Systematic notes on Asian birds. 12.[1]
Types of the Alaudidae

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

With contributions by
M. Kalyakin, V. Loskot, H. Morioka, C. Violani, C. Voisin & J-F. Voisin

Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 12. Types of the Alaudidae.
Zool. Verh. Leiden 335, 10.xii.2001: 85-126.— ISSN 0024-1652.
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: seck@snsd.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).
Mikhail V. Kalyakin, Zoological Museum, Moscow State University, Bol'shaya Nikitskaya Str. 6, Moscow 103009, Russia. (e-mail: kalyakin@1.zoomus.bio.msu.ru).
Vladimir M. Loskot, Department of Ornithology, Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Science, St. Petersburg, 199034, Russia. (e-mail: otus@zin.ru).
Hiroyuki Morioka, Curator Emeritus, National Science Museum, Hyakunin-cho 3-23-1, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 100, Japan.
Carlo Violani, Department of Biology, University of Pavia, Piazza Botta 9, 27100 Pavia, Italy. (e-mail: acquint@ipv.36.unipv.it).
Claire & Jean-François Voisin, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Laboratoire de Zoologie, Mammifères et Oiseaux, 55 Rue de Buffon, F-75005 Paris, France (e-mail: jfvoisin@cimrs1.mnhn.fr).

Keywords: Alaudidae; larks; types; lectotype designation.
A list is provided of the 165 names applied to identifiable Asian forms of species of lark (family Alaudidae). This list summarises our collective knowledge on the whereabouts of types for these names; where our information does not include reliable data we provide notes relating to the deficit and to stimulate others to send us additional data or to suggest sources of information. In two appendices we deal with certain old names that we judge to be indeterminate and we designate a lectotype for Eremophila sibirica (Swinhoe, 1871b).

Introduction

In our previous paper 'Systematic notes on Asian birds. 3. Types of the Eurylaimidae' (Dekker et al., 2000) we have explained the rationale for this set of articles on the types of Asian birds. Readers will find a fuller introduction and methodology in that paper than the abbreviated one given here.

---

[1] An invitational series arranged by René W.R.J. Dekker and Edward C. Dickinson under the auspices of the National Museum of Natural History, Leiden, The Netherlands, and the Trust for Oriental Ornithology, Eastbourne, U.K.

Methodology

Our table shows the names applied to the taxa, with author(s) and date (these being reported in the 'References'), the acronym of a museum holding a type and, especially where this is lacking, we give the number of the comment following the table. A list of acronyms preceded the reference list. The arrangement of the list is by species and within that by subspecies. The sequence is that of Peters (1960a).

The subspecies recognized here differ from those recognized in Peters's Check-list of Birds of the World in two particulars. First, we include the two names new since that work of which we are aware (*Calandrella cheleensis tuvinica* Stepanyan, 1976, and *Alauda gulgula dharmakumarsinjhi* Abdulali, 1976) and a synonym that should have been included Alauda arvensis dementievi Korelov, 1953. Second, our list follows our own views on species limits, recognizable subspecies and correct synonymy, some of our views being derived from our accompanying paper on this family (Dickinson & Dekker, 2001). We should like to stress, however, that these are preliminary decisions. Additional information and suggestions received before the 'Synopsis' may lead to modified treatment therein (see general introduction to the first volume and the series of 'Systematic notes on Asian birds', Zool. Verh. Leiden 331: 5-9).

Should our readers note that we have omitted names that they believe to be relevant we should much appreciate being advised so that our 'Synopsis' may benefit from such corrections. All names used have been checked to the original citation. We use precisely the original spellings, with diacritic marks and capital letters as they were then employed. Names are given in exactly the form used by the original author and as such may include, for example, bracketed subgeneric names. In the case of unusual spellings we add the usual adjunction 'sic'.

We have relied heavily on published type catalogues and on type data given in the original description. We have usually tried to confirm museum holdings and, occasionally, with the help of the relevant curators it has been possible to obtain additional or corrected information. In our personal searches for types, which one cannot safely describe as exhaustive even for the few museums that we have visited, we have been privileged to be able to access and examine type material, as detailed under 'Acknowledgements'. It should not be assumed however that we have re-examined any particular type. We have examined some where we had a particular reason to do so. When type details have been published this has been rare. Even for names published but lacking some details of the type(s) we have usually relied on information from the curators responsible, to whom we are extremely grateful. We are delighted to begin collaborating with V.M. Loskot in St. Petersburg and with M.V. Kalyakin in Moscow as the information in the Russian collections will greatly strengthen our series. In the same way our approach to Japanese material will benefit from our association with H. Morioka. C. Violani, whose contribution we also welcome, will help us to better cover material in Italian collections.

Two detailed reviews of larks have been particularly helpful in the context of type material, because each author reported on lark types personally examined. One dealt with the whole family except the genera Mirafra, Eremopterix and Eremophila (Meinertzhagen, 1951). The other, published a few months later and written with access to the former paper when that was in draft or in press, dealt only with Asian birds (Vau-

rie, 1951). Both papers appeared not too long before the death of J.L. Peters in April 1952, and in the next few years Peters's manuscript for the Check-list of Birds of the World was reviewed by Vaurie, and brought up to date by him and by the editors (Mayr & Greenway, 1960).

It has not been our practice to mention nomina nuda in this series since qualifying types do not exist for such names, nor is it our intention to include them. However, in the case of the genus Alauda three such names have required detailed review. Since being introduced as nomina nuda other authors have used them with a description. In one case there seems to be consensus as to the identity of the bird in question and the name is in constant use. In the other two cases the history of the names is extremely muddled and neither is in current use. This discussion does not fit within the framework of the main paper and these three names are discussed in Appendix 1.

In the following table "Plate" means that the original description is survived by a plate on which the name was based but probably not by a specimen.

Mirafra javanica				
M. j. cantillans				
M[irafra]. cantillans	'Jerdon' Blyth	1845	ROM	1.
Alauda cheendoola	'Frankl.' Jerdon	1840	?	2.
M. j. williamsoni				
Mirafra cantillans williamsoni	E.C.S. Baker	1915a	BMNH	
M. j. beaulieui				
Mirafra javanica beaulieui	Delacour	1932	MNHN	
M. j. philippinensis				
Mirafra philippinensis	Wardlaw Ramsay	1886	BMNH	
M. j. mindanensis				
Mirafra javanica mindanensis	Hachisuka	1931a	BMNH	3.
M. j. javanica				
Mirafra Javanica	Horsfield	1821	BMNH	
Alauda mirafra nom. nov.	'Horsfield' Temminck	1824	BMNH	4.
Mirafra borneensis	Swinhoe	1871a	BMNH	
M. j. parva				
Mirafra parva	Swinhoe	1871a	BMNH	
M. j. timorensis				
Mirafra javanica timorensis	Mayr	1944	AMNH	
Mirafra assamica				
Mirafra Assamica	Horsfield	1840	BMNH	
Mirafra Immaculata	Hume	1872a[2]	BMNH	

[2] Baker (1930) listed *Mirafra immaculata* Hume, described in the first issue of Stray Feathers, as having appeared in November 1872. Others list it for 1873 (Warren & Harrison, 1971). In the same issue, in a paper on 'Novelties' Hume described ten other taxa including *Ptionoprogne pallida* and *Pomatorhinus obscurus*; these two names are usually cited as from 1872 (Peters, 1960b; Deignan, 1964; Ripley, 1982). Hume's article on skylarks appears later in the same issue and we have chosen to retain the date 1872 for it.

Mirafra affinis[3]				
M. a. affinis				
M[irafra]. affinis	'Jerdon' Blyth	1845	ZSI ?	1.
Alauda coromandeliana	Pucheran	1854	Lost	5.
Mirafra affinis ceylonensis	Whistler in Ali	1936	BMNH	
M. a. microptera				
Mirafra microptera	Anonymous = Hume	1873a	BMNH	
M. a. erythrocephala				
Mirafra erythrocephala	Salvadori & Giglioli	1885	UCCM	
Mirafra assamica marionæ	E.C.S. Baker	1915b	BMNH	
Mirafra assamica subsessor	Deignan	1941	USNM	
Mirafra erythroptera				
M. e. sindiana				
Mirafra erythroptera sindianus	Ticehurst	1920	BMNH	
Mirafra erythroptera furva	Koelz	1951	FMNH	
M. e. erythroptera				
M[irafra]. erythroptera	'Jerdon'Blyth	1845	ROM	1.
Eremopterix nigriceps				
E. n. melanauchen				
C[oraphites]. melanauchen	Cabanis	1851	MH	
Pyrrhulauda sincipitalis	Blyth	1867a	?	6.
E. n. affinis				
Pyrrhulauda affinis	Blyth	1867a	?	6.
Eremopterix grisea				
Alauda (grisea)	Scopoli	1786	Plate	7.
Fringilla cruciger[4]	Temminck	1824	RMNH	
Pyrrhulauda grisea siccata	Ticehurst	1925	BMNH	
Eremopterix grisea ceylonensis	Whistler in Whistler & Kinnear	1934	BMNH	
Ammomanes cincturus				
A. c. zarudnyi				
Ammomanes cinctura zarudnyi	Hartert	1902	AMNH	
Ammomanes heterura	Madarász	1903	HNHM	8.
Ammomanes phoenicurus				
A. p. phoenicurus				

[3] As discussed in Dickinson & Dekker (2001) – preceding article – this arrangement may need to give way to the recognition of three species.

[4] The name is given as *crucigera* in livraison 102, the "Tableau Méthodique" of Temminck & Laugier, which appeared in the same book, Le Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées, but 15 years after the original name.

Mirafra phoenicura	Franklin	1831	?	9.
A. p. testaceus				
Ammomanes phoenicurus testaceus	Koelz	1951	FMNH	
Ammomanes deserti				
A. d. orientalis				
Ammomanes deserti orientalis	Zarudny[5] & Loudon	1904	TASU	10.
A. d. iranicus				
A[mmomanes]. deserti iranica	Zarudny	1911	?	10.
Ammomanes deserti darica	Koelz	1951	FMNH	
A. d. phoenicuroides				
M[irafra]. phoenicuroides	Blyth	1853	ZSI ?	11.
Alaemon alaudipes				
A. a. doriae				
Saxicola (?) *pallida*	Blyth	1847	ZSI ?	12.
Certhilauda doriae	Salvadori	1868	MNSG	
Certhilauda desertorum var. cinerea	Zarudny	1903-04	?	10.
Melanocorypha calandra				
M. c. psammochroa				
Melanocorypha calandra psammochroa	Hartert	1904	AMNH	
Melanocorypha calandra raddei	Zarudny & Loudon	1904	?	10.
Melanocorypha bimaculata				
M. b. torquata				
Melanocorypha torquata	Blyth	1847	ZSI?	13.
Melanocorypha maxima				
M. m. maxima				
Melanocorypha maxima	'Gould' Blyth	1867b	?	6.
Melanocorypha maxima	Gould	1867	?	14.
M. m. holdereri				
Melanocorypha holdereri	Reichenow	1911	ZMB	
Melanocorypha maxima subgrisea	Stegmann	1937	ZISP	
Melanocorypha maxima flavescens	Stegmann	1937	ZISP	
Melanocorypha maxima kashmirica	Koelz	1939a	FMNH	
Melanocorypha mongolica				
Alauda mongolica	Pallas	1776	?	15.
Alauda sinensis	Waterhouse	1839	BMNH	
Melanocorypha mongolica emancipata	Meise	1933a	ZMB	

[5] In German literature transcribed as Sarudny; here standardised as Zarudny.

Melanocorypha leucoptera				
[Alauda] sibirica [nom. nov.][6]	Gmelin	1789	?	16.
Alauda leucoptera	Pallas	1811	?	15.
Melanocorypha yeltoniensis				
[Alauda] yeltoniensis	Forster	1767	?	17.
Alauda tatarica	Pallas	1773	?	15.
Tanagra siberica	Sparrman	1786	NRM	
Calandrella brachydactyla				
C. b. dukhunensis				
Alauda Dukhunensis	Sykes	1832	BMNH	
C[orypha]. baghaira	Blyth	1842	?	18.
C. b. longipennis				
Alauda longipennis	Eversmann	1848	?	19.
Calandrella brachydactyla artemisiana	Banjkowski	1913	ZMMU	
Calandrella brachydactyla orientalis	Sushkin	1925	ZISP	
Calandrella cinerea puii	Yamashina	1939a	YIO	
Calandrella acutirostris				
C. a. acutirostris				
C[alandrella]. acutirostris	Hume	1873b	BMNH	
C. a. tibetana				
Calandrella tibetana	Brooks	1880	BMNH	
Calandrella raytal				
C. r. raytal				
A[lauda]. raytal	'Buch. Hamilton MS' Blyth	1845	Lost	20.
Calandrella raytal vauriei[7]	Koelz	1954	UMMZ	
C. r. krishnakumarsinhji				
Calandrella raytal krishnakumarsinhji	Vaurie & Dharmakumarsinhji	1954	AMNH	
C. r. adamsi				
Alauda adamsi	Hume	1871	BMNH	
Calandrella rufescens				
C. r. persica[8]				
[Alaudula pispoletta] Subsp. δ.				
Alaudula persica	Sharpe	1890	BMNH	
Calandrella minor seistanica	Zarudny & Loudon	1904	?	10.

6 We are not certain that this has been placed in the correct synonymy. See comment.
7 The validity of this form was not accepted by Ripley (1961, 1982).
8 This taxon may be better placed with *C. cheleensis.*

Calandrella cheleensis[9]				
C. c. seebohmi				
[Alaudula pispoletta] Subsp. ε.				
Alaudula seebohmi	Sharpe	1890	BMNH	
C. c. kukunoorensis				
Alaudula kukunoorensis	Przewalski	1876	ZISP	
Calandrella rufescens tangutica	'Tugarinov MS', Hartert & Steinbacher	1933	?	21.
C. c. beicki				
Calandrella rufescens beicki	Meise	1933b	ZMB	
Calandrella rufescens stegmanni	Meise in Stresemann et al.,	1937	ZMB	
C. c. cheleensis				
Alaudula cheleënsis	Swinhoe	1871b	BMNH	
Pseudalaudula pispoletta obscura	Tugarinov	1932	ZISP	
C. c. tuvinica				
Calandrella cheleensis tuvinica	Stepanyan	1976	ZMMU	
Galerida cristata				
G. c. magna				
Galerida magna	Hume	1871	BMNH	
Galerida cristata iwanowi	Loudon & Zarudny	1903	?	10.
Galerida cristata vamberyi	Härms	1907	ZFMK	
Galerida cristata submagna	Zarudny & Bilkewitch	1918	?	10.
Galerida cristata retrusa	Bangs & Peters	1928	MCZ	
Galerida cristata alashanica	Meise	1933a	ZISP	
G. c. leautungensis				
Alauda leautungensis	Swinhoe	1861	BMNH	22.
G. c. coreensis				
Galerita cristata coreensis	Taczanowski	1888	MPHN	23.
G. c. lynesi				
Galerida cristata lynesi	Whistler	1928	BMNH	
G. c. chendoola				
Alauda Chendoola	Franklin	1831	?	9.
C[erthilauda]. Boysii	Blyth	1846	?	24.
Galerida malabarica				
Alauda (malabarica)	Scopoli	1786	Plate	7.
Galerida malabarica propinqua	Koelz	1939b	FMNH	
Galerida deva				
Alauda Deva	Sykes	1832	BMNH	
M[irafra]. Hayi	'Jerdon', Blyth	1845	?	1.

9 We are not entirely confident in listing this as a good species as Stepanyan (1990) does. See also Dickinson & Dekker (2001, this issue, Syst. Note. 11).

Spizalauda simillima	Hume	1870	BMNH	
Mirafra cantillans bangsi	Koelz	1939b	FMNH	
Alauda arvensis				
A. a. dulcivox[10]				
[Alauda] Dulcivox	'Hodgson' Hume	1872b	BMNH	25.
Alauda dulcivox	'Hodgson' Brooks	1873a	AMNH	25.
Alauda cinerea	Ehmcke	1903	ZMB	
Alauda cinerascens nom. nov.	Ehmcke	1904a	ZMB	
Alauda schach	Ehmcke	1904b	?	26.
Alauda beludshistana	Ehmcke	1904b	?	26.
Alauda arvensis almásyi	Keve	1943	NMW	
Alauda arvensis dementievi	Korelov	1953	IZA	27.
A. a. kiborti				
Alauda arvensis kiborti	Zaliesski	1917	?	28.
Alauda arvensis alticola	Sushkin	1925	ZISP	
Alauda arvensis sushkini	Domaniewski	1933	MPHN	
A. a. intermedia				
Alauda intermedia	Swinhoe	1863	BMNH	
Alauda arvensis quelpartae	Momiyama	1927	YIO	29.
Alauda arvensis nigrescens	Kistjakovskij & Kotshubej	1929	Lost	30.
Alauda arvensis pusilla	Ivanov	1929	ZISP	
A. a. pekinensis				
Alauda pekinensis	Swinhoe	1863	BMNH	
Alauda blakistoni	Stejneger	1884	USNM	
Alauda buxtoni	J.A. Allen	1905	AMNH	
A. a. lonnbergi				
Alauda arvensis lönnbergi [sic]	Hachisuka	1926	NRM	
A. a. japonica				
Alauda japonica	Temminck & Schlegel	1848	RMNH	
Alauda arvensis kagoshimae	Yamashina	1939b	YIO	
Alauda gulgula				
A. g. inconspicua				
Alauda inconspicua	Severtsov	1873	ZISP	
Alauda gulgula punjaubi	Whistler, in Ali	1936	BMNH	
Alauda transcaspica	Ehmcke	1904b	?	26
A. g. dharmakumarsinhjii				
Alauda gulgula dharmakumarsinhjii	Abdulali	1976	BNHS	
A. g. lhamarum				
Alauda guttata	Brooks	1871	BMNH	31
Alauda triborhyncha	'Hodson' [sic] Hume in Henderson & Hume	1873b	BMNH	32

[10] Hume, 1872, *nec* Horsfield & Moore (see Appendix).

Alauda arvensis lhamarum	Meinertzhagen & Meinertzhagen	1926a	BMNH	
A. g. inopinata				
Alauda japonica inopinata	Bianchi	1904a	ZISP	
A. g. sala				
Alauda sala	Swinhoe	1870	BMNH	
Alauda arvensis hainana	Hartert	1922	AMNH	
A. g. herberti				
Alauda arvensis herberti	Hartert	1923a	AMNH	
A. g. wattersi				
Alauda wattersi	Swinhoe	1871b	BMNH	
A. g. wolfei				
Alauda arvensis wolfei	Hachisuka	1930	DMNH	
A. g. vernayi				
Alauda arvensis vernayi	Mayr in Stanford & Mayr	1941	AMNH	
A. g. weigoldi				
Alauda arvensis weigoldi	Hartert	1922	AMNH	
A. g. coelivox				
Alauda coelivox	Swinhoe	1859	BMNH	
Alauda gulgula pescadoresi	La Touche	1922	MCZ	
[*Alauda gulgula*] *pescadoresiana* nom. nov.	La Touche	1930	MCZ	
A. g. gulgula				
Alauda Gulgula	Franklin	1831	?	9
A[lauda]. gracilis	Blyth	1842	?	33
Alauda gangetica	Blyth	1843	?	34
[Alauda] peguensis	Oates	1875	BMNH	
Alauda parkeri	Legge	1880	?	35.
A. g. australis				
Alauda Australis	Brooks	1873a	ZSI?	36.
Eremophila alpestris				
E. a. flava				
[Alauda] flava	Gmelin	1789	Plate	37.
Otocorys sibirica	'Eversm.' Swinhoe	1871b	BMNH	38.
Otocorys alpestris euroa	Thayer & Bangs	1914	MCZ	
E. a. albigula				
Otocoris[11] *albigula*	'Brandt' Bonaparte	1850	RMNH	
[Otocorys alpestris] Subsp. β				
Otocorys pallida	Sharpe	1890	BMNH	39.
Otocorys diluta nom. nov.	Sharpe	1890	BMNH	39.
O[tocorys] pennicillata transcaspica	Flöricke	1898	?	40.
Otocoris oreodrama	Oberholser	1902	USNM	

[11] See comment 45 where we discuss the alternative spelling.

Otocorys penicillata iranica	Zarudny & Härms	1902	TASU	10.
E. a. brandti				
Otocorys brandti	Dresser	1874	?	41.
Otocorys Parvexi	Taczanowski	1876	?	42.
Otocorys brandti montana	Bianchi	1904b	ZISP	
Eremophila alpestris hachlowi	Meise	1932	MTD	43.
Eremophila alpestris altaica	Meise	1932	ZMB	
E. a. longirostris				
Otocoris longirostris	'Gould' Moore	1856	BMNH	
Otocoris perissa	Oberholser	1902	USNM	
Otocorys wellsi	Babault	1920	MNHN	
Eremophila alpestris deosai	Meinertzhagen & Meinertzhagen	1926b	AMNH	
E. a. teleschowi				
Otocoris Teleschowi	Przewalski	1887	ZISP	44.
E. a. przewalskii				
Otocorys brandti przewalskii	Bianchi	1904b	ZISP	
E. a. argalea				
Otocoris argalea	Oberholser	1902	USNM	
E. a. elwesi				
Otocoris Elwesi	Blanford	1872	BMNH	
E. a. nigrifrons				
Otocoris nigrifrons	Przewalski	1876	ZISP	45.
E. a. khamensis				
Otocorys elwesi khamensis	Bianchi	1904b	ZISP	

Comments

1. On pages 957-960 Blyth (1845)[12] gave names to four larks, based on those used by Jerdon in manuscript. For all these the whereabouts of the types is open to question, and the cases are closely similar. They are therefore all treated in this one note. The four names were: *M[irafra]. erythroptera* (p. 958), *M[irafra]. affinis* (p. 959), *M[irafra]. Hayi* (p. 959) and *M[irafra]. cantillans* (p. 960). The last of these names had been employed by Blyth (1843) but was there a nomen nudum. Some time later, and able to cite the page numbers of Blyth's descriptions, Jerdon (1846)[13] included in his "Second Supplement to the Catalogue of the Birds of Southern India" the names Blyth had used. These four

[12] This paper, cited by Peters (1960a) from 1844 with a reference to volume 13 indeed appeared in the 1844 volume of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, volume 13, No. 156, was cited from "1844-1845" by Baker (1930) and since conservatively given as 1845 (Warren & Harrison, 1971: 90) which we follow.

[13] We have failed to trace authentic information as to when exactly Jerdon's "Second Supplement" in the 1844 volume of the Madras J. Science appeared. The pages are dated 1844, but this is given as 1845 by Peters (1960a) in the citation of this taxon. A more precise date of 'after August 1845' was used by Baker (1930), and 1846 is given by Warren & Harrison (1971: 6-7 under *Mirafra affinis*), which we have used herein.

names appear as follows: *erythroptera* on p. 136 under No. 189 (which Jerdon had found in the northern part of the Deccan, and which Blyth suggested was represented further south by the next taxon), *affinis* on p. 136 under No. 189 bis (which Jerdon mentioned from Goomsoor and added "it is abundant in all the Carnatic, and also in Malabar, and in portions of the Table land. It is not found in the neighbourhood of Jaulnah. It abounds in every compound in Madras"), *Hayi* on p. 136, below the above two, but called No. 188 bis (where the name reflected the possession of the first specimen by Lord Arthur Hay, but Jerdon had taken it from Malabar and the "Eastern Ghauts") and *cantillans* on p. 135, under No. 185 (where we are told that as well as the specimens recently taken by Jerdon - he does not say where, but the Catalogue shows that he had failed to take specimens in the Carnatic - Blyth had obtained it near Calcutta). The numbers cited above, except when 'bis' numbers, come from the Catalogue itself (Jerdon, 1840). In there, except where Jerdon indicated otherwise, his specimens are thought to have come from Madras. It is apparent from the final page of Blyth's text that the Asiatic Society of Bengal's museum possessed specimens from Jerdon of each of these. However, the type series in front of Blyth could have comprised or included other specimens. Jerdon (1846) implied that Blyth's descriptions were based on specimens that he had named and sent to Blyth. This is substantiated by Blyth (1852) who noted that Jerdon presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal specimens of *erythroptera* (four adults and one young in 1844-46), *affinis* (four in 1844) and *Hayii* [sic] (two in 1844-47). Of the fourth *cantillans* only the two specimens from the "vicinity of Calcutta" remained. These numbers, published in 1852, should exclude any earlier passed on to India House, also known as East India House, the headquarters of the Hon. East India Company.

That some specimens, almost certainly from Jerdon, were passed on by Blyth to the Hon. East India Company is shown by the catalogue of that collection (Horsfield & Moore, 1854). In this it is stated that a large collection of birds comprising "several separate despatches" was received from the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1846. In the accounts of the species listed there appear (Horsfield & Moore, 1856: 474) the following specimens from the 'ASB': *Mirafra erythroptera* (the name was credited to Jerdon) 2, (p. 475) *Mirafra affinis* (similarly credited) 2, (p. 476) *Mirafra cantillans* (also credited to Jerdon) 1, and (p. 477) "*Spizalauda deva*" Sykes, 1, identified as or with the name *M. Hayi* Jerdon. We believe there can be no doubt that these specimens are, in each case, syntypes of Blyth's four names. That these names should be credited here to Jerdon, and not to Blyth, is not surprising as Blyth (1852) so treated them.[14]

This collection, from the India Museum at East India House, Leadenhall Street, was later integrated with that of the British Museum[15]. At the time of the 'Catalogue

---

[14] It seems probable that the practice of ascribing such names to the published writer, rather than the person credited by the published writer, became fixed at some later date – and Blyth should not be criticized for his use of MS names, such as Jerdon's or Hodgson's (see, for example, Cocker & Inskipp, 1988), without the chronology of the evolution of protocol being fully investigated.

[15] In 1868 the governance of India passed from The East India Company to the British Government as a consequence of the "Indian Mutiny". The East India Museum was, by 1867, at Fife (or Fyfe) House, Whitehall (Blyth, 1865: 32; Sharpe, 1906). The East India Museum collection was 'integrated' with that of the British Museum in parts between '1860 and 1880' (Sharpe, 1906), in fact, in three accessions (BMNH 1860.4.16.1-584; BMNH 1879.11.28.1-700; BMNH 1880.1.1.1-4731 and related later entries).

of the Birds in the British Museum' (Sharpe, 1890), wherein types of each of these names were listed, the birds of these four taxa that had been received by the India Museum in 1846, and which we are confident originated with Jerdon, should have reached the British Museum. The 'types' listed by Sharpe (1890) seem to have been received directly from Jerdon (in accessions in 1845 and 1846, that cannot be shown to have passed, and probably did not pass, through Blyth's hands). Specimens not demonstrably from Blyth should not, in our view, qualify as valid types. But Blyth specimens that were marked "A.S.B." [= Asiatic Society of Bengal] in the catalogue of the museum of the Hon. East India Company would qualify. The accession numbers are of great importance as they distinguish materials received from Jerdon that cannot be shown to be types (unless proven to have been returned to Jerdon by Blyth) from material than can be documented as having been in the A.S.B. collection (whence it was sent by Jerdon). Jerdon's material not only reached the British Museum directly but also as part of the Gould collection and perhaps from other sources. The number of Jerdon's "types" listed by Sharpe (1890) was as follows: 2 *erythroptera* (pp. 612-614), 2 *affinis* (pp. 614-615), 2 *Hayi* (pp. 621-623) and 2 *cantillans* (pp. 605-606). An examination of the register of accessions reveals only one specimen each of *erythroptera, affinis* and *cantillans*, and none of *hayi*, that seem to have been accessioned as part of the India Museum collection. These will be discussed below. The other material presumably perished, as it is known that moths destroyed some of the India Museum collection about the time it moved from East India House to Fyfe House (Sharpe, 1906).

In Warren & Harrison (1971) there is some discussion on each of these four taxa. Keeping to the order in which Blyth named them, and in which we have discussed them, each is discussed further below:

M[irafra]. erythroptera: Warren & Harrison (1971: 166) suggested that a specimen that was received directly from Jerdon (BMNH 1846.4.30.2) was a syntype of Blyth's name. In our view this is improbable and evidence would be needed to support it. The specimen listed is said to be "one of the specimens listed by Jerdon, 1840, Madras J. Lit. Sci. 11, p. 33 as *Mirafra javanica* Horsfield?" but Jerdon did not, in fact, list any specimens. Of the two once held by the India Museum (Horsfield & Moore, 1856) one was accessioned as BMNH 1880.1.1.4434. This specimen was exchanged, probably in 1900, with the 'Canada Museum' (now the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto). This specimen (ROM 01.20.4.744) is associated with "Jerdon" on the BMNH label, but the accession number links it firmly to the India Museum and indeed an older label present appears to be the label of that museum, and that refers to the "As. Soc. Beng.". There can, in our view, be no doubt that this was one of Jerdon's series in front of Blyth.

The list of Blyth's types drawn up by Sclater (1892) and divided between taxa for which specimens were on hand, and those for which they were not, made no mention of this taxon.

M[irafra]. affinis: in this case Warren & Harrison (1971: 6) took the position that the specimens (one being BMNH 1845.1.10.31) listed by Sharpe (1890) as types are not or probably not Blyth's types. Although we would agree it should be noted that, *contra* Warren & Harrison, Jerdon (1846) did not describe these. He just indicated that Blyth had named this in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, volume 13. Of the two held by the India Museum (Horsfield & Moore, 1856) one became BMNH 1880.1.1.4490. This spec-

imen has not been located, but the register does not record an exchange and this may eventually be found. If so, we believe it would be a valid syntype of Blyth's name. Blyth (1852) listed four specimens from Jerdon then still in Calcutta. The list of Blyth's types drawn up and divided between taxa for which specimens were on hand, and those for which they were not, again made no mention of this taxon (Sclater, 1892).

M[irafra]. Hayi: rendered by Warren & Harrison (1971: 233) as *Hayii*[16] where a "syntype" (BMNH 1845.1.10.25) of Jerdon's name was listed as accessioned in 1845 having been presented by Jerdon. This would be correct if this deserved name-bearing types, but Jerdon's name is a junior synonym of Blyth's near-identical name, and we do not believe it, or its fellow "syntype", can be types of Blyth's name. The one that was once in the India Museum (Horsfield & Moore, 1856) seems not to have been accessioned by the British Museum. Blyth (1852: 133) listed two specimens then in Calcutta from Jerdon.

M[irafra]. cantillans: here Warren & Harrison (1971: 90) took the position that Blyth's specimens from 'near Calcutta', and reported to be still in Calcutta (Sclater, 1892), were types and that the two specimens (one being BMNH 1846.11.9.40 which was presented by Jerdon) listed by Sharpe (1890) could not be. Had these been specimens that could be traced to the "A.S.B." and to India House on their way to the British Museum they would, in our view, be valid syntypes as a terra typica including S. India was explictly attached to Blyth's description. There was only one such specimen and this can be identified from the register; it was numbered BMNH 1880.1.1.4432 and it was considered a duplicate and sent to the "Canada Museum". It is now ROM 01.10.4.742. Unlike the specimen of *erythroptera* discussed above this has no old label attached. The BMNH label does, by the accession number, show it to have come from the India Museum and it is also annotated "A.S. Beng." We therefore consider this sufficiently proven to be a syntype. The specimens from near Calcutta, still in Calcutta in 1892, would be syntypes. It is not known whether these survive. Blyth (1852) listed only his own two specimens from near Calcutta. It would seem that he may have had only one from Jerdon, which would be the one sent on to the India Museum.

This, we believe, sets out a consistent and coherent position on these cases. When these four cases are compared it is clear that the positions taken by Warren & Harrison (1971) were not consistent with each other.

2. This name, attributed to Franklin, by Jerdon (1840) and described by the latter has been determined as a specimen of the genus *Mirafra* and not of *Alauda chendoola* Franklin, 1831 [= *Galerida cristata chendoola*]. It is not known whether the specimen or specimens on which Jerdon based his name were preserved and, as presumably Jerdon did not believe he was describing a new form, evidence on a Jerdon label relating any specimen to the original description might be lacking. The name is preoccupied by Franklin's name.

---

[16] Which spelling is correct in the context of Jerdon's utilisation at this date, but differs from Blyth's (1845) earlier use of the name.

3. The original description gave no precise type locality and did not list a type (Hachisuka, 1931a), but, by the measurements given, implied that at least two birds were taken of each sex. Nine years later the same author listed as "Type" a male collected on 22 Jan. 1930 again giving no precise locality (Hachisuka, 1942), and this was taken, rather incautiously, to imply that there was but one male of this date and to have been the designation of a lectotype (Dickinson et al., 1991). Earlier it had been noted that there were four syntypes (Warren & Harrison, 1971) and one (a male, BMNH 1932.6.2.14) was segregated and listed in their type catalogue, where they gave the collection date as "1930". They gave the type locality as "Gogoag", presumably misread from the label, for the correct locality is Gogong (Hachisuka, 1931b: 91, and map p. 96).

Unfortunately it was not noticed in 1991 that the segregated type had a fuller date on the label; both BMNH 1932.6.2.14 and BMNH 1932.6.2.17 prove to be dated 22 Jan. 1930. The latter was formally designated a lectotype and, as the specimen selected was one of the original type series the designation was valid, regardless of the special circumstances. By contrast's Hachisuka "designation" was presumably not intended as such, as two males were collected the same day and it is invalid. There are therefore three paralectotypes: the previously segregated male and the two females.

4. In proposing this name Temminck, 1824 (Apr.; livr. 51, pl. 305 in Temminck & Laugier, 1820-1839), made clear that he knew that this taxon had been named *Mirafra javanica* Horsfield, 1821. It has been noted (Dekker et al., 2000) that Temminck renamed *Eurylaimus javanicus* Horsfield, 1821, because he did not approve of geographic names. No doubt these sentiments were present in this case, but the argument put forward was that the genus *Mirafra* was not distinguishable from *Alauda* and Horsfield's proposed generic name was taken as the specific epithet. Temminck's name is thus a nomen novum and its type must be the holotype of *Mirafra javanica* Horsfield, 1821.

5. It is probable that the sole type of this taxon was MNHN GdO 8023 collected in or before 1819 by Leschenault, but this specimen was apparently discarded in 1869 for reasons not now known (MNHN Catalogue).

6. After his retirement and arrival in England in March 1863 Edward Blyth maintained his interest in Indian ornithology. In 1866-67 he wrote, for *The Ibis*, a "Commentary on Dr. Jerdon's 'Birds of India'", which engaged him in further literature and museum research (and from a footnote it is clear that he examined collections at "the British Museum, India Museum, the Derby Museum of Liverpool, the private collection of Mr. Wallace and others"). In the four parts of this paper he named nine new taxa; an investigation of these suggests no common source for the types and due to the limited information there must be doubts about some of those said to have been found. Three of the nine were larks: *Melanocorypha maxima* was in Gould's hands, and both forms of *Pyrrhulauda* were "made available to" Blyth: *affinis* apparently by Gould, and *sincipitalis* by Dresser (but the types are not known to be in Tring). None is listed as in Liverpool (Wagstaffe, 1978). The Dresser collection is in Manchester but the collection is being moved and the accessible records do not mention the type of

sincipitalis Blyth (H. McGhie, pers. comm.).

7. Scopoli, a Professor of Botany in Pavia, determined that birds collected and named in French by Sonnerat (1776, 1782) in his travel books should have proper scientific names (Stresemann, 1975). Scopoli probably never saw the underlying specimens from Sonnerat's travels as, amongst other mistakes, he applied the generic name *Oriolus* to a buttonquail from Luzon. *Alauda malabarica* and *Alauda grisea* were depicted in Sonnerat (1782) on plate 113, figures 1 and 2 (respectively). It is most unlikely that any type specimens survive and this black-and-white plate is of very little help.

8. It is possible that Madarász's type material remains intact in Budapest (although the Museum burnt down in 1956).

9. Major James Franklin's collection was presented to the Zoological Society of London by the Physical Committee of the Asiatic Society of Calcutta[17] (Franklin, 1831), at a time when the Asiatic Society was having financial difficulties and before it had a curator for its specimens (Sclater, 1892). The birds, perhaps only single specimens of each, were exhibited and a list attributed to Franklin appeared with 28 new taxa named in it. Of Franklin's type specimens, once in the hands of the Zoological Society, whose collection was dispersed in 1855, the part of the collection that was acquired by the British Museum seems to have included only one, the holotype of *Certhia spilonota* Franklin, 1831 (Warren & Harrison, 1971). No records exist to show what happened to the balance of the Zoological Society's collection (Dickinson et al., 1991: 109).

10. The situation regarding types of the birds named by Zarudny and his collaborators needs further research. Zarudny was based at Ashkhabad, in the Turkmen S.S.R. (now Turkmenistan). There is type material, in Tashkent State University, representative of some 71 avian taxa of the 238 reportedly named by Zarudny (Balan, 1966). This material needs further study and it leaves many unaccounted for. Some Zarudny material acquired by Lord Rothschild is now at the AMNH and this may contain type material too as Zarudny rarely selected a holotype. Peters (1960a) in the case of the name *Galerida cristata submagna* listed one author as Billewitch a lapsus for Bilkewitch.

11. The original description recorded a skin and a specimen in spirit (Blyth, 1853). The types of this taxon were already believed to be missing a century ago (Sclater, 1892).

12. The holotype was presented to the Asiatic Society of Bengal by the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society of London. It is mentioned by Blyth (1852: 133), a single specimen from Sindh, presumably the type, being "in bad order". This name was listed neither amongst the missing types nor amongst those found (Sclater, 1892).

---

[17] Later the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

13. This name was based on the "Afghanistan Lark" in Blyth (1845) but Blyth (1845, 1847) provided no details other than descriptive details. There is no mention of it in Blyth (1852). This name was listed neither amongst the missing types nor amongst those found (Sclater, 1892).

14. When Gould (1867, May) published, his name had been published by Blyth in January and Gould's proposed name is a junior synonym, but, as explained in comment 6 (above), the type of Blyth's name was in Gould's hands and no doubt the same specimen was named by Gould.

15. Towards the end of his life Pallas lived in the Crimea. It is known that some of his specimens which were sent to Germany for illustration are now in the Zoological Museum, Berlin, but it is not known whether any of his types survive there.

16. The name *sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, was based upon "Pall. it. 2, p. 708, n. 15 * 3 p. 697". Research shows that this refers to two volumes of a book by Pallas, first Pallas (1773) where on p. 708, which is within the Anhang (= Appendix), No. 15 is *"Alauda Calandra?";* second Pallas (1776), where on p. 697, again within the Anhang to the volume, No. 19 is *Alauda mongolica* - and a footnote to this refers to the 1773 text and explains that his *mongolica* is not the same as his *calandra* of 1773[18]. Peters (1960a) treated Gmelin's name as unavailable, presumably on the grounds of preoccupation by *Tanagra siberica* Sparrman, 1786 (which is a synonym of *Alauda yeltoniensis* Forster, 1767) although the editors of Peters Check-list footnoted a contrary opinion. *Alauda sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, would therefore seem from its citation to have been based on both *Alauda calandra* ? Pallas, 1773, and on *Alauda mongolica* Pallas, 1776. As Pallas's 1776 footnote makes clear that the two names relate to different entities Gmelin's name would seem to relate to a composite set of type material. However, Peters (1960a) treated *Alauda sibirica* Gmelin as an unavailable senior synonym of *Alauda leucoptera* Pallas, 1811. Pallas (1811) below his description of *leucoptera* referred to *"Alauda Calandrae affinis",* this seems to imply that he recognised that the two were very similar (rather than that *leucoptera* was a name put forward as a replacement name, but there is no mention of the 1776 name and we have not achieved a clear understanding of the application of these names). Sharpe (1890: 557) took it that both Gmelin's name and *leucoptera* Pallas applied to the same taxon. We have not examined Sharpe's reasons or sources for interpreting this name in the way he did (although a misreading of the 1776 footnote seems possible). These names all relate to type localities to the north of our area of interest and we have elected not to pursue this further. Our limited findings suggest that *Alauda sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, should probably be considered unidentifiable on the grounds that when first applied the indications given were to two distinct and different taxa, but we do not feel we have sufficiently resolved the matter.

---

[18] Which we omit from our list in the belief, explained above, that the name is indeterminate but hoping that others, studying Palaearctic birds, will re-examine this and the related names discussed here and clarify their applicability.

17. No information that might lead to the types is mentioned in the original description.

18. This name was based on "*Emberiza baghaira* Franklin". This refers to Franklin (1831: 119) where the 'Baag-geyra Lark' of Latham is mentioned. Franklin gave no description. His 'indication' to Latham is without a date. It refers to Latham (1823) General History of Birds (6: 307), and no scientific name was provided (M. Walters pers. comm.)[19]. Neither Franklin's nomen nudum nor Blyth's name was listed either amongst the missing types or amongst those found by Sclater (1892). Blyth's name may not be based on a specimen and be only a new combination. It was not mentioned in Blyth (1852). Latham referred to a Hardwicke specimen or perhaps picture.

19. Eversmann published in St. Petersburg but the type is not there.

20. Like other Blyth taxa covered by various notes above, this was listed neither as missing nor as present in Calcutta a century ago (Sclater, 1892). In the original description Blyth (1845) wrote "I obtained a fine specimen of this bird alive, and kept it for some time, when just as it had come into good plumage it died, and, as a specimen, was destroyed by the ants". He then mentioned a pair held by Buchanan Hamilton and another procured by Sir A. Barnes, but on the very next page *Alauda raytal* is listed as "absolutely wanting" in the Society's Museum. Blyth (1852) reported two specimens from the banks of the Hooghly, i.e. near Calcutta, received in 1845, which clearly must have been received later in the year. We may perhaps deduce that Blyth either described his own bird, before it was lost, or that he relied on a written description from Buchanan Hamilton. The description has the form and style of Blyth's own descriptions so the former is more likely, with perhaps just the name drawn from Hamilton.

21. Peters (1960a) seems to be quite wrong to attribute the published name to Tugarinov and the MS name to Hartert & Steinbacher. The citation given is to the work by Hartert & Steinbacher and they appear to acknowledge their use of a Tugarinov MS name, but not to argue that the description they give was written by him for them to include with attribution. No type specimen was mentioned in the original description and Hartert does not seem to have provided a type later. By 1933 the Rothschild Collection had been moved to New York and Hartert's type lists terminated.

22. The original description reported a male and a female and gave the measurements for each. It is therefore not clear why Warren & Harrison (1971) listed a holotype. The name was erroneously cited as *Galerida leautungensis* by Peters (1960a).

23. Taczanowski (1888) mentioned a pair collected in January 1886, but the description is not flagged as "subsp. nov." or "var. nov." unlike the description of a

[19] As no scientific name is involved this reference does not appear in the References.

new species on a later page, so this may not be the original description. Taczanowski did not select the male as his type yet Sztolcman & Domaniewski (1927) list this as if it was a holotype so perhaps an annotation on the label suggests this; it may be appropriate to consider that they designated the male as a lectotype.

24. Blyth wrote that his specimen had been presented to the Society by Captain Boys, however Horsfield & Moore (1856: 465) believed it had been named on the basis of a caged bird. This may be derived from Blyth (1852: 133) who listed an adult bird and a young bird and wrote "purchased caged (1846)" which, if the original description was correct, can have related only to the young bird. No type specimen of this was mentioned by Sclater (1892).

25. The name *dulcivox* first appeared as a *nomen nudum.* This is discussed in Appendix 1[20]. The name was then introduced with a description by Hume (1872b), and shortly after by Brooks (1873a) whose name was recognized for many years (Meinertzhagen, 1951; Vaurie, 1951) before Hume's description was noted (Vaurie, 1959). Vaurie (1951) considered that Brooks had not adequately fixed the type locality and designated it as Djarkent in 'Russian Turkistan'. As Brooks had not selected a type Vaurie also designated a neotype in the AMNH. The neotype is now somewhat irrelevant, Vaurie (1959) noted that Hume's identical name had priority, and to Hume's name the designations he made in 1951 do not apply.

Hume (1872b) reported *dulcivox* from the "Himalayas and as a winter visitant to the plains of north-western Punjab". Vaurie (1959) erred in suggesting that Hume selected no type. Hume wrote of a specimen "killed at Murdan in December, 1870, absolutely identical in every respect with his beautiful figure" (Hodgson's drawing then in Hume's possession) and this must clearly be taken as Hume's type. This is the specimen that Sharpe (1890) listed as specimen *l''* under *Alauda cantarella.* This was not listed by Warren & Harrison (1971). At our suggestion this has been searched for and found by Michael Walters. It is BMNH 1887.78.1.3736 and is now in the type collection.

26. Ehmcke's type specimens, when described, were in Budapest where the museum was burnt down in 1956.

27. We believe that the type may be in Almaty (Kazakhstan), but we do not yet have confirmation of this.

28. In the original the author's name was transcribed as Zaliesski, which is used here, rather than Zolesski which appeared in Peters (1960a). Meinertzhagen (1951) wrote that the name should be "Salesskij (not Saliensky)" and said that the type was once in the private collection of Mr. Salesskij, but that its whereabouts were now unknown. In fact the text seems to mention three syntypes.

---

[20] Three Hodgson names dating from 1844 have created much confusion. In four of these numbered comments, which deal only with names for which we believe types exist or did exist, we refer to these names. The *nomina nuda* and other names derived from them that are not in our table are all discussed in this Appendix.

29. Much of Momiyama's collection, including this type, is preserved at the Yamashina Institute, but some of the collection was destroyed in the war.

30. The authors published in German and their names were transliterated as given in our table. Peters (1960a) rendered the names as Kistjakowsky & Kotschubei. The holotype was in the Zoological Institute in Kiev, but was destroyed in World War II.

31. Usually cited as Brooks, 1873, J. Asiatic Soc. Beng., 41, p. 85 (Brooks 1873b). It was actually published earlier. The correct reference is Proc. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 1871, p. 210. This name is preoccupied by *Alauda guttata* Lafresnaye, 1839[21].

32. The original name *Alauda triborhyncha* Hodgson, 1844, is a nomen nudum further discussed in Appendix 1. In the same appendix we also discuss Alauda triborhyncha Horsfield & Moore, 1856, and *Alauda triborhyncha* Hume, 1872b, and we argue that none of these names is available.

By contrast the name *Alauda triborhyncha* 'Hodson' [sic] was used in "Lahore to Yarkand" by Hume (1873b), where it is depicted in pl. 28, following which is a plate of the rather similar *Alauda gulgula.* This name was therefore validly introduced, but the history of it is confused. Its use was reported by Sharpe (1890), who treated it not as a synonym of *A. gulgula* but of *A. arvensis*: four September or October Henderson specimens from Ladak, from the Hume Collection, were listed by Sharpe as *"Alauda liopus",* a form of *A. arvensis.* Sharpe (1890) listed no other specimens from Ladak, either under that name or under the name gulgula.

It was suggested by Meinertzhagen (1927) that the specimen collected in Ladak by Henderson, which became the holotype of *lhamarum* Meinertzhagen & Meinertzhagen, 1926a, is the exact bird depicted in plate 28 in Hume (1873b). The original description of *lhamarum* did not give a month of collection, nor was one given by Warren & Harrison (1971). The holotype has been re-examined and there is a Henderson label with it, loose; the date on it, all in figures, has been overwritten, but may originally have included a '9.' before the '70'. The name on the label was originally *triborhyncha* (which is consistent with Henderson & Hume), but this was later crossed through and replaced by *leiopus* (who wrote this is unknown; it may relate to Hume's or to Sharpe's views). This specimen has been compared with the plate. As there were at least four specimens from Ladak that could have been figured, Meinertzhagen's opinion on the identity of the individual depicted with the type of *lhamarum* is speculative, but Ladak and Kashmir birds belong to the same subspecies (Vaurie, 1951). It is no doubt best to treat all these Henderson specimens including the holotype of *lhamarum* as syntypes of *triborhyncha* Hume, 1873b (*nec triborhyncha* Hume 1872b – see Appendix 1). However, these birds are not consistent with the description of *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore, 1856 (see Appendix 1).

Sharpe (1890) identified the names *triborhyncha* of Hodgson and of Horsfield & Moore (but not of Hume, 1872b) with *Alauda gulgula.* He listed *triborhyncha* Hume,

---

[21] An African taxon name listed by Peters (1960a) as *Certhilauda albescens guttata* (Lafresnaye).

1873b, wrongly we believe, as a synonym of *arvensis*. It is demonstrably the oldest name of the population of Ladak (now called *lhamarum*).

The name *Alauda triborhyncha* 'Hodson' [sic] Hume, 1873b, does not appear in Peters (1960a) having been placed in synonymy by Sharpe (1890). It has its own types (one of which is also the holotype of *lhamarum* as discussed above) and was described without reference to Horsfield & Moore's name (based on birds from elsewhere), and it should appear in any full synonymy.

This name, for short *triborhyncha* Hume, 1873b, is a senior synonym of *lhamarum* but it is preoccupied by *Alauda triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore, 1856, which is indeterminate (see Appendix 1). The name *triborhyncha* Hume, 1873b, although validly introduced, is therefore unavailable and *lhamarum* should be used for the population of Ladak.

33. In his original description Blyth wrote "I have seen but two examples of this bird, the first alive in the shop of a dealer who had sold it, and the second was shot by Mr. Frith, and presented in a fresh state to the Society, as noticed in my Report for January." Nothing is known of Mr. Frith and no reference to the name *A[lauda]. gracilis* Blyth, 1842, was made by Sclater (1892). Despite this there seem to have been three specimens in 1846. Two specimens seem to have been presented in 1846 by the Asiatic Society of Bengal to the India Museum (Horsfield & Moore (1856: 467) but one specimen "E" was still in Calcutta after 1846 (Blyth, 1852: 132). These were listed as specimens of *Alauda malabarica* Scopoli, but that name relates to a species of the genus *Galerida*. These two specimens, neither certainly the lone type of *gracilis*, and probably both representative of a form of *A. gulgula,* should have been accessioned by the British Museum (Nat. Hist.), for example in 1880 with the specimens of *Mirafra* discussed earlier. So far they have not been traced. Very close to *gulgula* the lone type was distinguishable by a characteristic rufescent-white tip to the outer web of the penultimate tail feather (Blyth, 1845).

34. Blyth (1843: 181[22]) proposed that the new name *"A. gangetica"* be applied to a description that he had attached to "*A. gulgula* Franklin" in which, at the time, he had differed from Jerdon, who believed it to be "*A. Chendoola* Franklin" (see Blyth, 1842: 201). It is clear that Blyth's description was attached to a specimen obtained in the neighbourhood (op. cit. p. 199), i.e. near Calcutta, but although Blyth (1852) listed this as a synonym of *A. gulgula* he associated no specimens with that name. Horsfield & Moore treated this as another synonym of *Alauda malabarica* Scopoli, but they listed no specimen as received from Calcutta. Sharpe (1890) placed the name in his synonymy of *Alauda gulgula* but listed no specimen from Calcutta received from the India Museum. Sclater (1892) is silent on the name *gangetica*.

35. The holotype was collected on 27 June 1873 and should be in the Natural History Museum, Tring, as Whistler (1944) reported that Kinnear had found it and that it

[22] There are two sets of six pages each with the numbers 177 to 182 and this name is easily overlooked. An asterisk was added to the pages of the second set, which followed page 182. The page cited here is in the first set, without the asterisk.

was a juvenile of *gulgula*. It is not listed by Warren & Harrison (1971). It has been sought for us by Michael Walters but has not been found.

36. Founded on a single specimen in the "Indian Museum" labelled "*Alauda gulgula* Franklin, male, Ootacamund. W.T.B. donor" (Brooks, 1873a). W.T.B. was, of course, Blanford. The collection in Calcutta, known as that of the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Blyth's time, was incorporated in the "Imperial Museum" in 1865 (Sclater, 1892) and the inclusion of Blanford's material was specifically mentioned by Sclater. The name "Indian Museum" was clearly the official title by 1892 and, as it was used by Brooks (1873a) this name must have come into use some 20 years before Sclater wrote. This however is not to be confused with the India Museum or India House in London.

37. As with many other Gmelin names this was based on the works of Buffon (1771-1786), in this case on Daubenton's plate 650, figure 2. As discussed in Dickinson et al. (2000) any original specimens from this period must be assumed to have perished and Daubenton's plate must serve as the type.

38. This has caused us considerable research. The reasons for this are set out in Appendix 2 in which we designate a lectotype.

39. Sharpe (1890: 670) noted that Dwight (1890) had already introduced the name *pallida* for a form of this species. Sharpe's own name on p. 533 was therefore corrected to *diluta* at the foot of p. 670. Although Peters (1960a) added "= Kashgar" after 'central Asia' this appears to be based on the statement by Hellmayr (1929) that the type is from Kashgar. In fact Sharpe did not designate a type, and all 23 specimens he listed are syntypes (unless Sharpe's quotation of Stoliczka's details of soft parts colours be taken to dictate the selection of a type). The 'selected syntype' of Warren & Harrison (1971) is the male of Biddulph's two birds from Kashgar. Arguably if the type locality has been restricted to Kashgar then it has been done inferentially by Peters (1960a).

40. Mis-spelled or perhaps emended to *penicillata* by Peters (1960a). Flöricke's types have not been located. He was associated at different times with museums in Stuttgart, Budapest and Sarajevo. His collection in Stuttgart was destroyed in World War II (Walters, 1997); this may, or may not, have been his whole collection. We have not made contact with potential correspondents in Budapest or Sarajevo, but the bird collection in Budapest was destroyed in 1956.

41. There are unresolved problems associated with the type of *brandti*, which we have not been able to examine. Dresser (1874) named it on p. 397 as given by Peters (1960a), not on p. 401 as stated by Seebohm (1884: 186), and it is described there. His type, Dresser (1874) said, was from the Kirghiz Steppes and in Swinhoe's collection. Swinhoe's collection was largely from China and why a specimen from the Kirghiz steppes might have been there is unclear. Swinhoe's collection passed to Seebohm so it should have been part of Seebohm's collection when this was accessioned by the British Museum (Nat. Hist.) in 1896-1898 *fide* Sharpe (1906). Seebohm (1884: 186) said that it was a "Sarepta skin"[23], which may imply that he did then possess it. If actually

acquired by Dresser the type may be in Manchester Museum, University of Manchester. The collection is presently inaccessible but no other record there suggests this type is present (H. McGhie, pers. comm.). It is still possible that we have overlooked this type in Tring.

42. The type catalogue of the Polish Museum of Natural History, Warsaw, listed the continued absence of a type that was sent to Rostoff-on-Don during the war (Sztolcman & Domaniewski, 1927)[24]. However the original description suggests that there was more than a single type as a male and a female were described.

43. The spelling *bachlowi* used by Peters (1960a) was a typographical error; it is correctly rendered *hachlowi*.

44. Three descriptions appeared in 1887, one each in Russian, German and English journals (Peters, 1960a). The scientific name employed was the same and the German and English versions are reportedly translations. The three no doubt all relate to the same type.

45. Peters (1960a), in the context of Przewalski's use of it, erred in citing the original spelling as *Otocorys*. However, while on the subject of this generic name we should observe that we have deliberately not used "sic" for either of the two spellings, which were both used frequently. Sharpe (1890) employed the spelling *Otocorys* but cited the original spelling as *Otocoris*. Whether the emendation was Sharpe's or was earlier we have not checked, nor have we checked whether the citation is correct.

Summary of types of unknown whereabouts

We would specifically welcome information concerning the types of: *Alauda chendoola* 'Franklin' Jerdon, 1840, nec *Alauda Chendoola* Franklin, 1831; *M[irafra]. affinis* 'Jerdon' Blyth, 1845; *Pyrrhulauda sincipitalis* Blyth, 1867; *Pyrrhulauda affinis* Blyth, 1867; *Mirafra phoenicura* Franklin, 1831; *A[mmomanes]. deserti iranica* Zarudny, 1911; *M[irafra]. phoenicuroides* Blyth, 1853; *Saxicola* (?) *pallida* Blyth, 1847; *Certhilauda desertorum* var. *cinerea* Zarudny, 1903-04; *Melanocorypha calandra raddei* Zarudny & Loudon, 1904; *Melanocorypha torquata* Blyth, 1847; *Melanocorypha maxima* 'Gould' Blyth, 1867; *Melanocorypha maxima* Gould, 1867; *Alauda mongolica* Pallas, 1776; *[Alauda] sibirica* Gmelin, 1789; *Alauda leucoptera* Pallas, 1811; *[Alauda] yeltoniensis* Forster, 1767; *Alauda tatarica* Pallas, 1773; *C[orypha]. baghaira* Blyth, 1842; *Alauda longipennis* Eversmann, 1848; *Calandrella minor seistanica* Zarudny & Loudon, 1904; *Calandrella rufescens tangutica* 'Tugarinov MS', Hartert & Steinbacher, 1933; *Galerida cristata iwanowi* Loudon & Zarudny, 1903; *Galerida cristata submagna* Zarudny & Bilkewitch, 1918; *Alauda Chendoola* Franklin, 1831; *C[erthilauda]. Boysii* Blyth, 1846; *M[irafra]. Hayi* 'Jerdon' Blyth, 1845; *Alauda schach* Ehmcke, 1904; *Alauda beludshistana* Ehmcke, 1904; *Alau-*

[23] Sarepta: an old name, apparently near Volgograd although other suggestions have been put to us.
[24] Presumably World War I, although the authors could be read as implying a date between 1919 and 1927.

da arvensis kiborti Zaliesski, 1917; *Alauda transcaspica* Ehmcke, 1934; *Alauda Gulgula* Franklin, 1831; *A[lauda]. gracilis* Blyth, 1842; *Alauda gangetica* Blyth, 1843; *Alauda Australis* Brooks, 1873; *Otocorys pennicillata transcaspica* Flöricke, 1898; *Otocorys brandti* Dresser, 1874; and *Otocorys Parvexi* Taczanowski, 1876.

Acknowledgements

As in our previous work on Asian types (Dekker et al., 2000, Dickinson et al., 2000) we must begin by acknowledging a considerable debt to those who have published relevant type catalogues (Arbocco et al., 1978; Bangs, 1930; Deignan, 1961; Gyldenstolpe, 1926; Storer, 1988; Sztolcman & Domaniewski, 1927 and Warren & Harrison, 1971, 1973) and to those working on current drafts for type catalogues that have been shown to us. In addition we should like to thank all our contributors for sharing their knowledge, and especially those in Moscow, Paris, St. Petersburg and Tokyo for their hospitality. Mikhail Kalyakin is particularly grateful to Pavel Tomkovich for encouraging his interest in the type collection in Moscow.

In preparing this work, mainly based at our own institutions or at the Natural History Museum, Tring, UK (ECD), one or more of us has visited the following museums: Abiko City (ECD 2000), Berlin (SS 1997), Dresden (SS 1997), Moscow (ECD 2000), New York (ECD 1999), Paris (SS 1998, ECD & RD 1999), St. Petersburg (ECD & RD 2000). At these museums we have been welcomed and assisted by Robert Prys-Jones and Michael Walters and some of their predecessors at Tring, by Burkhard Stephan, Sylke Frahnert and the late Gottfried Mauersberger in Berlin, and by George Barrowclough, Mary LeCroy and Paul Sweet, and some of their predecessors in New York. One or more of us have been further assisted by Bernd Nicolai and Rüdiger Holz in Halberstadt, Henry McGhie in Manchester, Alain Hennache and Eric Pasquet in Paris, Helen Shapoval in St. Petersburg, Per Ericson in Stockholm, Brad Millen and Mark Peck in Toronto, and Anita Gamauf and Herbert Schifter in Vienna.

ECD is most grateful to the Frank M. Chapman Fund of the American Museum of Natural History for a collection study grant in early 1999, and SS is most pleased to acknowledge financial assistance from the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (1996), the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst (1997) and the French Ministry for Foreign Affairs through the Office for Co-operation and Cultural Affairs, French Embassy in Jakarta (1998).

We wish to thank Mrs F.E. Warr for much help to ECD with library work in Tring, and for the loan of her own copy of Stresemann (1975). Mrs Ann Datta greatly facilitated additional bibliographic work at The Natural History Museum, South Kensington. Attila Bankovics kindly helped with a rare reference. Murray Bruce reviewed our list of references and offered helpful suggestions which we have often used. Michael Walters assisted over the duplicate specimens sent to Canada and corresponded with Toronto, where Brad Millen was extremely helpful, supplying photographs of potential type specimens relating to Blyth. Michael Walters also assisted in developing the reasoning used in Appendix 2. In dealing with the synonymies we have made much use of Stepanyan (1990), although sometimes we follow him tentatively. We are also grateful to both Per Alström and Cees Roselaar for sharing drafts on the taxonomic treatment planned for two forthcoming books. Their views will add to what we offer

here and our Synopsis will benefit from that. We also thank L.B. Holthuis and Philip Tubbs for advice on nomenclatural issues. We are extremely grateful to Mary LeCroy and Michael Walters who have read a draft of this paper and helped us with some of the more difficult problems as well as helping to improve the clarity.

Acronyms

AMNH	American Museum of Natural History, New York.
BMNH	The Natural History Museum, Tring - formerly the British Museum (Natural History).
BNHS	Bombay Natural History Society.
DMNH	Delaware Museum of Natural History, Greenville.
FMNH	Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
HNHM	Hungarian Natural History Museum, Budapest.
IZA	Institute of Zoology, Almaty, Kazakhstan.
MCZ	Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard.
MH	Museum Heineanum, Halberstadt.
MNHN	Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.
MNSG	Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Genova, Genoa.
MPHN	Polish Museum of Natural History, Warsaw.
MTD	Staatliches Museum fur Tierkunde Dresden.
NMW	Naturhistorisches Museum Wien.
NRM	Swedish Natural History Museum, Stockholm.
RMNH	National Museum of Natural History, Leiden - formerly Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie.
ROM	Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.
TASU	Tashkent State University, Uzbekistan.
UCCM	Museo Regionale di Scienze Naturali, Turin.
UMMZ	University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.
USNM	United States National Museum, Washington DC.
YIO	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology, Abiko City, Chiba, Japan.
ZFMK	Zoologisches Forschungsinstitut und Museum A. Koenig, Bonn, Germany.
ZISP	Zoological Institute, St. Petersburg.
ZMB	Zoologisches Museum, Berlin.
ZMMU	Zoological Museum, Moscow State University, Russia.
ZSI	Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.

References

Abdulali, H., 1976. On a new subspecies of the skylark *Alauda gulgula* Franklin in Gujarat, India.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 72(2): 448-449.

Allen, J.A., 1905. Report on the birds collected in Northeastern Siberia by the Jesup North Pacific Expedition, with field notes by the collectors.— Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist. 21(13): 219-257.

Arbocco, G., L. Capocacchia & C. Violani, 1978. Catalogo dei tipi di uccelli del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Genova.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova 82: 184-265.

Babault, G., 1920. Mission Guy Babault dans les Provinces Centrales de l'Inde dans la région occidentale de l'Himalaya et Ceylan 1914. Résultats scientifiques. Oiseaux collectionnés au cours de la mission. 1-342.— Paris.

Baker, E.C.S., 1915a. *[Mirafra cantillans williamsoni,* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 36: 9-10.

Baker, E.C.S., 1915b. *[Mirafra assamica marionæ* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 36: 34.

Baker, E.C.S., 1930. The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma. Birds (2nd edition). 8: 485-801.— London.

Balan, P. M., 1966. Types of newly described birds of N.A. Zarudny's collection. [In Russian.]: 107-121.— In: T.Z. Zakhidova, 1966. (ed.) Vertebrate animals of central Asia. (Pozvonochnie zhivotnye srednei Azii): 1-232. Tashkent.

Bangs, O.C., 1930. Types of birds now in the Museum of Comparative Zoology.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 70(4): 145-426.

Bangs, O.C. & J.L. Peters, 1928. Birds collected by Dr. Joseph F. Rock in Western Kansu and Eastern Tibet.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 68(7): 313-381.

Banjkowski[25], V.B., 1913. On the bird fauna of Transcaucasia, in particular the Tbilisi government. [In Russian].— Izvest. Kavkas. Muz. 7: 205-286.

Bianchi, V.L., 1904a. Note préliminaire sur les formes paléarctiques du genre *Alauda* Linn.— Ann. Mus. Zool. Acad. Sci. St. Petersburg 9: xxx-xxxi.

Bianchi, V.L., 1904b. Key to the Palaearctic species of Larks of the Genus *Otocorys*.— Ibis (8)4: 370-372.

Blanford, W.T., 1872. Account of a visit to the Eastern and Northern Frontiers of Independant Sikkim with notes on the Zoology of the Alpine and Subalpine regions.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 41: 30-73.

Blyth, E., 1842. Curator's Report for February.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 11(122): 199-204.

Blyth, E., 1843. Memorandum in lieu of Curator's Report. With attached revisions to previous Reports.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 12(134): 167-182 bis.

Blyth, E., 1845. Synopsis of Indian Fringillidae.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal (156): 944-996 (1844).

Blyth, E., 1846. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 15(169): 1-54.

Blyth, E., 1847. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 16: 117-157, 428-476.

Blyth, E., 1852. Catalogue of the birds in the Museum [of the] Asiatic Society: i-xxxiv, 1-403.— Calcutta.

Blyth, E., 1853. Report of the Curator, Zoology Dept., for the August Meeting.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 22: 580-584.

Blyth, E., 1865. A few identifications and rectifications of synonymy.— Ibis (2)1: 27-50.

Blyth, E., 1867a. The Ornithology of India - A Commentary on Dr. Jerdon's 'Birds of India'.— Ibis (2)3: 147-185.

Blyth, E., 1867b. The Ornithology of India - A Commentary on Dr. Jerdon's 'Birds of India'.— Ibis (2)3: 1-48.

Bonaparte, C.L., 1850. Conspectus generum avium. 1: 1-543.— Lugduni Batavorum.

Brooks, W.E., 1871. Notes on the ornithology of Cashmir.— Proc. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 40: 209-210.

Brooks, W.E., 1873a. Notes on the skylarks of India.— Stray Feathers 1(6): 484-487.

Brooks, W.E., 1873b. Notes on the ornithology of Cashmir.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 41: 73-86.

Brooks, W.E., 1880. Ornithological observations in Sikhim, the Punjab and Sind.— Stray Feathers 8(6): 464-489.

Buffon, G.L.L. (Comte de), 1771-1786. Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux. 10 vols.— Paris.

Cabanis, J., 1850-1851. Museum Heineanum. Verzeichniss der ornithologischen Sammlung des Oberamtmann Ferdinand Heine auf Gut St. Burchard vor Halberstadt mit kritischen Anmerkungen und Beschreibung der neuen Arten, systematisch bearbeitet. I. Singvogel. 1-233.— Halberstadt.

Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1987. A Synopsis of the Avifauna of China. 1-1223.— Beijing.

Cocker, M. & C. Inskipp, 1988. A Himalayan ornithologist. 1-87.— Oxford.

David, A., 1871. Catalogue des Oiseaux de Chine observés dans la partie septentrionale de l'Empire de 1862 à 1870.— Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris 7, Bull. 1: 3-14.

David, A. & J-F.E. Oustalet, 1877. Les oiseaux de la Chine: i-vii, 1-573.— Paris.

Deignan, H.G., 1941. New races of Alaudidae and Timaliidae from northern Thailand.— Zoologica 26(3): 241.

Deignan, H.G., 1961. Type specimens of birds in the United States National Museum.— U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 221: i-x, 1-718.

---

[25] This is the German transliteration of the surname, which may be transliterated into English as Ban'kovskii. The German spelling is used here because it was used by Peters and a German title was given for the paper.

Deignan, H.G., 1964. Subfamily Timaliinae: 240-427.— In: E. Mayr & R.A. Paynter Jr., 1964. Check-list of Birds of the World. X. i-ix, 1-502.— Cambridge, Mass.

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., 1932. Description de deux oiseaux d'Indochine.— L'Oiseau 2(4): 616-618.

Dickinson, E.C. & R.W.R.J. Dekker, 2001. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 11. A preliminary review of the Alaudidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 335 (this volume).

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.S. Kennedy & K.C. Parkes, 1991. The Birds of the Philippines. An annotated Check-list.— BOU Check-list Ser. 12: 1-507.

Domaniewski, J., 1933. Contribution à la connaissance des oiseaux de la Transbaikalie du sud-ouest et de la Mongolie du Nord.— Acta Orn. Mus. Zool. Polon. 1(6): 147-179.

Dresser, H.E., 1874. Pt. 32.— In: H.E. Dresser, 1871-1881. A History of the Birds of Europe, including all the species inhabiting the Western Palaearctic Region. 4: 1-635. London. [Page 3 of Pt. 32, dated 1874, became p. 397 in Vol. 4 when bound.].

Dwight, J. Jr., 1890. The horned larks of North America.— The Auk 7(2): 138-158.

Ehmcke, A., 1903. In: Bericht über die Jahresversammlung.— J. f. Orn. 51: 149-153.

Ehmcke, A., 1904a (April). In: Bericht über die Dezember-Sitzung 1903.— J. f. Orn. 52: 308-313.

Ehmcke, A., 1904b. Beschreibung einiger neuer Lerchenarten aus den Museen von Sarajevo und Budapest.— Ann. Mus. Nat. Hung. 2: 296-301.

Eversmann, E., 1848. Einige Beiträge zur Mammalogie und Ornithologie des Russischen Reichs.— Bull. Soc. Imp. Nat., Moscow 21(1): 186-227.

Fleming, R.F., 1968. Nepal birds: supplement to Biswas List.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 65: 326-334.

Fleming, R.L. & M.A. Traylor, Jr., 1961. Notes on Nepal Birds.— Fieldiana, Zool. 35(8): 441-487.

Fleming, R.L. & M.A. Traylor, Jr., 1964. Further notes on Nepal birds.— Fieldiana, Zool. 35(9): 489-558.

Fleming, R.L. & M.A. Traylor, Jr., 1968. Distributional notes on Nepal birds.— Fieldiana, Zool. 53(3): 145-203.

Flöricke, K., 1898. Schilderungen aus der Vogelwelt fremder Länder. Meine Reisse nach Centralasien.— Gefiederte Welt 27: 44-46.

Forster, J.R., 1767. Specimen Historiae Naturalis Volgensis.— Philos. Trans. 57: 312-357 (Aves: 346-351).

Franklin, J., 1831. Catalogue of Birds (systematically arranged) which were collected on the Ganges between Calcutta and Benares, and in the Vindhyian hills between the latter place and Gurrah Mundela, on the Nerbudda.— Proc. Commit. Zool. Soc. London (1831): 114-125.

Gmelin, J.F., 1789. Systema Naturae, per regna tria Naturae: secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, Differentiis, Synonymis, Locis. 13th edition. Tome 1, Pars 2: 501-1032.— Lugduni.

Gould, J., 1867. Part 19 (May), pl. 8.— In: J. Gould, 1850-1883. Birds of Asia. IV. London. Unpaginated. [In vol. 4 the plate becomes plate 72.].

Gray, J.E. & G.R. Gray, 1846. Catalogue of the specimens and drawings of Mammalia and Birds of Nepal and Thibet presented by B.H. Hodgson Esq., to the British Museum. 1-156.— London.

Gyldenstolpe, N., 1926. Types of birds in the Royal Natural History Museum in Stockholm.— Arkiv for Zool. 19A(1): 1-116.

Hachisuka, M., 1926. A new race of the Skylark *Alauda arvensis* from Saghalien.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 47: 23-24.

Hachisuka, M., 1930. Contributions to the birds of the Philippines. 2.— Orn. Soc. Japan, Suppl. Publ. 14: 137-222.

Hachisuka, M., 1931a. Descriptions de nouvelles races d'oiseaux de Mindanao (Iles Philippines).— L'Oiseau 1: 471-472.

Hachisuka, M., 1931b. The birds of the Philippine islands. 1(2): 1-168.— London.

Hachisuka, M., 1942. List of birds described by the Japanese authors.— Tori 11: 270-351.

Härms, M., 1907. *Galerida cristata vamberyi*.— Orn. Monatsber. 15: 49-51.

Hartert, E., 1902. [*Ammomanes cinctura zarudny*, subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 12: 42-43.

Hartert, E., 1904. Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna. 1. Heft 2: 113-240.— Berlin.
Hartert, E., 1905. Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna. 1. Heft 3: 241-384.— Berlin.
Hartert, E., 1922. Zoologische Ergebnisse der Walter Stötznerschen Expeditionen nach Szetschwan, Osttibet und Tschili. 3 Teil. Aves. 2. Alaudidae und Troglodytidae.— Abh. Ber. Mus. Tierk. Dresden 15(3): 19-22.
Hartert, E., 1923a. [*Alauda arvensis herberti*, subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 43: 149-150.
Hartert, E., 1923b. Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna. Nachtrag. 1. 1-92.— Berlin.
Hartert, E. & F. Steinbacher, 1933. Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna. Ergänzungsband. Heft 2: 97-192.— Berlin.
Hellmayr, C.E., 1929. Birds of the James Simpson-Roosevelts Asiatic Expedition.— Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Zool. 17(3): 27-144.
Hodgson, B.H., 1844. Catalogue of Nipalese Birds collected between 1824 and 1844.— [Gray's] Zool. Misc. pt 3: 81-86.
Horsfield, T., 1821. A systematic arrangement and description of birds from the island of Java.— Trans. Linn. Soc. London 13(1): 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. VII: 146-167 (1839).
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.
Horsfield, T. & F. Moore, 1856. A catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East India Company. 2: 453-752.— London.
Hume, A.O., 1870. Additional observations regarding some species of birds noticed by Mr. W.T. Blanford in his 'Ornithological Notes from Southern, Western and Central India'.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 39: 113-122.
Hume, A.O., 1871. Stray notes on Ornithology in India. VII.— Ibis (3)1: 403-413.
Hume, A.O., 1872a. Novelties.— Stray Feathers 1(1): 1-19.
Hume, A.O., 1872b. The skylarks of India.— Stray Feathers 1(1): 38-41.
Hume, A.O., 1873a. Novelties.— Stray Feathers 1(6): 464-483.
Hume, A.O., 1873b. Ornithology: 151-304.— In: G. Henderson & A.O. Hume, 1873. Lahore to Yarkand. 1-370.— London.
ICZN, 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (4th edition): i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
Inskipp, C. & T.P. Inskipp, 1991. A Guide to the Birds of Nepal. 1-400.— London.
Ivanov, A., 1929. Die sibirischen Feldlerchen.— Ann. Mus. Zool. Acad. Sci. URSS 29 (1928): 279-287.
Jerdon, T.C., 1840. Catalogue of the birds of Peninsular India. 3.— Madras J. Lit. Sci. 11(26): 1-38.
Jerdon, T.C., 1846. Second Supplement to the Catalogue of the birds of Peninsular India.— Madras J. Lit. Sci. 13(31): 116-144 (1844).
Keve, A., 1943. Einige neue Vogelrassen aus Asien.— Anz. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math-Naturwiss., 80: 16-22.
Kistjakovskij, A. & G. Kotshubej, 1929. Eine neue Lerche aus dem Ussurigebiet – *Alauda arvensis nigrescens* subsp. nov.— Mem. Acad. Sci. Ukraine 13, math-phys. cl., pt. 1: 249.
Koelz, W.N., 1939a. Three new subspecies of birds.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 52: 121-122.
Koelz, W.N., 1939b. New birds from Asia, chiefly from India.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 52: 61-82.
Koelz, W.N., 1951. Four new subspecies of birds from southwestern Asia.— Am. Mus. Novit. 1510: 1-3.
Koelz, W.N., 1954. Ornithological studies I. New birds from Iran, Afghanistan and India.— Contr. Inst. Reg. Explor. 1: 1-32.
Korelov, M.N., 1953. On forms of Kazakhstan skylarks. [in Russian].— Vestnik Akad. Nauk Kazakhskoi SSR, 1953 (5): 113-115.
Latham, J., 1783. A general synopsis of birds. 2: i-ii, 1-818.— London.
Latham, J., 1823. A general history of birds. 6.— London.
La Touche, J.D.D., 1922. New forms of Chinese birds.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 43: 20-23.
La Touche, J.D.D., 1930. A handbook of the birds of eastern China. 1 pt. 5: 392-486.— London.

Legge, W.V., 1880. A History of the Birds of Ceylon. 2: 731-1237.— London.
Linnaeus, C., 1758. Systema Naturae per regna tria Naturae, secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, Differentiis, Synonymis, Locis. 10th edition. Tome 1: 1-823.— Holmiae.
Loudon, (Baron) H. & N.A. Zarudny, 1903.— In: H. Loudon, 1903. Zur Kenntnis der west-turkestanischen Repräsentanten der Gattung *Galerida*. Orn. Jahrb. 14(5): 170-174.
Madarász, J. v., 1903. *Ammomanes heterura* n. sp.— Orn. Monatsber. 11: 91.
Martens, J. & S. Eck, 1995. Towards an ornithology of the Himalayas: systematics, ecology and vocalizations of Nepal birds.— Bonner Zool. Monogr. 38: 1-445.
Mayr, E., 1941.— In: J.K. Stanford & E. Mayr, 1941. The Vernay Cutting expedition to northern Burma. Part IV. Ibis (14)5: 353-378.
Mayr, E., 1944. The birds of Timor and Sumba.— Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist. 83(2): 123-194.
Mayr, E. & J.C. Greenway, Jr., 1960. Check-list of Birds of the World. IX: i-xii, 1-506.— Cambridge, Mass.
Meinertzhagen, R., 1927. Systematic results of birds collected at high altitudes in Ladak and Sikkim. Part I.— Ibis (12)3: 363-422.
Meinertzhagen, R., 1951. Review of the Alaudidae.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. 121(1): 81-132.
Meinertzhagen, R. & A. Meinertzhagen, 1926a. [*Alauda arvensis lhamarum,* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 46: 96-101.
Meinertzhagen, R. & A. Meinertzhagen., 1926b. [*Eremophila alpestris deosai,* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 46: 83-86.
Meise, W., 1932. Neue Subspecies aus Sibirien und der Mandschurei.— Orn. Monatsber. 40(2): 43-44.
Meise, W., 1933a. Zoogeographische Lerchenstudien. 2. Die zoogeograpische Gliederung der ostpaläarktischen Trockengebiete auf Grund der Verbreitung und Rassengliederung der Lerchen (Alaudidae).— Mitt. Zool. Mus. Berlin 19: 42-47.
Meise, W., 1933b. Neue Formen aus Kansu.— Orn. Monatsber. 41(3): 81-82.
Meise, W., 1937.— In: E. Stresemann, W. Meise & M. Schonwetter, 1937. Aves Beickianae. Beiträge zur Ornithologie von Nordwest-Kansu nach den Forschungen von Walter Beick in den Jahren 1926-1933. (part 1). J. f. Orn. 85(3): 375-576.
Momiyama, T.T., 1927. Some new and unrecorded birds from Japanese territories. [In Japanese]. Descriptions of twenty five new birds and three additions from Japanese territories. [In English].— Annot. Orn. Orient. 1(1): 1-80 (Jap.), 81-101 (Eng.).
Moore, F., 1856. Notice of some new species of birds.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1855): 215-217.
Oates, E.W., 1875. Notes on some Burmese birds.— Stray Feathers 3(5): 335-350.
Oberholser, H.C., 1900. Notes on birds collected by Doctor W.L. Abbott in Central Asia.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus. 22: 205-228 (Publ. 1195).
Oberholser, H.C., 1902. A review of the larks of the genus *Otocoris*.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus. 24: 801-883 (Publ. 1271).
Pallas, P.S., 1773. Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des russischen Reichs. 2. 1-744.— St. Petersburg. (Anhang: 701-744).
Pallas, P.S., 1776. Reise durch verschiedene Provinzen des russischen Reichs. 3. 1-760.— St. Petersburg. (Anhang: 691-760).
Pallas, P.S., 1811. Zoographia Rosso-Asiatica, sistens omnium animalium in extenso Imperio Rossico et adjacentibus maribus observatorum recensionem, domicilia, mores et descriptiones, anatomen atque icones plurimorum: i-xviii, 1-568.— St. Petersburg.
Peters, J.L., 1960a. Family Alaudidae: 3-80.— In: E. Mayr & J.C. Greenway, Jr., 1960. Check-list of Birds of the World. IX: i-xii, 1-506. Cambridge, Mass.
Peters, J.L., 1960b. Family Hirundinidae: 80-129.—In: E. Mayr & J.C. Greenway, Jr., 1960. Check-list of Birds of the World. IX: i-xii, 1-506. Cambridge, Mass.
Przewalski, N.M., 1876. Mongolia and the Tangut Country, a three year journey in the eastern highlands of Asia. [In Russian]. 2(2): i-iv, 1-176. [Aves.].— St. Petersburg.
Przewalski, N.M., 1887. New species of birds of central Asia. [In Russian].— Zapiski Imp. Akad. Nauk, St. Petersbourg 55: 76-95.
Pucheran, J., 1854. Études sur les types peu connus du Musée de Paris.— Rev. et Mag. Zool. (2) 6: 62-70.
Rand, A.L. & R.L. Fleming, 1957. Birds from Nepal.— Fieldiana, Zool. 41(1): 1-218.

Reichenow, A., 1911. Neue Arten.— Orn. Monatsber. 19: 34-35.
Ripley, S.D., 1950. Birds from Nepal 1947-1949.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 49(3): 355-417.
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.
Salvadori, T., 1868. Studio Intorno ai Lavori Ornitologici del professore Filippo de Filippi.— Atti della R. Acad. Sci. Torino 3(4): 257-296.
Salvadori, T. & E.H. Giglioli, 1885. Due nuove specie di uccelli della Cocincina racolta durante il viaggio della R. pirofregata 'Magenta'.— Atti della R. Accad. Sci. Torino 20: 427-429.
Sclater, W.L., 1892. On the Indian Museum and its collection of birds.— Ibis (6)4: 65-87.
Scopoli, G.A., 1786. Deliciae Florae et Faunae Insubricae. II: i-ii, 1-115.— Ticini.
Seebohm, H., 1884. On the East-Asiatic Shore-Lark *(Otocorys longirostris)*.— Ibis (5)2: 184-188.
Severtsov, N.A., 1873. Vertical and horizontal distribution of Turkestan animals. [In Russian.].— Izv. imp. obshch. est., antrop. etnogr., Moskva 8(2): 101-157 (Dec. 1872).
Sharpe, R.B., 1890. Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum. 13: i-xvi, 1-702.— London.
Sharpe, R.B., 1906. Birds: 79-515.— In: The history of the collections contained in the Natural History departments of the British Museum. 2. Separate historical accounts of the several collections included in the department of zoology: i-iv, 1-728. London.
Sonnerat, P., 1776. Voyage à la Nouvelle Guinée: i-xiv, 1-206.— Paris.
Sonnerat, P., 1782. Voyage aux Indes Orientales et à la Chine. 2 vols: i-xv, 1-317; i-viii, 1-298.— Paris.
Sparrman, A., 1786. Museum Carlsonianum. Fasc. 4: 1-25.— Stockholm.
Stegmann, B., 1937. Die geographischen Formen von *Melanocorypha maxima* Gould.— Orn. Monatsber. 45(2): 54-56.
Stejneger, L., 1884. Diagnoses of new species of birds from Kamtschatka and the Commander Islands.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 2: 97-99.
Stepanyan, L.S., 1976. A new subspecies of the salt-plain lark from the Tuva Autonomous Republic. [In Russian.].— Ornitologiya 12: 246-247.
Stepanyan, L.S., 1990. Conspectus of the ornithological fauna of the USSR. [In Russian.]. 1-727.— Moscow.
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., 1975. Ornithology from Aristotle to the Present Day: i-xii, 1-432.— Cambridge, Mass.
Sushkin, P.P., 1925. List and distribution of birds of the Russian Altai and nearest parts of NW Mongolia, with a description of new or little-known forms. [In Russian and English.]. 1-79.— Leningrad.
Swinhoe, R., 1859. Description of the small Chinese Lark.— The Zoologist 17: 6723-6727.
Swinhoe, R., 1861. Notes on the birds observed about Talien Bay, (North China).— Ibis (1)3: 251-262.
Swinhoe, R., 1863. On new and little-known birds from China.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1863): 87-94.
Swinhoe, R., 1870. On the ornithology of Hainan.— Ibis (2)6: 77-97, 230-256, 342-367.
Swinhoe, R., 1871a. On four new species of Asiatic Birds.— Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. (4)7: 257.
Swinhoe, R., 1871b. A revised catalogue of the birds of China and its islands, with descriptions of new species, references to former notes, and occasional remarks.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1871): 337-423.
Sykes, W.H., 1832. Catalogue of Birds of the Raptorial and Incessorial Orders (systematically arranged), observed in the Dukhun.— Proc. Commit. Zool. Soc. Lond. 2 (1832): 77-99.
Sztolcman, J. & J. Domaniewski, 1927. Les types d'oiseaux au Musée Polonais d'Histoire Naturelle.— Ann. Zool. Mus. Polonici Hist. Nat. 6(2): 95-193.
Taczanowski, L., 1876. Faune de la Siberie Orientale.— Bull. Soc. Zool., France 1(2): 157-183.
Taczanowski, L., 1888. Liste des Oiseaux recuellis en Corée par M. Jean Kalinowski.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1887): 596-611.
Temminck, C.J., 1824.— In: C.J. Temminck & M. Laugier de Chartrouse, 1820-1839. Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées d'oiseaux, pour servir de suite et de complement aux planches enluminées de Buffon. 102 livraisons, 600 pls. [livr. 45 (Apr.), pl. 269 and livr. 51 (Oct. 23), pl. 305.]. Paris.
Temminck, C., & H. Schlegel, 1848.— In: C. Temminck & H. Schlegel, 1844-1850. Description des oiseaux observés au Japon par les voyageurs Hollandais. In P.F. von Siebold, (ed.). Fauna Japoni-

ca sive descriptio animalium, quae in itinere per Japoniam, jussu et auspiciis superiorum, qui summum in India Batava Imperium tenent, suscepto, annis 1823-1830 collegit, notis, observationibus et adumbrationibus illustravit. II. Aves: 1-142. Lugduni Batavorum.

Thayer, J.E. & O.C. Bangs, 1914. Notes on the birds and mammals of the Arctic coast of East Siberia.— Proc. New Eng. Zool. Cl. 5: 1-66.

Ticehurst, C.B., 1920. [*Mirafra erythroptera sindianus*, subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 41: 55-56.

Ticehurst, C.B., 1922. Some remarks on the names of certain birds.— Ibis (11)4: 147-150.

Ticehurst, C.B., 1925. [*Pyrrhulauda grisea siccata,* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 45: 87.

Tugarinov, A.Ya., 1932. Birds of eastern Mongolia as observed by the expedition of 1928. [In Russian]: 1-46.— Leningrad.

Vaurie, C., 1951. A study of Asiatic larks.— Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist. 97(5): 435-526.

Vaurie, C., 1959. The birds of the Palearctic fauna. Order Passeriformes. 1-762.— London.

Vaurie, C. & K.S. Dharmakumarsinhji, 1954. A new sand lark from western India (Saurashtra).— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 52: 8-9.

Wagstaffe, R., 1978. Type specimens of birds in the Merseyside County Museums. 1-32.— Liverpool.

Walters, M., 1997. On the identity of *Lophornis melaniae* Floericke (Trochilidae).— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 117: 235-236.

Wardlaw Ramsay, R.G., 1886. Contributions to the ornithology of the Philippines. 2. On additional collections of birds.— Ibis (5)4: 155-162.

Warren, R.L.M. & C.J.O. Harrison, 1971. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 2. Passerines: i-vi, 1-628.— London.

Warren, R.L.M. & C.J.O. Harrison, 1973. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 3. Systematic Index: i-xi, 1-76.— London.

Waterhouse, G.R., 1839. [*Alauda sinensis*].— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. VII: 60-61.

Whistler, H., 1928. [*Galerida cristata lynesi,* subsp. nov.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 49: 52-53.

Whistler, H., 1934.— In: H. Whistler & N.B. Kinnear, 1934. The Vernay scientific survey of the eastern Ghats. VII. J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 37: 96-105.

Whistler, H., 1936.— In: S. Ali, 1936. The ornithology of Travancore and Cochin. With notes by Hugh Whistler. Part V. J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 38(4): 759-790.

Whistler, H., 1944. The avifaunal survey of Ceylon conducted jointly by the British and Colombo Museums.— Spolia Zeylanica 23(3-4): 117-321.

Yamashina, M.Y., 1939a. Notes on the specimens of Manchurian birds chiefly made by Hyojiri Orii in 1935.— Tori 10(49): 446-544.

Yamashina, M.Y., 1939b. A new race of skylark from South Kiusiu.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 59: 134-135.

Zaliesski, I.M., 1917. A new form of the field lark. *Alauda arvensis kibort*i subsp. nov. [In Russian].— Orn. Vestnik 8(2): 125.

Zarudny[26], N.A., 1903-1904. Les Oiseaux de la Perse Orientale.— Mem. Soc. Imp. Russe Geog. 36(2): 1-467.

Zarudny, N.A., 1911. Notes on the ornithology of Turkestan. [In Russian]— Orn. Vestnik. 2(1): 3-16.

Zarudny, N.A. & S. Bilkewitch, 1918. Ornithological news from Transcaspia. [In Russian].— Izv. Zakasp. Muz. 1: 16.

Zarudny, N.A. & M. Härms, 1902. Neue Vogelarten.— Orn. Monatsber. 10(4): 49-54.

Zarudny, N.A. & H. Loudon, 1904. Einige neue subspecies aus Persien und dem transkaspichen gebiet.— Orn. Jahrb. 15: 221-227.

Received: 6.1.2001; second draft 12.ii.2001
Accepted: 20.iv.2001
Edited: C. van Achterberg

---

[26] Also spelled as Sarudny.

Appendix 1

A chronology of the use of names ascribed to Hodgson and comments upon those that appear to lack type specimens

Introduction

Hodgson (1844) included three names of larks of the genus *Alauda* on p. 84 in his list of birds from Nepal (based on his specimens and drawings made for him): *Alauda dulcivox* Hodgson; *Alauda triborhyncha* v[el]. *leiopus* Hodgson; and *Alauda leiopus* v[el]. *orientalis* Hodgson.

Here, and also where subsequently published by Gray & Gray (1846), these were *nomina nuda*. The last two of these three names (presumably intended to reflect real if minor differences) have essentially been treated under their binomials *triborhyncha* and *leiopus*. It cannot be excluded that the two have been somewhat confused. That the drawings were not published, and were therefore restricted in their availability, must have fostered confusion.

Subsequent authors applied these names as they saw fit and, by providing descriptions or satisfactory "indications" (ICZN, 1999), created potentially valid names.

In the main part of the present paper we have listed: *A[lauda]. Dulcivox* 'Hodgson' Hume, 1872b; *Alauda dulcivox* 'Hodgson' Brooks, 1873a; and *Alauda triborhyncha* 'Hodson' [sic] Hume, 1873b, in Henderson & Hume. Each of these names we believe to have been validly introduced, with a description and with one or more types designated.

Five more names were introduced with descriptions but our analysis suggests that these descriptions are insufficient to resolve the identities in the light of the relevant circumstances. The circumstances include questions about whether composite series of two or more different taxa were involved. In addition we have considered the potential for related but different taxa to occur in the localities concerned (in cases where the evidence to-day shows that such taxa do occur). We also consider the unavailability of evidence from, or the unsatisfactory designation of, type material. These five names are: *A[lauda] gulgula* Franklin var. *A. leiopus* 'Hodgson MS' Blyth, 1845; *Alauda triborhyncha* 'Hodgson' Horsfield & Moore, 1856; *[Alauda] Triborhyncha* Hume, 1872b; *[Alauda] Orientalis* vel *Leiopus* Hume, 1872b; and *Alauda liopus* Sharpe, 1890.

We review Hodgson's original *nomina nuda* and the five derivatives just listed and in all five cases believe that the name should be considered indeterminate. These names, although available, cannot be placed in specific synonymies but they have the ability to prevent identical specific or subspecific names from being available through preoccupation.

We do not believe that valid types exist for these names and we have omitted them from the list in our main paper.

Hodgson and his unpublished drawings

Brian Hodgson spent 23 years in Nepal retiring from the Residency in 1843, returning for a while to England where his "Catalogue of Nipalese Birds collected

between 1824 and 1844"[27] appeared in J.E. Gray's journal 'Zoological Miscellany' in June 1844 (Cocker & Inskipp, 1988). Some of the names in the Catalogue were new, often they were names that Hodgson had used on his drawings and some had been submitted for publication, but all the new names in the Catalogue appeared without descriptions. Had the drawings been published beforehand or together with the Catalogue these names would not be *nomina nuda.* Most of these new names reappeared two years later in the "Catalogue of the specimens and drawings of Mammalia and Birds of Nepal and Thibet presented by B.H. Hodgson Esq., to the British Museum" (Gray & Gray, 1846), and, in an appendix to this list with some explanations of synonymy, descriptions are given of 24 taxa.

The name *Alauda dulcivox* Hodgson, 1844; its derivative names, and the thorny question of potential conspecificity of arvensis and gulgula

The name *Alauda dulcivox* appears on p. 84 in the 1844 'Catalogue' of Hodgson as a nomen nudum and it was not subsequently described by Gray & Gray (1846). However it appears in the synonymy of Horsfield & Moore (1856)[28] and of Sharpe (1890). It was also a basis for subsequent use, with descriptions by Hume (1872b) and Brooks (1873a). The first of these names, Hume's, has priority and is the applicable name, although Hume's description was long overlooked. In addition to providing a description Hume (1872b) wrote that he had a painting of *dulcivox* from Hodgson.

The name *dulcivox* Brooks, 1873a, was listed as a synonym of *Alauda arvensis* subsp. in Sharpe (1890) and in Hartert (1905: 247). The latter author, who at this date treated *arvensis* and *gulgula* as separate species, placed it below his listing of *cinerea* Ehmcke, 1903, associating it not with that Siberian form but with the name *leiopus* (discussed below). However Hartert used neither name, instead taking the heading *Alauda arvensis* subsp? for a Himalayan montane form. While Hartert (1905) was at work, Ehmcke (1904a) changed his name to *cinerascens* because the name *Alauda cinerea* had been used by Gmelin (1789)[29].

The names to be found in synonymy must be accounted for in any systematic arrangement. Their type localities may reflect their breeding range or their seasonal dispersal. Reviewers began to question whether there is a Himalayan breeding form of A. arvensis and this question was inevitably interwined with the issue of whether *A. arvensis* and *A. gulgula* are one or two species.

The first point was addressed by Ticehurst (1922) who discussed the actual type locality of *dulcivox* Brooks and suggested that Siberian migrants might be concerned both at the type locality and in respect of wintering birds in the Punjab and elsewhere in the plains of India. Ticehurst could find no specimens of *dulcivox* that supported earlier assertions of breeding and looked at the birds ascribed to *dulcivox* from the plains of India and considered that they matched Siberian birds. He concluded that

---

[27] Although usually and apparently correctly credited to the pen of Hodgson, this list does not appear in the bibliography of his work prepared by J.E. Gray *in* Gray & Gray (1846).
[28] Without a description and therefore not available.
[29] Now the basis for *Calandrella cinerea* (Gmelin, 1789).

Brooks's name should be applied to such migrants. It is perhaps appropriate to add here that Hume's name applies to the identical taxon so that these comments relate to it too.

This contribution appeared too late to catch the "Nachtrag" of Hartert (1923b) in which he began to treat *arvensis* and *gulgula* as a single species. Of Hartert's accepted forms, of the united species, two occurred in the Himalayas: *A. a. intermedia* was treated as the migrant form (with *dulcivox* and Ehmcke's names in synonymy) and *guttata* Brooks was treated as a breeding form. This was modified in the "Erganzungsband" (Hartert & Steinbacher, 1933: 127) where the view of Ticehurst (1922) was accepted, and *dulcivox* and *intermedia* were both listed, the latter now being assigned a breeding range in "Transbaikalien".[30]

This is further discussed separately (Dickinson & Dekker, 2001), but briefly the current treatment, as two separate species, derives from Vaurie (1951). However, the evidence from the Himalayas and other areas of reported sympatry, is not clear cut. Definitive proof of an overlap in breeding range is still slim or lacking and although morphological evidence suggests the present treatment is tenable the acoustic evidence so far presented is, at least in Nepal, anomalous.

The name *triborhyncha* v[el]. *leiopus* Hodgson, 1844

This name and the name *leiopus* v[el]. *orientalis* appeared simultaneously and although they apparently referred to different subjects even the related drawings do not tell us how to attribute these names with certainty. ...This name appeared on p. 84 of the 'Catalogue' (Hodgson, 1844), where it is linked to unpublished drawing no. 739, and on p. 109 of the list by Gray & Gray (1846). It has also been said to appear on two of Hodgson's drawings (Hume, 1872b). In both the 1844 and 1846 references mentioned it was a nomen nudum. Hodgson's drawing is not a valid 'indication' as it was not published.

Alauda triborhyncha 'Hodgson' Horsfield & Moore, 1856

The potential validity and availability of the name *triborhyncha* 'Hodgson' Horsfield & Moore does not seem to have been carefully discussed although it was brought into use (Meinertzhagen, 1927) and then discarded (Meinertzhagen, 1951). Horsfield & Moore (1856) used this shortened derivative name and provided a description. They declared that "it differs from *A. gulgula* (Frankl.) in being larger, and in having the beak somewhat smaller; the ferruginous colours being brighter, especially on the wings". The wing length cited was 3.75 to 4.2 inches (say 95-105 mm). Their specimens were two Hodgson skins from Nepal and two collected in Bhutan by Pemberton.

The average wing lengths of male *dulcivox*, *inopinata* and *lhamarum* are given respectively as 116-118 mm, 109.7 mm and 102+ mm by Vaurie (1951). The name *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore cannot then apply to, and antedate, *dulcivox*. Much the

---

[30] Much later Vaurie (1951) reported that the type of *intermedia*, taken in Shanghai in January, matched a June bird from southern Ussuriland.

same thought was expressed by Hume (1872b), who wrote that it was a "great mistake" to identify Hodgson's *dulcivox* "with either *Triborhyncha* or *Orientalis* vel *Leiopus* … *dulcivox* was a larger bird". Horsfield & Moore's name also relates, therefore, to birds of what we may call *gulgula* dimensions. However, brighter ferruginous colours than *gulgula* would not allow Horsfield & Moore's bird to be either *inopinata* or *lhamarum* (unless they misunderstood the characters of true *gulgula*) and the least unlikely identity is, we believe, with *vernayi* Mayr, 1941, which is known from Bhutan.

In fact Horsfield & Moore (1856) may well have been confused about *gulgula*. They listed *gulgula* Franklin (of which they listed a specimen collected by Tytler in Dacca) as a synonym of *Alauda malabarica* Scopoli, of which they had no reliable material, and this is a name now treated as applicable to a species of the genus *Galerida*.

The four specimens in the India Museum from two Himalayan origins listed by Horsfield & Moore allow the possibility that the description must be composite, or taken from one of Hodgson's Nepalese birds or of one of Pemberton's from Bhutan. Later, Sharpe (1890: 575) listed two Pemberton specimens from Bhutan under the name *Alauda liopus.* These may have accession numbers that demonstrate that they came from the India Museum and if so they are syntypes of *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore. Sharpe (1890: 575) also listed two Hodgson specimens from Nepal under the name of and as types of *Alauda liopus* (see below), these may also have accession numbers showing them to be types of *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore. If all four can be assembled and are the same taxon then it may be argued that this name was not given to a composite series, but it seems the Bhutan birds differ. In addition Sharpe (1890: 577) listed five other Nepal specimens as types of *Alauda triborhyncha* (relating them to Hodgon's nomen nudum) and, as he listed these under *gulgula*, the previous four birds mentioned by Sharpe, under *arvensis*, should be expected to be larger.

Meinertzhagen (1927), in the context of a single broad species *arvensis*, employed the name *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore. To judge from his words he seems to have believed that the types must be Hodgson's birds, for which Horsfield & Moore had merely provided a description, and that they did not include the two Pemberton specimens from Bhutan. Basing himself on two Hodgson specimens from Nepal (not necessarily those that had been before Horsfield & Moore) he used *triborhyncha* for Sikkim birds taken in October (where Meinertzhagen claimed to have collected *inopinata* in November and nominate *gulgula* in January). He did not include Bhutan in his range statement, but stated that two in the British Museum (perhaps but not certainly Pemberton's) agreed best with Burmese birds, to which he assigned no subspecific name. He gave *triborhyncha* a breeding range including Nepal, Sikkim and Batang in eastern Tibet. He treated Kashmir birds as *guttata* and the recently named Ladak birds as *lhamarum*. If these three populations are lumped the name *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore should be used unless it can be shown that it is unavailable. In his later paper, still treating *arvensis* and *gulgula* as a single species, Meinertzhagen (1951) combined these populations (except that from Batang) under the name *lhamarum*. In so doing he suppressed *triborhyncha* and correctly placed guttata in synonymy due to its preoccupation. He placed *lhamarum* between *gulgula* and *inconspicua* (presumably implying a close relationship to these forms). He did not explain his suppression of *triborhyncha* but perhaps now reasoned that as it had been given to Bhutan birds and to Nepal birds which differed it must be considered indeterminate.

Meinertzhagen (1927) in order to employ the name *triborhyncha* compared the description by Horsfield & Moore with two Nepal specimens from Hodgson and claimed them to be a good match. If he checked their wing lengths this should suggest, as does his own determination of them, that his two Hodgson birds were from the five that Sharpe had listed as *gulgula*. These may be the same Hodgson specimens, but the link to the India Museum must be established. This outcome would predict that the Bhutan types of *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore should also be small and not the two birds that Sharpe listed.

The two Pemberton birds, wherever they are, seem to be indisputable syntypes of *triborhyncha*. One could restrict the type locality to Bhutan and, if one could find one, designate a Pemberton syntype as the lectotype. However, Meinertzhagen's suggestion that Bhutan and Burmese birds should be united was taken up and the name *Alauda arvensis vernayi* Mayr, 1941, was applied. To replace this with the name *triborhyncha* would confuse the literature and not clarify it.

It is also now known that three races occur in Nepal. It has not been suggested that birds matching the type of *vernayi* occur in Nepal (although this may be the case and should be investigated). If two discrete breeding populations occur in Bhutan and a Pemberton syntype of *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore matched the western birds, and not Nepal birds, then a restriction of type locality might be useful. In the light of so much uncertainty however it seems better to treat *triborhyncha* Horsfield & Moore, 1856, as presumably based on a composite series and as indeterminate. We have therefore excluded it from our synonymy. However the name was validly introduced, and by preoccupation it prevents acceptance of the name *triborhyncha* Hume (see below).

The name [*Alauda*] *Triborhyncha* Hume, 1872b

Hume (1872b: 39) set out to solve the riddle of the names Hodgson had given to the various skylarks, in much the way we are doing here. He wrote "His two drawings of *Triborhyncha* and one of *Orientalis* vel *Leiopus*, show that both these species, or races, or perhaps different sexes of the same race belonged to the smaller skylark the wings of which vary from 3.3 to 3.8 inches."

In the subsequent text Hume described the latter (which we discuss below) and then, on p. 41, provided a description of *Triborhyncha* saying that it had: "the shortest and stumpiest bill of all, and in summer plumage is darker and more rufous, and in winter plumage greyer, and duskier than any of the others". He had specimens "from the Himalayas, from Murree to Sikkim, ranging up to heights of eight and ten thousand feet" and also mentioned a stray winter-taken specimen from the "salt range". He gave wing lengths for both this and for "*orientalis* vel *leiopus*" as 3.8 to 4 inches (despite his upper limit of 3.8 inches on p. 39), but suggested that in the latter they averaged larger.

It is clear that he considered *Orientalis* vel *Leiopus* to be "the most distinct…..skylark of the high Himalayan plateau", but he had specimens of both from the Himalayas and it seems likely, although this cannot be proved, that he used the name *triborhyncha* for what we believe must have been *inopinata* in the case of the salt range bird, and by extension for his other "true" *triborhyncha*. However this name cannot be

safely assigned without the rediscovery and identification of several of his specimens including the one from the salt range[31]. The chance of reassembling the evidence looks extremely slim and the name is best treated as indeterminate.

The name *leiopus* v[el]. *orientalis* Hodgson, 1844

This name also appeared on p. 84 of the 'Catalogue' (Hodgson, 1844), where it is linked to unpublished drawing no. 728, and by Gray & Gray (1846) on p. 108 of the list and on p. 155 where, probably drawing upon Blyth (1845), it is said this "is *Alauda gulgula* Frankl.", as, confusingly, is *Alauda triborhynchus*, v. *leiopus* of which it is said "is the *Alauda gracilis* Blyth, and the same as the former species."

We do not consider these judgements to be "indications" in the technical sense of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999). Hodgson's drawing is not a valid 'indication' as the drawing was not published. There was no description in 1844 or 1846. Gray's name like Hodgson's name is therefore a nomen nudum.

The name *A[lauda] gulgula* Franklin var. *A. leiopus* Hodgson MS Blyth, 1845

The name *A[lauda]* gulgula Franklin var. *A. leiopus* Hodgson MS was used by Blyth (1845), although he treated its subject as a doubtful variety of *gulgula*. Hodgson's description is limited, and was for Blyth insufficient. He wrote "Mr. Hodgson marked a Nepalese specimen of the common Bengal variety as being probably distinct from his *A. leiopus,* and one of his specimens of *leiopus* resembles most minutely the common peninsular variety ….while in general the Nepalese specimens seem to be rather short in the bill and to have the outer tail feathers of a purer and brighter white than in the others; but I confess my inability to draw up any marked and constant distinguishing characters". This text, from which it is unsafe to draw conclusions because of the word *leiopus* in each of two Hodgson names, seems to suggest that Blyth's series from Nepal was a composite series, possibly even comprising two species: *arvensis* and *gulgula*.

The specimens Blyth had from Hodgson may have had either of Hodgson's two names associated with them or may even have not been labelled with such names. Furthermore Blyth, and indeed Hodgson, might have applied the name *leiopus* to Nepalese migrants not to breeding birds. Migrants do occur, and it seems quite probable that if Hodgson's birds were taken in the Katmandu valley that his collectors could have found migrant *inopinata* there from about October to April. It is likely that Hodgson also had lower elevation birds from the terai. Collectors for Hodgson seem to have operated over quite a wide range including the terai (Cocker & Inskipp, 1988) and we now know, that in this species, residents of the terai differ from those in the higher Himalayas. Hodgson's labels usually just read Nepal and the difference in origin between birds from the terai and from the higher slopes will thus not have been apparent to Blyth.

---

[31] The worthwhile material from Hume's collection was accessioned in 1886 and available to Sharpe (1890). His lists of specimens then in the British Museum include only two birds from the salt range; these were collected in November by Jerdon and apparently not from the Hume Collection. Sharpe (1890) treated them as *Alauda arvensis* under the name – *Alauda cantarella*.

The presence of a breeding population of *Alauda gulgula* in the terai was affirmed by Rand & Fleming (1957), but their own specimens taken in December and April were apparently not then breeding. Later Fleming & Traylor (1961, 1964, 1968) concluded that *A. g. gulgula* occupied the whole of the Nepalese terai. Inskipp & Inskipp (1991), based on these three references, listed *gulgula* as occurring up to 150 m; they then said that *inopinata* and *lhamarum* "have been mainly collected in winter between 1280 m and 1700 m … but possibly also breed". Three citations were given. In the first, Fleming (1968) reported unspecified specimens taken in November, February and March, which between them represent *gulgula*, *lhamarum* and *inopinata* (at none of these dates, we believe, would the birds have been breeding). In the second, Fleming & Traylor (1961) recorded a pair said to match topotypes of *lhamarum* from Ladak, from 10,000 ft on 25 October. On the grounds that *lhamarum* is not known to be migratory they suggested that it presumably breeds, but the record is well outside the likely breeding season and the presumption speculative. In the third, Ripley (1950) reported a new December record. Neither Ripley nor Fleming & Traylor rule out *inopinata* in their published details (their Ladak topotypes are not said to be breeding birds and could have been migrants in Ladak) and the specimens should be re-examined with broader comparative material of known dates available. More recently Martens obtained five specimens at 2950-3350 m in late May that were singing and thought to be breeding and ascribed these to *lhamarum* on relative proportions (Martens & Eck, 1995). However, the song heard was apparently rather typical of *A. arvensis.*

We have the impression that no one has considered Blyth's name to be a new name with, perhaps, type specimens available. There is no mention of this name in relation to the search made in Calcutta for Blyth's types (Sclater, 1892), and there is no suggestion that such types might be in the Natural History Museum, Tring (Sharpe, 1890; Warren & Harrison, 1971). It seems most unlikely that types can be found. On the evidence above we consider that Blyth's name is unavailable as the description is indeterminate. Blyth's utilisation of this name has not been the basis for later use and his name could be considered a nomen oblitum in the context of Art. 23.9.2 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999). The conditions of Art. 23.9.1.1 are met, and the conditions of Art. 23.9.1.2 are met provided the name *lhamarum* Meinertzhagen is seen as the junior synonym that should be retained, on the grounds of consistent use, for reasons of stability.

The question of availability of the name *leiopus* remains. The focus now shifts to its use in 1872. After that the emended form *liopus* Sharpe, 1890, requires consideration.

The name [*Alauda*] *Orientalis* vel *Leiopus* Hume, 1872

In his discussion on the sylarks of India, Hume (1872b) set out Hodgson's names, using the above inverted version of this one, and, in relating them to the different forms present in India, he clearly understood this to be the bird of the "high Himalayan plateau (which in the cold season may, and doubtless does, descend into the lower hills and valleys)". He described it, saying "this race has the whole lower breast and abdomen perfectly pure snowy white, and this I have observed in none of the other races. The bill is slender like the true *Gulgula*; but still more sharply pointed; the wings too are larger on an average than in any other of the four races, and in the

males vary apparently from 3.8 to 4.0 inches." He went on to explain how it differed from *dulcivox* which he correctly assigned to *Alauda arvensis*.

Hume's description did not sufficiently clarify things. Later, in an editorial footnote to Brooks (1873a), Hume discussed *Alauda guttata* Brooks, writing that under the name *triborhyncha* he had figured that form in "Lahore to Yarkand" in plate 28 (Hume, 1873b), but that he no longer believed in the specific separability of "these various races". Sharpe (1890), not remarking upon Hume's inversion of Hodgson's name, recorded the note by Hume (1872b) in the synonymy of *Alauda arvensis* after the name *Alauda leiopus* vel *orientalis* Hodgson, and he also listed both the "Lahore to Yarkand" reference after the name *Alauda triborhyncha* (nec Hodgs.), and *Alauda guttata* Brooks. In doing this he was consistent, neither of the two Hodgson names as used in Hume (1872b) appears in the synonymy of *Alauda gulgula.*

There seems to be no doubt about the use of the name *triborhyncha* by Hume (1873b) for Ladak birds: the Henderson specimens survive and one is the holotype of *lhamarum* (which we treat as part of the *gulgula* complex); however just as we have considered there to be doubt about what Hume (1872b) considered *triborhyncha* so there must be an element of doubt about *Orientalis* vel *Leiopus* in the same paper.

We conclude that neither of these descriptions in Hume (1872b) is satisfactory and that these names as used by Hume are *nomina dubia.*

Oberholser (1900) applied the name *Alauda arvensis leiopus* (Hume) to two breeding males from Shooshot, Indus Valley, Ladak and argued for the adoption of this name. Apart from saying that "these specimens did not differ from those obtained by Dr. Abbott in Cashmere" Oberholser does not describe them. Since then Hume's name appeared in synonymy in Hartert (1905) where the 1872 Stray Feathers paper was ascribed to '1873'[32]. The name spelled *leiopus* has not been used with a valid and satisfactory description since Blyth's use of it.

Alauda liopus Sharpe, 1890

Sharpe (1890) distinguished geographical forms of *Alauda arvensis* and of *Alauda gulgula* and used for them combinations of Greek letters and binomial labels. In the case of *Alauda arvensis* his first two populations retained the name *arvensis* but were respectively a "dark form" and a "rufous form", his third was labelled *cantarella* and his fourth *liopus*. This spelling, beginning a few lines higher on p. 571 where it is associated with a description and with the name *guttata* Brooks, is used consistently (with the exception of a deliberate reference on p. 571 to Hodgson's use of the name *leiopus*). It is also used in preference to *guttata* Brooks, which shows that Sharpe considered the name to be a prior name. It must therefore relate to, and because of its consistency of use be a deliberate emendation of, the name *leiopus* of Hodgson, as given by Sharpe (1890: 568) in synonymy.

In the various volumes of the Catalogue of Birds in the British Museum Sharpe regularly introduced Hodgson's names based on his unpublished drawings. The notion that the drawings were not published and that the names were not available is

[32] Probably based on the title page for the volume, but pp. 1-50 appeared in Nov. 1872.

more recent. Sharpe listed several uses of this name, as follows: "id. In Gray's Zool. Misc., p. 84 (1843)[33]; Hume, Str. F. 1, p. 40 (1873)[34], [ibid.] 8, p. 109 (1879); Gray [& Gray], Cat. Mamm. &c Nepal pres. Hodgs. p. 108 (1846)". The first of these is a nomen nudum. Hume's use we have discussed above and Gray & Gray (1846) employed it in a bare list, but added on p. 155 that "this is the *Alauda gulgula* Frankl.", which view, probably derived from Blyth (1845), was not how Sharpe understood it.

Hodgson's name, with its original spelling or emended, seems to have remained a nomen nudum until Sharpe (1890). Now however Sharpe provided it with a description and types seem to be listed. If the description might seem to be composite, as the long list of specimens from as far afield as China and Japan might suggest, one might suppose that it should be anchored to the types. These types are not listed by Warren & Harrison (1971). This is presumably because they cannot now be safely distinguished.

Sharpe's description reads as follows: "Between *A. guttata* and *A. liopus* a certain difference is observable in series; thus in Cashmere and Gilgit the coloration is much more dingy brown, never so rufous, and the abdomen is not so pure white. Gradually throughout the Himalayas the species becomes more and more rufous on the upper parts and whiter on the belly, and especially on the wing. The most rufous of all the birds are the specimens from Japan". However Sharpe lumped all these birds, and the types of *guttata* and the types of *liopus* all fall within his list. In listing Hodgson's specimens as types of *liopus* it may be inferred that he thought these were Hodgson's own types and that, in this instance, to be totally consistent he should have used the spelling *leiopus*. Had he considered himself to be proposing a new name this might have caught his eye. Nonetheless it is quite clear from his wording that he was describing a composite population and it would be quite inappropriate to single out Hodgson's types as a selection of types for a new name.

Just lines ahead of the description Sharpe wrote "Writing in 1871 in the "Birds of Europe" I considered that the Sky-lark of Cashmere was a small race of *A. arvensis,* and some specimens in the Museum still bear my determination of that date. Mr. Brooks afterwards named the Cashmere Skylark *Alauda guttata,* but subsequently he came to the conclusion that it was the same as *A. leiopus* of Hodgson. With this identification I thoroughly agree, after comparing the types of the two species together; though Nepalese specimens are large". Thus in spite of the description it is best to consider *liopus* Sharpe, 1890, as covering a composite series and indeterminate.

Hartert (1905) followed Sharpe by placing *leiopus* in the synonymy of a Himalayan *Alauda arvensis* 'subsp. ?' (as reported earlier, at this time Hartert treated *gulgula* as a separate species). He made no mention of Sharpe's emended spelling (nor did he suggest that Sharpe had newly named a form *liopus*). By his use of the term "*partim*" it is clear that he thought that both Hodgson (1844) and Hume (1872b, given as "1873") had composite series. As we have seen above, by 1923 Hartert treated *arvensis* and *gulgula* as a single species. Perhaps in the light of these changing opinions it is not surprising that Meinertzhagen (1951) and Vaurie (1951) both avoided mention of the name *leiopus* or *liopus*.

---

[33] Hodgson (1844).
[34] Hume (1872b).

So far as we can ascertain Sharpe's name *liopus* has not been used in the literature, except in synonymy, since the revised treatment by Hartert (1905) which superseded Sharpe's arrangement. We believe it should continue to be treated as indeterminate and not listed in synonymy.

Appendix 2

Designation of a lectotype for *Otocorys sibirica* 'Eversm.' Swinhoe, 1871

Warren & Harrison (1971: 508) listed a "holotype" of this. Initially this was not a cause for concern. However, we noticed that Cheng (1987: 429) mapped the distribution of the species *Eremophila alpestris* (Linnaeus, 1758) in such a way as to show that records along the north-eastern coast of China were all of *flava*, and that he gave the *terra typica* as "Mongolia southward to Beijing, China". How was it then possible that Warren & Harrison listed a holotype from Tientsin right on the coast?

Our examination of the "holotype" showed that it had the forehead white with the black lores only just meeting above the bill. And that on the sides of the neck the black cheeks or moustachial area does not meet the black plastron, but is separated by whitish buff. Compared with *brandti*, the back is darker brown and less grey, instead of having just dark brown shaft stripes the feathers have dark brown centres. The mantle is also browner and darker than specimens of *brandti*. Judged by the face pattern and the colour of the upper parts it is a good match for *flava* (for example BMNH 1888.9.20.1008 a male collected 7 Jun. 1877 by Seebohm in the valley of the Yenesei River in Siberia). The Tientsin bird is almost lacking in yellow on the throat, as one might expect of a winter bird, but there is a hint of yellow.

With the type of *sibirica*, identified as a specimen of *flava*, taken on the east coast and consistent with the other information mapped, it seemed clear that the name *sibirica* should be moved from the synonymy of *brandti*, where Cheng listed it, to the synonymy of *flava*. Before recommending this we decided to re-examine the original description by Swinhoe (1871b).

In fact Swinhoe did not knowingly give a new name to this, in using Eversmann's name (now believed to exist only as a manuscript name) he apparently sought to indicate that his specimen belonged to an eastern form of *alpestris*. Swinhoe (1871b) begins his account with three prior references to his treatment of the bird. Each of these, when examined, proves to relate to Fleming's skin from Tientsin. In the third, Swinhoe (1863), who had previously recorded his bird as *Otocoris penicillata,* changed his opinion and treated it as *Otocoris alpestris.* In some fashion it clearly no longer agreed with his conception of *penicillata*.

Happily, due to Swinhoe's correction of his earlier views, and our examination of his type from Tientsin, it is not necessary to discuss here the characteristics and relevance of *penicillata*. This is just as well as *penicillata*, which is a name now restricted to Asia minor, was previously in widespread use as the senior name for Asian birds from south of the tundra, although this was later corrected (Seebohm, 1884). It was, therefore, used for populations of both Indian and Chinese birds and how Swinhoe may have understood it would be very difficult to ascertain.

It is apparent that Cheng's "Mongolia southward to Beijing, China" is taken from Swinhoe's text given in quotation marks and attributed to David. David & Oustalet (1877) listed a paper by David (1871) in their synonymy for this taxon, but this is not the source as it is no more than a bald list, and they give no other paper by David. On the other hand their text says "L'*Otocorys sibirica* se trouve communément en toutes

saisons sur les hauts plateaux de la Mongolie; de là il descend parfois en hiver dans la Chine septentrionale". They also listed the name *Alauda sibirica* Evers., without a citation. This may suggest that their text existed in draft form as early as 1871 and that Swinhoe paraphrased it. If this is so then he did not adjust the text to include Tientsin in the range. The inclusion of this text from David, whatever its source, must imply that Swinhoe considered birds taken in Beijing to be the same taxon. The description may therefore be a composite; this may explain why it does not mention the hint of yellow on the throat. In these circumstances it seems best to accept that the indications to the Tientsin specimen, taken at least nine years earlier, may not allow us safely to conclude that this was his only specimen. Rather than restate that the evidence is consistent with it being a holotype it seems to us to be better to conclude that this is in doubt. By contrast there is no doubt that the Tientsin specimen (BMNH 1890.1.29.52) was a type and as such we designate it as a lectotype and the name *siberica* must therefore be removed from the synonymy of *brandti* and transferred to that of *flava*.

We are aware that Seebohm (1884) reported that this specimen was "a long-billed form of *O. brandti*", but in this judgment we do not concur. We base our view on the original description of *brandti* (see below), and on the comparative specimens of *brandti* in Tring, that we believe to be representative. We have explained above the very different upperparts of the Tientsin bird.

We have not been able to find the type of *brandti* (see Comment 40). Dresser (1874) said the "entire back, nape and hind crown are pale sandy isabelline, with a greyish tinge, some of the feathers having indistinct darker centres" and this does not match the Tientsin bird at all.