Systematic notes on Asian birds. 54. Comments on the names proposed by Hodgson (1845) and their priority

E.C. Dickinson & M. Walters

Dickinson, E.C. & M. Walters. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 54. Comments on the names proposed by Hodgson (1845) and their priority.
Zool. Med. Leiden 80-5 (6), 21.xii.2006: 155-167.— ISSN 0024-0672.
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: edward@asiaorn.org).
Michael Walters, 62 Mark Street, Portrush, Co. Antrim, Northern Ireland BT56 8BU, U.K. (e-mail: mpwalters62@btinternet.com), formerly of The Natural History Museum, Tring.

Key words: history; priority; synonymy; Hodgson; Blyth; type locality; restriction; *Ficedula tricolor tricolor*; *Ficedula tricolor leucomelanura.*
Hodgson (1845) described 49 'new' taxa. It appears that when he prepared this paper for publication Hodgson was unaware of parallel publications by Blyth. Conflicts of priority are thus a concern and although Blyth's relevant papers have generally been conceded to have priority the 'fit' of the dates has not previously been clearly explained. We apply the dates for Blyth's papers provided by Dickinson & Pittie (2006) and confirm that these fit with previous understanding, implying that no fresh issues of priority arise. 26 of the 49 'new' taxa prove not to have been new, having been named before. Of 18 Hodgson names 16 are in current use. Another has been replaced by a *nomen novum* due to preoccupation, and one more has been declared a *nomen oblitum*. Three of Hodgson's 1845 novelties seem to be duplicate names, their subjects having been named twice in the same paper. Two others present problems of identification which require that the type material be re-studied; such studies will be carried out after Hodgson's drawings have been fully studied and the sequence of his drawing numbers presented and explained. Some notes are provided on five of the 49 names. The name *Buteo plumipes* (Parbattiah = Hodgson, 1836) must be used in place of *Buteo burmanicus* Hume, 1875. The type locality of *Digenea leucomelanura* is restricted to the central hills of Nepal.

Introduction

In establishing the priority of a name, Article 21 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (I.C.Z.N.[1], 1999; The Code) requires the use of the specified date (or imprint date) unless that is shown to be incorrect. Here, we investigate the evidence relevant to dating a paper by Hodgson (1845) in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* (PZS) and several papers by Blyth (1845 a, b, c) in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (JASB) some of which were in contention because both authors were working with Hodgson's material. Some names and descriptions put forward by Blyth apply to taxa named by Hodgson (1845). We provide a table (Table I) grouping the 49 names proposed by Hodgson (1845) according to whether, based on the priority we establish, they were new names or not. The table includes short notes on a few names. Longer notes are incorporated into the body of this paper.

[1] I.C.Z.N. = International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Establishing priority

In Dickinson & Walters (2006, this volume) we concluded that the paper by Hodgson (1845) in the PZS was what he (Hodgson, 1855) referred to as the paper he had been asked to 'recast', and we have reported the circumstances of that request by J.E. Gray. In 1844, when the recast paper was being written, Hodgson could not have known how far Blyth had progressed with his work on Hodgson's other drafts, including the document that in Calcutta had been despatched from Nepal to Calcutta in late 1843 before his (Hodgson's) departure from Nepal. Thus it was always likely that some, perhaps many, of the new names in Hodgson's 'recast' paper would prove to be synonyms of names already proposed by Blyth.

Data were gathered by F.H. Waterhouse regarding the publication of the PZS, but for the period 1830-1858 these data, consisting of the dates of delivery of printed sheets from the printers, did not always allow him to identify the make-up of the parts that may have been combined from such deliveries (Sclater, 1893). However, the data have been accepted and it has been general practice by zoologists to use the dates that Sclater provided as dates of publication, or at least as close approximations of them.

The date generally accepted for Hodgson's paper can most easily be accessed in Duncan (1937), who repeated Sclater's findings and showed that pp. 21-42 for the year comprised "no. cxlvi", also that these pages were delivered to the Zoological Society of London in August 1845. In accordance with Art. 21.2.1 of The Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999) we take this as 31st Aug. 1845.

A full study of the dates of publication of the JASB awaits the completion of an on-going search for evidence, but a preliminary report by Dickinson & Pittie (2006; this volume) deals with the dates of papers that are relevant to the evaluation of Hodgson (1845). Blyth's papers, for which we need comparative dates, come in issue numbers 121, 125, 129, 143, 149, 156, 159 and 164 of the JASB, and we know of no report that any issue was published out of sequence. Nos. 121 and 125 are in the 1842 volume and are believed to have appeared that year. No. 129 is also in the 1842 volume, but did not appear earlier than 20th Jan. 1843 (see Dickinson & Pittie, 2006). No. 143 is in the 1843 volume and no delays of this issue into 1844 have been suggested. No. 149 is from the 1844 volume and is believed to have appeared in 1844. No. 156, also from the 1844 volume, was certainly delayed and is dated about March, 1845 (Dickinson & Pittie, 2006). No. 159 is part of the 1845 volume and is dated about September 1845 (Dickinson & Pittie, 2006). Finally, No. 164, also from the 1845 volume, may have been delayed into 1846, but is best dated 31st December 1845 (Dickinson & Pittie, 2006). Thus Blyth (1845b and c) are the only two papers preceded by Hodgson (1845).

Dickinson & Gregory (2006; this issue) have considered the appropriate date to be accepted for a paper by T.C. Jerdon in an issue of the *Madras Journal of Literature and Science* with an 1844 imprint date. They conclude that this appeared in 1845, after No. 156 (March) of the JASB and before No. 159 (September), and explain why they felt it is best to cite this as Jerdon (1845) with, where needed, the qualification 'not before Aug. 10th 1845'. There is no direct conflict between Jerdon (1845) and Hodgson (1845), the date of which we take as 31st Aug. 1845 [2], but the relative dates of appearance of Jerdon '1844' (= 1845), Hodgson

[2] The lack of a direct conflict means that if it is decided that both must date from 31st Aug. 1845 this should present no problem.

(1845) and Blyth (1845c which we must take as Dec. 31st 1845), are important and need to be both logical and consistent.

Names in synonymy

It should be noted that Hodgson signalled his new names and descriptions by adding the term 'mihi' [= mine] to each such name; but it should be remembered that at this period such a signal was also used when names were merely new combinations (placing a known species in a previously unconnected genus), and a few clearly are new combinations based on Hodgson's own prior names.

Hodgson had provided Blyth with some kind of draft, and perhaps further specimens, before leaving Nepal in late 1843 and sailing from Calcutta in February 1844; and once in London he was unable to communicate with him speedily. This inevitably led to the risk of duplication. Indeed, because Hodgson had sent his specimens to Blyth along with his MS names for them, it was also inevitable that the duplication would extend to the name used. Blyth would have been describing specimens that he had received from Hodgson, and occasionally specimens apparently of the same taxon sent by others from Darjeeling, while Hodgson, in his recast article, would have been working from his drawings and such specimens as were then available to him in London. The second of them to publish, as if new, a name published by the other created what we now know as a primary homonym[3].

Table 1 refers to the pages where Baker (1930a, b) dated the names listed, but relies on our research in its elucidation of the extent of synonymy between Hodgson (1845), Blyth (1845c) and earlier authors. However, Baker's dates are generally internally consistent and do not contradict our more precise suggestions.

Notes on questions of priority, identification or type locality

1. *Buteo plumipes*: this name does not appear in the synonymy of the index of Baker (1930a, b) despite the fact that it was used as the name of a valid taxon by Sharpe (1874) and Legge (1878) and is referred to widely in *Stray Feathers* (1873-1888). At some point since then the name was accepted into the synonymy of *Buteo buteo japonicus* (Temminck & Schlegel, 1844), along with the name *Buteo burmanicus* Hume, 1875. It seems unlikely that *Buteo plumipes* was more than a new combination in 1845, although Warren (1966: 230) cited the 1845 description when she listed a 'holotype', and in Warren & Harrison (1973: 6) *Buteo plumipes* is identified with *Buteo burmanicus* Hume, 1875. Gray & Gray (1847: 39) thought that Hodgson had renamed

[3] The specimens upon which a name that is a primary homonym is based are not types of that name because primary homonyms are 'permanently invalid' (Art. 57.2 of The Code, I.C.Z.N., 1999). This is a very rigid rule for a fluid situation. Our knowledge of actual dates of publication in the early 19th century is relatively poor and researched priority may need correction in the future. It is hoped that if priority is reversed, and thus the designation of primary homonym passes from the name of one author to that of another, the 'permanent' invalidity will be seen to mean 'as long as the name remains a primary homonym'.

Circus plumipes which he had first published in the *Bengal Sporting Magazine* (1836: 182) under his pseudonym 'Parbattiah' (see Blyth, 1846: 2) [4]. It is recommended that this 'holotype' designation, the status of which is to be confirmed in due course, now be associated with the 1836 name and description [5]. The name *plumipes* has been used as the valid name for a Chinese buzzard as recently as 1907 (la Touche, 1907: 10; Ogilvie-Grant & la Touche, 1907: 257). It seems that la Touche did not consider *plumipes* a synonym of *japonicus* (although whether he applied this name to specimens properly called *japonicus* or to the more western birds is not immediately clear). In any event, it seems that because *Buteo plumipes* has been used since 1899 [6] it cannot be considered a *nomen oblitum*; and this implies that where Rasmussen & Anderton (2005: 102) treated *Buteo burmanicus* as a species separate from *Buteo buteo* they should have used the name *Buteo plumipes* ('Parbattiah' = Hodgson, 1836) [7].

2. *Digenea tricolor*: Table 1 shows that Hodgson (1845) described *D. tricolor* and *D. leucomelanura* on the same page and had separate drawings made of them [8] (later seen to depict respectively the female and the male of the same species). The 'genus' *Digenea* is now subsumed in *Ficedula* (see Vaurie, 1953a) [9]. Vaurie (1953b) decided to restrict the type locality of nominate *tricolor* described, he thought, from 'Nepal' to eastern Nepal, and to recognise *notata* Whistler, 1930, described from Kashmir. He was describing a new eastern subspecies (*diversa*) from the borders of Sichuan and Gansu, which he found matched by specimens from Yunnan at the eastern end of the Himalayas, and he perceived a population intermediate between western Himalayan birds and those of eastern Nepal east to Assam and south-east Tibet, different from *diversa*, and he wished to attach the name *tricolor* to this, which would permit him to use *notata* for the western bird. In support of his restriction of type locality

---

[4] As apparently did Hume (1876) referring to "Beng. Sp. Mag. p. 182" but without mention of Parbattiah and not giving *Circus plumipes* as the original name.

[5] Warren & Harrison (1971: 4) did, rightly, associate a syntype of *Accipter affinis* with this paper (although they did not cite or even mention Parbattiah).

[6] See Art. 23.9.1.1 of The Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999).

[7] The Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999; Art. 51) is silent on how to cite pseudonyms.

[8] Given by Gray & Gray (1847) as 795 for *D. tricolor* and 419 for *D. leucomelanura*.

[9] It had been subsumed into *Muscicapa* by Hartert (1907: 473), who, presumably thinking the name *tricolor* preoccupied (later Vaurie, 1953b, argued that it was not), employed the specific name *leucomelanura* Hodgson (1845). Hartert (1907) initiated the concept of a broad genus *Muscicapa* at a time when, early in the 20th century, many small genera were lumped in larger genera. His genus *Muscicapa* was further expanded by others later, as reported by Deignan (1947). However, this treatment was not accepted universally, and *Muscicapula* was recognised by Baker (1930a: 132), with *Digenea* subsumed in it and *tricolor* as one of its species. Mayr & Amadon (1951: 19), in their proposed new classification of birds, noted the need for a generic revision of the Muscicapinae, and it fell to Vaurie (1953a) to produce one, although this was restricted in its scope to the tribe Muscicapini. In this, what Vaurie (p. 475) referred to as 'the *Muscicapa* complex' was said to include 77 species, which he divided between the genera *Ficedula*, *Niltava* and *Muscicapa*. The generic name *Digenea* Hodgson, 1845, was listed as one subsumed in *Ficedula* Brisson, 1760, as was *Muscicapula* Blyth, 1843. Thus when reviewing the species *tricolor*, Vaurie (1953b) employed the generic name *Ficedula* and the binomen *Ficedula tricolor*. However, this deconstruction of the broad genus *Muscicapa* was not acceptable to Ripley (1961: 427; 1982: 389) who retained the nomenclature introduced by Hartert (1907: 489). Since Ripley (1982), the deconstruction of the broad genus *Muscicapa* has been more generally accepted (e.g., by Watson et al., 1986b: 338, 352).

he wrote "The type locality of nominate *tricolor* (1845) is Nepal, but there is no certainty that the type came from central Nepal. It may have come from eastern Nepal or even Sikkim, for, according to Kinnear (in Ludlow & Kinnear, 1937, p. 32) [10], Hodgson left Nepal for Sikkim in 1843." But Vaurie was misinformed. At the time the description in Hodgson (1845) was written, Hodgson had not yet gone to Sikkim. Although Ripley (1961: 427) followed Vaurie, he later (1982: 389) followed Biswas (1962: 812) in rejecting this scenario and placed Whistler's *notata* in the synonymy of nominate *tricolor* because the western form named by Hodgson extended east as far as central Nepal,[11] and Vaurie had shown that birds from Kashmir and central Nepal belonged together. That sort of misunderstanding of Hodgson's collecting is probably quite widespread in the literature and Biswas, who had studied Nepalese birds extensively, was well placed to spot this. Dickinson (2006) set out the timing of Hodgson's movements and found that Biswas was correct in claiming that Hodgson's type material must have been obtained in Nepal, and most probably in central Nepal. However, Vaurie (1953b: 2) mapped *tricolor* as the Himalayan population from east Nepal to Sikkim based on specimens he had seen, and Bhutan and the more eastern Himalayas based on some he did not examine. Kinnear in Ludlow (1944: 194)[12] observed in birds from southeast Tibet [= Xixang] "a good deal of variation in the colour of the underside in the black-backed males as regards the amount of rusty buff. For instance there is none on no. 4722, while in no. 4718 it is strongly marked". Vaurie (1953b) took this to mean that such birds showed a tendency towards his new race *diversa*. Assuming that this is so, and that birds from Manipur (*cervineiventris*) [13] are separable, the central population in the Himalayas and the Khasi hills could be a distinct intermediate form or could lie on a stepless cline between *tricolor* and *diversa*. Should it be distinct the name *minuta* Hume, 1872, from Sikkim is available, and this was used by Ripley (1982: 389) and Watson et al. (1986). Although a cline along the Himalayas may be more likely we follow Ripley (1982), not having assembled the material to rebut his view. But Ripley did confuse one aspect of this matter. Whereas Vaurie had restricted the type locality of *tricolor*, Ripley (1961: 427; 1982: 389) reported that Vaurie had restricted the type locality of *leucomelanura*. In fact, Vaurie's action had no effect on this name, only on *tricolor*. These two names, relating to the two sexes of one species, are synonyms and one cannot doubt that their type material would have been taken in the same general locality. Noting that Gray & Gray (1847) gave the type locality of *leucomelanura* simply as 'Nepal', we hereby restrict this to the 'central hills of Nepal' which is the *terra typica* Gray & Gray listed for *tricolor* (as restored by Ripley, 1982).

---

[10] In our References see Ludlow (1937).

[11] And used the available name *minuta* Hume, 1872, from Sikkim for the central Himalayan population.

[12] In our References see Ludlow (1944).

[13] Vaurie's map shows *tricolor* south of the Brahmaputra, relating to the Khasi hills as his text makes clear, but not labelled as such. Birds from the Khasi hills should be examined to verify that they do not deserve separation.

3. *Prinia brunnifrons*: Baker (1930a: 177, 197) listed this name twice. First (on p, 177) he listed it as a synonym of *Prinia buchanani* Blyth, 1844; twenty pages later (on p. 197) he listed it as the basis for the name *Horeites* (now *Cettia*) *brunnifrons* (Hodgson, 1845). No doubt, the roots of this anomaly are to be found in earlier publications and these will be sought during later work. In the meantime there would appear to be two (or perhaps more) tenable hypotheses: in one, Baker simply erred on one of these two pages; in the other, there were specimens of both these taxa that Hodgson had associated with the same drawing number (Hodgson no. 836) and thus with this name. If the second hypothesis is true it will be necessary to designate a lectotype and, if no specimen can be determined to be a type [14], such a designation might have to be of the specimen depicted in the Hodgson drawing [15]. As Baker (1930a: 197) brought into his synonymy of *Horeites brunnifrons* two other names from 1845 – *pollicaris* Hodgson, 1845 (Hodgson drawing no. 848) and *schistilata* [16] Blyth, 1845c (Hodgson drawing no. 860) – they, too, will have to be investigated to see whether specimens associated with these names may have influenced Baker's judgement. Hodgson's name *schistilatus* is also relevant. Several species of *Cettia* exhibit significant sexual size dimorphism. That Gray & Gray (1847) named *pollicaris* the 'Small Horeites' may signal this to be the female of *brunnifrons*, which they dubbed 'Brown-fronted Horeites' or of *schistilatus* [17] which they called 'Mountainous Horeites'. It has been suggested to us (by Inskipp & Inskipp *in litt.*) that Hodgson's description of *schistilatus* better fits *Cettia major* (Moore, 1854) of which it would be a senior synonym (which would lead to the declaration that *Horeites schistilatus* Hodgson, 1845, is a *nomen oblitum* under Art. 23.9.1 of The Code as an unused senior synonym). Further study of the basis for these names and the hypothesis of a composite type series is essential.
4. *Heterura sylvana*: now known as *Anthus sylvanus*. Hall (1961: 289) explained her emendation of the authorship/citation from Blyth in the JASB to Hodgson in the PZS. Hall was correct as to the journal and page number, although her reasoning in favour of the priority of the article in the PZS was flawed. Blyth (1845c) did not quote the description that Hodgson (1845) used; rather he quoted from the MS supplied to him by Hodgson at some earlier date. Happily, Hall was right in her belief that Hodgson (1845) should be ceded priority. However, the citation of Blyth as the author of the name was always incorrect, this being a case where Blyth cited Hodgson as author of the name and, exceptionally, gave Hodgson's description in quotation marks, so the author should have been given as Hodgson (or Hodgson in Blyth).

---

[14] A situation likely to arise because of Hodgson's labelling practices (see Dickinson & Walters, 2006, this issue).

[15] One does not designate a depiction as a lectotype. Correctly, one designates the specimen shown in the illustration, whether the specimen is extant or not – see Art. 74.4 in The Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999). However, Hodgson's drawing was unpublished and this choice may not be valid.

[16] Here, due to the context, we use the spelling of Blyth's name as given by Baker (1930a). In Hodgson (1844: 82) his *nomen nudum* was *Nivicola schistilatus* and his drawing number was associated with this. Hodgson (1845) used *Horeites schistilatus* (see Table I). Baker did not mention Hodgson's name from the PZS, 1845.

[17] Gray & Gray (1847: 65) correctly cited the spelling in Hodgson (1845) as *schistilatus*.

5. *Nemura flavolivacea*: this, the taxon Blyth (1845c) described by the name *N*[*eornis*] *flavolivacea*, was treated by Watson et al. (1986a: 14) as *Cettia flavolivacea* (Blyth, 1845c). Its attribution to Blyth "ex Hodgson" was unfortunate; in fact Blyth not only indicated that the name was Hodgson's, but also placed Hodgson's description in quotation marks, so authorship should have been ascribed to 'Hodgson in Blyth'. Above, however, we have shown that *Nemura flavolivacea* Hodgson, 1845, is the earlier name. Because *N*[*eornis*] *flavolivacea* Hodgson was included in a paper by Blyth it is likely that a specimen was in the museum of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, but any other specimen available to Hodgson when he wrote that description, including specimens he later took to London, might be thought to qualify as types. But since both names are attributable to Hodgson it is necessary to consider whether *N*[*eornis*] *flavolivacea* is a new combination and thus not entitled to types of its own. When recasting his work Hodgson would not have had access to any specimen in Calcutta, and thus the types of *Nemura flavolivacea* must be sought in London. However, none was listed by Warren & Harrison (1971). Although it seems probable that it will be difficult to show that *Nemura flavolivacea* and *N*[*eornis*] *flavolivacea* were represented by specimens of more than one taxon this is not impossible as there are two differently numbered drawings (*Nemura flavolivacea* is depicted in drawing 884 and *Neornis flavolivacea* relates to drawing 976, which may post-date Blyth's use of that name)[18]. The evidence of these drawings needs to be considered as do any related specimens. In the meantime, we recommend that although we here list the PZS name as having priority authorship of *Cettia flavolivacea* Hodgson in Blyth (i.e., *sensu* Watson et al., 1986a), and the citation used by Watson et al., be retained because of the need for verification of the identity of the taxon or taxa to which these two names were applied. It is intended that soon one or both of us will report further on this riddle.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Aasheesh Pittie for his work on the dating of the issues of the JASB. We are also indebted to Alison Harding of The Natural History Museum, Tring for help with the literature and Tim & Carol Inskipp for some suggestions in another context that had impact here. We also thank our two referees Pamela Rasmussen and Steven Gregory for their valuable suggestions.

References

Baker, E.C.S., 1930a. The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Birds. 7: i-viii, 1-484.— London.

Baker, E.C.S., 1930b. The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Birds. 8: i-iv, 485-801.— London.

Biswas, B., 1962. The birds of Nepal. Part 8.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 59 (3): 807-821.

Blyth, E., 1842a. Curator's report. January meeting.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XI (121): 95-115.

Blyth, E., 1842b. Curator's Report for April.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XI (125): 444-470.

Blyth, E., 1843a. Report of the Curator [for September].— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XI (129): 880-891 (1842).

[18] Drawing numbers higher than 900 are invariable from Hodgson's time in Sikkim.

Blyth, E., 1843b. Mr Blyth's monthly report for December Meeting 1842, with addenda subsequently appended.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XII (143): 925-1011.
Blyth, E., 1844. Mr Blyth's monthly report for December Meeting 1842, with addenda subsequently appended (cont.).— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XIII (149): 361-395.
Blyth, E., 1845a. Synopsis of Indian Fringillidae [19].— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XIII (156): 944-963 (1844).
Blyth, E., 1845b. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XIV (159): 173-212.
Blyth, E., 1845c. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds (Cont.).— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XIV (164): 546-602.
Blyth, E., 1846. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XV (169): 1-54.
Burton, E., 1836. [Birds which had recently been presented to the Museum of the Army Medical Department at Chatham].— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 152-154 (1835).
Deignan, H.G., 1947. Some untenable names in the Old World flycatchers.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash., 60: 165-168.
Dickinson, E.C. (Ed.), 2003. The Howard & Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World 3rd Edition. 1-1040.— London.
Dickinson, E.C. 2006. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 52. An introduction to the bird collections of Brian Houghton Hodgson (1801-1894).— Zool. Med. Leiden. 80-5 (4): 125-136.
Dickinson, E.C. & S.M.S. Gregory, 2006. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 55. A re-examination of the date of publication of Jerdon's Second Supplement to the Catalogue of the Birds of southern India.— Zool. Med. Leiden. 80-5 (7): 169-178.
Dickinson, E.C. & A. Pittie. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 51. Dates of avian names introduced in early volumes of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal.— Zool. Med. Leiden 80-5 (3): 113-124.
Dickinson, E.C. & M. Walters, 2006. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 53. The authorship and date of publication of 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".— Zool. Med. Leiden. 80-5 (5): 137-153.
Duncan, F.M., 1937. On the dates of publication of the Society's "Proceedings", 1859 -1926.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 71-83.
Gray, J.E. & G.R. Gray, 1847. Catalogue of the specimens and drawings of Mammalia and Birds of Nepal and Thibet presented by B.H. Hodgson Esq., to the British Museum. i-xi, 1-156.— London.
Hall, B.P., 1961. The taxonomy and identification of pipits (genus *Anthus*).— Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Zool., 7 (5): 245-289.
Hartert, E., 1907. Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna. 1 (4): 385-512.— Berlin.
Hodgson, B.H., 1837a. Indication of some new forms belonging to the Parianae.— Indian Rev., 2 (1): 30-34.
Hodgson, B.H., 1837b. On three new Genera or sub-genera of long-legged Thrushes, with descriptions of their species.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, VI (62): 101-104.
Hodgson, B.H., 1844. Catalogue of Nipalese Birds collected between 1824 and 1844.— [Gray's] Zoological Miscellany: 81-86.
Hodgson, B.H., 1845 (Aug.). [On Nepalese birds].— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 22-37.
Hodgson, B.H., 1855. Catalogue of Nipalese Birds, collected between 1824 and 1844.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, XXIV (7): 572-582.
Hume, A.O., 1872. Descriptions of six new species of Indian birds.— Ibis, (3) 2: 107-111.
Hume, A.O., 1875. A first list of the birds of Pegu.— Stray Feathers, 3 (1-3): 1-194.
Hume, A.O., 1876. A first list of the birds of the Travancore hills.— Stray Feathers 4 (4-6): 351-405.
I.C.Z.N., 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
I.C.Z.N., 2000. Precedence of names in wide use over disused synonyms or homonyms in accordance with Article 23.9 of the Code.— Bull. zool. Nomencl., 57 (1): 6-10.

[19] This appears within a paper by Hodgson.

Jerdon, T.C., 1845. Second Supplement to the Catalogue of the birds of Southern India.— Madras J. Lit. Sci., 13 (31): 116-144 (1844).
la Touche, J.D.D., 1907. Field notes on the birds of Chinkiang, Lower Yangtse Basin, Part III.— Ibis (9) 1: 1-30.
Legge, V., 1878. A History of the Birds of Ceylon. 1 (1): i-xlvi, 1-345.— London.
Ludlow, F., 1937. The birds of Bhutan and adjacent territories of Sikkim and Tibet. With notes by N.B. Kinnear.— Ibis (14) 1: 249-293.
Ludlow, F., 1944. The birds of south-eastern Tibet (with notes by N.B. Kinnear).— Ibis 86: 43-86, 176-208, 348-389.
Mayr, E. & D. Amadon, 1951. A classification of recent birds.— Amer. Mus. Novit., 1496: 1-42.
Moore, A. In: 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.
Ogilvie-Grant, W.R. & J.D.D. la Touche, 1907. On the birds of the island of Formosa.— Ibis (9) 1: 151-198, 254-279.
'Parbattiah' [= Hodgson, B.H.], 1836. Summary description of some new species of birds of prey.— Bengal Sporting Mag., 8: 177-183.
Penard, T.E., 1919. Some untenable names in ornithology.— Proc. New Eng. Zool. Cl., 7: 21-22.
Rasmussen, P.C. & J.C. Anderton, 2005. Birds of South Asia. The Ripley Guide. 2. Attributes and status 1-683.— Washington D.C. and Barcelona.
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.
Sclater, P.L., 1893. List of the dates of delivery of the sheets of the "Proceedings" of the Zoological Society of London, from the commencement in 1830 to 1859 inclusive.— Proc. Zool. Soc., London: 435-440.
Sharpe, R.B., 1874. A Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum. I. Catalogue of the Accipitres or diurnal birds of prey in the collection of the British Museum. i-xiii, 1-480.— London.
Sykes, W.H., 1832. Catalogue of Birds of the Raptorial and Incessorial Orders (systematically arranged), observed in the Dukhun.— Proc. Commit. Sci. Corresp. Zool. Soc. Lond., 2: 77-99.
Temminck, C.J. & H. Schlegel, 1844-1850. Fauna Japonica – Aves. 1-141.— Lugduni Batavorum.
Tickell, S.R., 1833. List of birds collected in the jungles of Borabhum and Dholbhum.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, II (23): 569-583.
Vaurie, C., 1953a (Mar. 11). A generic revision of the flycatchers of the tribe Muscicapini.— Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., 100 (4): 453-538.
Vaurie, C., 1953b (Dec. 19). Systematic Notes on Palearctic Birds. No. 2. Geographical variation in *Ficedula tricolor*.— Amer. Mus. Novit., 1641: 1-8.
Warren, R.L.M., 1966. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 1: i-x, 1-320.— London.
Warren, R.L.M. & C.J.O. Harrison, 1971. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 2: i-vi, 1-628.— London.
Warren, R.L.M. & C.J.O. Harrison, 1973. Type-specimens of birds in the British Museum (Natural History). 3: i-xii, 1-76.— London.
Watson, G.E., M.A. Traylor, Jr. & E. Mayr, 1986a. Family Sylviidae. 3-294. In: E. Mayr and G.W. Cottrell. Check-list of Birds of the World. XI. A continuation of the works of James L. Peters.— Cambridge, Mass.
Watson, G.E., M.A. Traylor, Jr. & E. Mayr, 1986b. Family Muscicapidae (*sensu stricto*). 295-375. In: E. Mayr and G.W. Cottrell. Check-list of Birds of the World. XI. A continuation of the works of James L. Peters.— Cambridge, Mass.
Whistler, H., 1930. [Hitherto undescribed races].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 50: 70-72.

Final draft: 12.viii.2006
Accepted: 27,viii.2006
Edited: D.R. Wells

Table 1. An analysis of the names published by Hodgson (1845) showing prior usage and synonymy

Legend for column 6: Yes = a synonym for a previous name, potentially even for another name introduced in Hodgson (1845); No = new names that are not immediate synonyms, but were put forward as if new (but not evident new combinations). Notes re column 7: redescription, as used strictly for this column, relates to a new description by the same author under the same name. Dickinson (2003) is taken as the basis for the names now in use.

	Hodgson (1845)		**Baker (1930a, b)**		**Synonym**	**Comments**
		Page no.	**Page no.**	**Cited from**	**Yes/No**	
	A. Names given to taxa since believed to have been described earlier					
	a) Previously named by Hodgson in his own publications; now a new combination (4)					
1	*Pnoepyga albiventer*	24	94	Hodgson (1837b: 102)	No	A redescription. Originally described in *Tesia*. Now *Pnoepyga albiventer* (Hodgson, 1837b).
2	*Pnoepyga rufiventer*	25	94	Hodgson (1837b: 102)	Yes	A redescription. Originally described in *Tesia*. A synonym of *Pnoepyga albiventer* (Hodgson, 1837b).
3	*Oligura flaviventer*	25	95	Hodgson (1837b: 102)	Yes	A redescription. Originally described in *Tesia*. A synonym of *Oligura castaneocoronata* (Burton, 1836).
4	*Oligura cyaniventer*	25	95	Hodgson (1837b: 101)	No	A redescription. Originally described in *Tesia*. Now *Tesia cyaniventer* Hodgson, 1837b.
	b) Named by Hodgson in his own earlier publications; name modified in 1845 (3)					
5	*Pnoepyga unicolor*	25	94	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	Baker (1930: 94) listed this as a synonym of *Tesia albiventer* Hodgson, 1837b.
6	*Temnoris atrifrons*	31	20	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Suthora nipalensis* Hodgson, 1837a, now *Paradoxornis nipalensis* (Hodgson, 1837a). A redescription under a new name.
7	*Buteo plumipes*	37		Parbattiah (1836: 182)	No	A redescription. Originally described in *Circus*. Not found in Baker (1930). See Note 1.
	c) Named by Blyth in earlier publications using Hodgson MS names (5)					
8	*Stachyris nigriceps*	22	52	Blyth (1844: 378)	Yes	Now *Stachyris nigriceps* Blyth, 1844. Hodgson's name is a primary homonym.
9	*Stachyris pyrops*	23	54	Blyth (1844: 379)	Yes	Blyth's earlier name was spelled *pyrrhops*; now *Stachyris pyrrhops* Blyth, 1844. Hodgson's name must also be treated as a primary homonym.
10	*Stachyris chrysæus*	23	52	Blyth (1844: 379)	Yes	Now *Stachyris chrysaea* Blyth,1844. Hodgson's name is a primary homonym.
11	*Accentor Nipalensis*	34	126	Blyth (1843b: 958)	Yes	Now *Prunella collaris nipalensis* (Blyth, 1843b). Baker (1930: 126), in

						his synonymy, did not list use by Hodgson (1845). Hodgson's name is a primary homonym.
12	*Accentor strophiatus*	34	128	Blyth (1843b: 959)	Yes	Now *Prunella strophiata strophiata* (Blyth, 1843b). Baker (1930: 128), in his synonymy, did not list use by Hodgson (1845). Hodgson's name is a primary homonym.
	d) Named by Blyth in earlier publications using a different scientific name (7)					
13	*Erpornis xanthochlora*	23	67	Blyth (1844: 379)	Yes	Now *Erpornis zantholeuca zantholeuca* Blyth, 1844. Note Hodgson's different spelling (under Art. 58 of the Code this is not a homonym).
14	*Dimorpha ? rubrocyanea*	26	132	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Ficedula hyperythra* (Blyth, 1843a: 885).
15	*Horornis ? fulviventris*	31	185	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A synonym of *Phylloscopus fuscata* (Blyth, 1842a: 113).
16	*Chelidorynx chrysoschistos*	32	144	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Rhipidura hypoxantha* Blyth, 1843b: 935.
17	*Loxia himalayana*	35	228		Yes	Not found in Baker (1930). A junior synonym of *Loxia himalayensis* Blyth, 1845a: 952. Imprint date 1844. Now *Loxia curvirostra himalayensis* Blyth, 1845.
18	*Pyrrhulinota roseata*	36	232	Hodgson (1845)	**Yes**	According to Baker (1930: 232) a junior synonym of *Propasser roseatus* Blyth (1842b: 461); Blyth's name, which was actually *Erythrospiza roseata*, was based on Tickell's material. Hodgson made no reference to Blyth's name and is judged to have, wrongly, described this as new and not to have merely proposed a new combination. A secondary homonym of *Carpodacus erythrinus roseatus* (Blyth, 1842b).
19	*Propyrrhula Rubeculoides*	36	229	Blyth (1846: 37)	Yes	Not listed from the PZS by Baker (1930: 229), but Baker did mention the 'redescription' of *Pyrrhospiza punicea* Blyth ('1844': 953) by Blyth (1846: 37) using the name *Propyrrhula rubeculoides*, as had Hodgson (1845). A synonym of *Carpodacus puniceus puniceus* (Blyth, 1845).
	e) Named by others in earlier publications (7)					
20	*Mixornis ruficeps*	23	55	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	In the synonymy of *Mixornis gularis rubricapilla* (Tickell, 1833) – now *Macronous gularis rubricapilla* (Tickell, 1833).
21	*Pyctoris rufifrons*	24	45	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	Baker (1930: 45) gave this as a synonym of *Chrysomma sinensis* (Gmelin, 1789).
22	*Synornis Joulaimus*	27	131	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Muscicapa albicill*a Pallas, 1811 -- now *Ficedula parva albicilla* (Pallas, 1773).

	Hodgson (1845)	Page no.	Page no.	Baker (1930a, b) Cited from	Synonym Yes/No	Comments
23	*Nemura cyanura*	27			Yes	Not found in Baker (1930). Seems likely to have been based on *Motacilla cyanurus* [sic] Pallas, 1773, and is just a new combination. Now *Luscinia cyanura cyanura* (Pallas, 1773).
24	*Hemipus picæcolor*	33	151	Hodgson (1844: 84)	Yes	Baker (1930: 151) only cited this from Hodgson (1844) where it was a *nomen nudum*; a synonym of *Muscicapa picata* Sykes, 1832, now *Hemipus picatus* (Sykes, 1832).
25	*Emberiza oinops*	35	247	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Emberiza pusilla* Pallas, 1776, and of *Emberiza sordida* Blyth, 1845a: 958 (imprint date 1844).
26	*Buteo leucocephalus*	37	421	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Buteo hemilasius* Temminck & Schlegel, 1844. *Buteo aquilinus* Blyth (1845b) is a junior synonym of both.
	B. NEWLY DESCRIBED TAXA					
	i) Names given to new taxa described in Hodgson (1845) (18)					
27	*Pnoepyga pusillus*	25	94	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Pnoepyga pusilla* Hodgson, 1845.
28	*Dimorpha ? monileger*	26	137	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Ficedula monileger* (Hodgson, 1845).
29	*Digenea tricolor*	26	132	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Ficedula tricolor tricolor* (Hodgson, 1845). See Note 2.
30	*Muscisylvia leucura*	27	111	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Myiomela leucura* (Hodgson, 1845).
31	*Nemura rufilatus*	27	110	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Luscinia cyanura rufilata* (Hodgson, 1845). In the original, the name was not *rufilata* as cited by Baker (1930: 110).
32	*Tarsiger chrysæus*	28	110	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Luscinia chrysaea chrysaea* (Hodgson, 1845).
33	*Orthotomus Patia*	29	173	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Orthomus sutorius patia* Hodgson, 1845.
34	*Prinia fusca*	29	201	Hodgson (1845)	No	Seen as a junior synonym of *Prinia inornata* Sykes (1832: 89) by Baker (1930); but since separated as *Prinia inornata fusca* Hodgson, 1845.
35	*Prinia brunnifrons*	29	177, 197	Hodgson (1845)	No?	Now *Cettia brunnifrons* (Hodgson, 1845), but requires further investigation. See Note 3.
36	*Tribura luteoventris*	30	172	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Bradypterus luteoventris luteoventris* (Hodgson, 1845).
37	*Horornis fortipes*	31	195	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Cettia fortipes* (Hodgson, 1845).
38	*Horornis flaviventris*	31	172	Hodgson (1845)	No	Baker (1930a) considered this name a synonym of *Tribura luteoventris* Hodgson, 1845 (see above). However, Dickinson et al. (2000: 24) reported on a re-examination of syntypes which they considered should be identified as *Bradypterus thoracicus* (Blyth, 1845c: 584). That this was probably a synonym of *flaviventris* was

						recognised and Case 3102 was registered with the ICZN, consequent upon which *flaviventris* is a *nomen oblitum* (I.C.Z.N., 2000).
39	*Horornis ? fuligiventer*	31	185	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Phylloscopus fuligiventer* (Hodgson, 1845).
40	*Temnoris fulvifrons*	31	21	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Paradoxornis fulvifrons* (Hodgson, 1845).
41	*Hemichelidon fuliginosa*	32	130	Hodgson (1845)	No	Baker (1930: 130) employed the name *Hemichelidon sibirica fuliginosa*, but *Hemichelidon* has been submerged in *Muscicapa* where *fuliginosa* is preoccupied and the replacement name *Muscicapa sibirica cacabata* Penard, 1919, has been brought out of synonymy.
42	*Hemichelidon ferruginea*	32	130	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Muscicapa ferruginea* (Hodgson, 1845).
43	*Heterura sylvana*	33	269	Blyth (1845c: 556)	No	Now *Anthus sylvanus* (Hodgson, 1845). See Note 4.
44	*Accentor immaculatus*	34	127	Hodgson (1845)	No	Now *Prunella immaculata* (Hodgson, 1845). The original name was not spelled *immaculata* as cited by Baker (1930: 127).
	ii) Second names (and descriptions) attached to taxa named earlier in Hodgson (1845) (3)					
45	*Digenea leucomelanura*	26	132	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A synonym of *Digenea tricolor*, and thus of *Ficedula tricolor* (see above) unless treated in the broad genus *Muscicapa* when *tricolor* is preoccupied and *leucomelanura* becomes the substitute name.
46	*Horeites pollicaris*	30	197	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	A junior synonym of *Prinia brunnifrons* if that has been correctly listed in *Horeites* (see above); thus now in the synonymy of *Cettia brunnifrons* (Hodgson, 1845).
47	*Accentor Cacharensis*	34	126	Hodgson (1845)	Yes	Listed from Hodgson, PZS, but as a synonym of *Accentor nipalensis* Hodgson, 1845 (see above).
	C. Special cases that require further investigation (2)					
48	*Nemura flavolivacea*	27	194	Blyth (1845b: 590)	No	See Note 5.
49	*Horeites schistilatus*	30	197	Blyth (1845b: 586)	No	Baker (1930), who did not list Hodgson's use of *schistilatus* in the PZS, dated Blyth's name, *schistilata*, 'after Aug. 29, 1845', listing this in the synonymy of *Horeites brunnifrons*. Hodgson's use of *schistilatus*, in August, is here considered the prior naming. It is not 100% certain that these names apply to the same taxon, and evidence is being gathered to resolve the identity to be attached to Hodgson's name. See Note 3.