be attributed to Gray (1849). Schulze & Kükenenthal (1926) cited the name from Blyth (1846: 369) but usage there, in conjunction with a 'very large eagle' that was shot but not collected and was 'probably *Blagrus dimidiatus* (Raffles)', seems a very unsatisfactory basis for the introduction of a new generic name.

A few of Blyth's other generic names may require separate later comment due to issues such as determination of type species or availability.

³⁹ 35 Monarch Road, Northampton, NN2 6EH, U.K.

