

Systematic notes on Asian birds. 50

Types of the Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae

E.C. Dickinson, V.M. Loskot, H. Morioka, S. Somadikarta
& R. van den Elzen

With contributions by
M. Kalyakin, C. Voisin & J-F. Voisin

Dickinson, E.C., V.M. Loskot, H. Morioka, S. Somadikarta & R. van den Elzen. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 50. Types of the Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae.

Zool. Med. Leiden 80-5 (2), 21.xii.2006: 65-111.— 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).

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.

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

Renate van den Elzen, Oberkustos, Sektion Ornithologie, Forschungsmuseum A. Koenig, Adenaueralle 160, D- 53113 Bonn (e-mail: R.Elzen.ZFMK@Uni-Bonn.de)

Mikhail V. Kalyakin, Zoological Museum, Moscow State University, Bol'shaya Nikitskaya Str. 6, Moscow, 103009, Russia. (e-mail: kalyakin@zmmu.msu.ru)

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).

Key words: Paridae; titmice; types; type species, war; *Parus griffithii*.

A list of 251 names applied to Asian forms of species of titmice or tits (of the families Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae) is presented. This list provides information on the whereabouts of type specimens. Where our information does not include reliable data we provide notes to explain the deficit and to stimulate others to offer additional data or sources of information. *Parus griffithii* is declared a *nomen oblitum*. The type locality of *Orites niveogularis* Moore, 1855, is restricted.

Introduction

In 'Systematic notes on Asian birds. 3. Types of the Eurylaimidae' (Dekker et al., 2000) we explained the rationale for this comprehensive set of articles on the types of Asian birds. Readers are reminded that that paper contains a fuller introduction and more details on methodology.

Methodology

Our table shows the names applied to the taxa, with author(s) and date (the relevant publications being reported in the 'References'). Where a type or types have been

located the acronym of a museum holding a type is given¹. The final column gives the number of a comment. The numbered comments follow the table. The arrangement of the list is by species in the sequence adopted by Snow (1967) for Peters's Check-list and, within that, subspecies in a sequence that in some cases we have amended. The inclusion in the Paridae, and indeed in the genus *Parus sensu lato*, of *Pseudopodoces humilis* (Hume, 1871) has been proposed by James et al. (2003). The type of this was listed in Dickinson et al. (2004b), in its traditional place in the Corvidae; it is not relisted here (although discussed by Eck & Martens, 2006, this volume). Our treatment here of the genus *Parus* as one broad entity should not be taken to imply that we will retain this in the planned Synopsis.

The subspecies list adopted here differs from that used in Peters's Check-list in two particulars. First, we include the subsequent names of which we are aware: *Parus semi-larvatus snowi* Parkes, 1971, *Parus ater martensi* Eck, 1998, and *Parus ater eckodedicatus* Martens, Tietze & Sun, 2006. Second, we apply the taxonomic decisions made in the accompanying paper on this family (Eck & Martens, 2006) except that we usually retain the sequence of subspecies used by Snow (1967). We stress, again, that our views in these papers are preliminary in nature. Additional information and suggestions received before the 'Synopsis' is prepared may lead to modified treatment therein – see 'Introduction to Systematic notes on Asian birds' (Dickinson & Dekker, 2000).

As in our reports on Asian types of other families in this series, the Eurylaimidae (Dekker et al., 2000), the Pittidae (Dickinson et al., 2000), the Alaudidae (Dickinson et al., 2001a) and subsequent papers, we investigated all the names that we found in synonymy. We list all taxa that occur in our area (see map in Editor's Foreword, p. xi) and all the synonyms of such names. We have not pursued a number of listed names that have type localities well outside our region; in these cases an "E", for extralimital, appears in the right hand column. All names have been checked to the original citation and original spellings are used. In the case of unusual spellings we add the adjunction 'sic'. For every name listed, except those marked "E", we explored what was known about the types.

A list of acronyms appears before the list of References.

Published type catalogues and data provided as part of the original description have remained our main sources, but interested museum curators and collection managers have again provided most welcome help. In our personal searches for types, which cannot safely be described 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 examined every last type, only those we had a particular reason to need to.

This is the first paper in our series that demonstrates how much type material was destroyed in World War II. The holotype, or set of syntypes, of 20 names covered herein are shown here to have been lost by war in Japan or the Philippines. Kakizawa (1980)

¹ It is beyond the scope of this paper to identify other museums that share a type series. Our purpose is simply to signal where a type may be examined. However, when the holotype is lost known paratypes may be mentioned and when a lectotype has been designated known paralectotypes may be mentioned.

mentioned the loss of almost all Nagamichi Kuroda's collection of some 13000 skins and listed the few types (relating to six taxa) that Kuroda had been able to save. It is thought Kuroda had kept these in a fire-proof safe. Matsudaira suffered financial problems before the war and his collection, believed to have been the largest in Japan (H. Morioka), was dispersed; Taka-Tsukasa obtained about half of it and Kuroda and Yamashina, between them, probably had another third. Of these specimens essentially only those that went to Yamashina survived the war. Momiyama, who lost his first collection in the 1923 earthquake, built up another and most of this is now in the Yamashina Institute for Ornithology, as is the post-War collection by Nagamichi Kuroda and specimens that were once in the Imperial Household Museum (Morioka et al., 2005: 142). The need to better determine this was the main impetus behind Morioka et al. (2005), and the preparation of this paper has been greatly facilitated by the work of these authors, since 38 of the names treated are in their publication. Morioka et al. (2005) also drew attention to the dangers of allowing broad type localities to be restricted without direct comparison of original type material with representative fresh specimens from populations from which the original collection might have been made.

Recent bibliographical background for these families

After Snow (1967), the most useful and comprehensive treatment of these three families has been the guide of Harrap (1996), but northern Palaearctic species have benefited further from the work of Stepanyan (1983, 1990, 2003).

Taxonomic papers published on these families have been concerned with species or species groups, with particular attention to species limits, or with recognition of the component parts of the genus *Parus* by elevation of its subgenera to full genera (a topic that is treated in the companion paper by Eck & Martens (2006), so that no references on this are cited here). Field studies in the Himalayas and the Far East have contributed significantly too: see for example Martens & Eck (1995) and Nazarenko et al. (1999). Papers dealing with voice and with phylogeny have been largely lacking for the Aegithalidae and the Remizidae. Most relevant papers, for all three families, are examined by Eck & Martens (2006).

The types

In the right hand column of the table below the numbers relate to the Comments that follow the table. In column 4 a “-” implies that the name listed was a primary homonym, which is permanently invalid, or a *nomen nudum*² or that it is thought to have been based on a description with no type specified or depicted. The first two of these three kinds of names are placed in square brackets and are not valid names; the third kind relates to valid names where there is no primary evidence available to identify the type if it is still extant. A “?” implies that we do not know where a type, if there

² Not all *nomina nuda* are included; the intent is to help avoid confusion in future research. Those we include are names that have, by their use in earlier works, affected subsequent nomenclature or may on discovery raise questions about their validity.

was one, may have been deposited and thus do not know whether it is lost or not. The comments that follow this table relate to type material and historical information relevant to that. Corrections to names and dates and other information relating to the names rather than the types are to be found in our footnotes.

The types

Name	Author(s)	Date	Mus.	
<i>Aegithalos caudatus</i>				
<i>A. c. caudatus</i>				
[<i>Parus</i>] <i>caudatus</i>	Linnaeus	1758	?	E
<i>Ae[githalos]. c[audatus]. brachyurus</i>	Portenko	1954	ZISP	E
<i>A. c. sibiricus</i>				
<i>Acredula caudata sibirica</i> ³	Seebohm	1890	BMNH?	1.
<i>A. c. kamtschaticus</i>				
<i>Aegithalos caudatus kamtschaticus</i>	Domaniewski	1933	MPNH	E
<i>A. c. japonicus</i>				
<i>Aegithalus</i> [sic] <i>caudatus japonica</i> [sic] ⁴	Prazák	1897	USNM	2.
<i>A. c. vinaceus</i>				
<i>Mecistura vinacea</i> ⁵	J. Verreaux	1870 ⁶	MNHN	
<i>Acredula calva</i>	Pleske	1893	ZISP	
<i>A. c. glaucogularis</i>				
<i>Orites</i> (?) <i>glaucogularis</i>	Moore	1855 ⁷	BMNH	3.
[<i>Mecistura glaucogularis</i>] ⁸	Gould	1855 ⁹	-	3.
<i>Mecistura Swinhoei</i>	Zelevor in von Pelzeln ¹⁰	1865	NMW	
<i>A. c. magnus</i>				
<i>Acredula trivirgata magna</i>	Clark	1907	USNM	
<i>Aegithalos caudatus shimokoriyamae</i>	Kuroda	1923c	Lost	4.

³ Seebohm (1890), writing when trinomials were in their infancy, noted that "it is difficult to avoid recognizing an *Acredula caudata sibirica*" and preceded that with a description. Hartert (1905: 383) listed this as a synonym of nominate *caudatus*.

⁴ The original spelling might also be rendered *Aegithalus* [sic] *caudata* [sic] *japonica* because Prazak was inconsistent in his spelling of the scientific name.

⁵ Following an abortive attempt to meet Père David in Paris Swinhoe (1870c), who examined much of his collection, used the name *Mecistura ouratensis* for this, and in Swinhoe (1871) used *Orites ouratensis*, but he did not provide descriptions and these are *nomina nuda*. The first name was the MS name on specimens at the Lazarist Mission; Père David had no doubt only recently sent specimens to Paris for description.

⁶ Dated 1871 by Snow (1967: 55) but Verreaux (1871) cited names from this paper with the date 1870.

⁷ April 11, see Duncan (1937).

⁸ As this name is apparently antedated by Moore's name, Gould's name seems to be a primary homonym and permanently invalid under Art. 57.2 of The Code (as such Gould's name can have no type). However, it should not be forgotten that the choice between these two names is based on evidence that may, in both cases, be inaccurate. In such circumstances, were there separate types for each name, it would be senseless to fail to preserve both equally rigorously!

⁹ "April", see Waterhouse (1885), which must be taken as April 30.

¹⁰ The original spelling of the name is all in capital letters, but it appears twice on the next page with the S capitalised. The description is in Zelevor's words and as such is quoted. In his Foreword von Pelzeln emphasised Zelevor's role. The full citation should give "Zelevor in von Pelzeln".

¹¹ A referee has kindly pointed out that the first of these must, of course, contain the original description.

<i>Ægithalos caudatus tarihoæ</i>	Momiyama	1927a,b ¹¹	YIO	5.
A. c. trivirgatus				
<i>Parus (Megisturus) trivirgatus</i>	Temminck & Schlegel	1848 ¹²	RMNH	
<i>Ægithalos caudatus enaga</i>	Momiyama	1927a,b ¹¹	-	6.
<i>Aegithalos caudatus pallidolumbo</i>	Mishima	1961	YIO	
A. c. kiusiuensis				
<i>Aegithalos caudatus kiusiuensis</i>	Kuroda	1923c	Lost	7.
<i>Aegithalos leucogenys</i>				
<i>Orites leucogenys</i>	Moore in Horsfield & Moore ¹³	1854	BMNH	8.
<i>Aegithalos concinnus</i>				
A. c. iredalei				
<i>Parus erythrocephalus</i>	Vigors	1831	Lost?	9.
<i>Ægithaliscus concinna iredalei</i> nom. nov.	Baker	1920a	Lost?	10.
<i>Ægithaliscus concinna rubricapillus</i>	Ticehurst	1925	BMNH	
A. c. manipurensis				
<i>Æ[githaliscus]. manipurensis</i> Hume		1888	BMNH	
A. c. talifuensis				
<i>Ægithaliscus talifuensis</i>	Rippon	1903	BMNH	
<i>Ægithaliscus concinnus tonkinensis</i>	Delacour & Jabouille	1930	AMNH	
A. c. concinnus				
<i>Psaltria concinna</i>	Gould	1855	BMNH	
<i>Ægithaliscus anophrys</i>	Swinhoe	1868	BMNH	
<i>Aegithalos concinnus taiwanensis</i> ¹⁴	Yamashina	1944	YIO	
A. c. pulchellus				
<i>Ægithaliscus pulchellus</i>	Rippon	1900	BMNH	
A. c. annamensis				
<i>Ægithaliscus annamensis</i>	Robinson & Kloss	1919	BMNH	
<i>Aegithalos niveogularis</i>				
<i>Orites (?) niveogularis</i> Gould, MS	Moore ¹⁵	1855 ¹⁶	BMNH	11.
<i>[Acanthiparus niveogularis]</i>	Gould	1855 ¹⁷	-	11.
A. n. bonvaloti				
<i>Acredula Bonvaloti</i>	Oustalet	1892 ¹⁸	MNHN	
A. n. obscuratus				
<i>Ægithaliscus iouschistos obscuratus</i>	Mayr in Stanford & Mayr	1940	AMNH	

¹² The description on p. 71 probably appeared in fasc. 5 or 6 in early 1848, but was not later than Nov. 1848; the exact date of pl. 34 is not known (Holthuis & Sakai, 1970).

¹³ This publication antedated Moore (1855), see Dickinson (2004a).

¹⁴ Snow (1967: 57) erred in listing the original generic name as *Aegithaliscus*.

¹⁵ Snow (1967: 58) listed Gould as author but Moore's publication of the name has priority (his reading of the paper at the meeting of the Zoological Society of London does not). We hereby restrict Moore's type locality "N India" to "Northern Punjab", this being identical to the restriction by Vaurie (1957: 20) of the type locality of Gould's name and thus preventing future confusion.

¹⁶ April 11 see Duncan (1937).

¹⁷ "April", see Waterhouse (1885), which must be taken as April 30.

¹⁸ Dated 1891 by Snow (1967: 58); it actually appeared in 1892 as proved by the date consistently used by Oustalet (1893) for taxa described in the "1891" work, e.g., for *Trochalopteron Elliotti* var *Bonvaloti* (op. cit. 1893: 194) and for *Trochalopteron henrici* (op. cit. 1893: 196).

<i>A. n. sharpei</i>				
<i>Ægithaliscus sharpei</i>	Rippon	1904	BMNH	
<i>Aegithalos iouschistos</i>				
<i>P[arus]. iouschistos</i> 'Hodgson'	Blyth	1845 ¹⁹	ZSI?	12.
<i>[Parus jouschistos [sic]]</i> ²⁰	Hodgson	1845a	-	13.
<i>Aegithalos fuliginosus</i>				
<i>Mecistura fuliginosa</i>	J. Verreaux	1869 ²¹	MNHN	
<i>Aegithaliscus fuliginosus scurrula</i>	Bangs & Peters	1928	MCZ	
<i>Psaltria exilis</i>				
<i>Psaltria exilis</i>	Temminck in Temminck & Laugier	1836	RMNH	
<i>Remiz pendulinus</i>				
<i>R. p. coronatus</i>				
<i>Aegithalus coronatus</i>	Severtsov ²²	1873a ²³	ZISP	
<i>Aegithalus atricapillus</i>	Severtsov	1873a	ZISP	
<i>R. p. stoliczkae</i>				
<i>Ægithalus Stoliczkae</i>	Hume	1874	ZSI?	14.
<i>Remiza [sic] yenseiensis</i> ²⁴	Sushkin	1904	ZISP	
<i>Remiza [sic] pendulina centralasiæ</i>	Sushkin	1904	ZISP	
<i>R. p. consobrinus</i>				
<i>Ægithalus consobrinus</i>	Swinhoe	1870b	BMNH	15.
<i>Remiz consobrinus suffusus</i>	Clark	1907	USNM	
<i>R[emiz]. c[onsobrinus]. japonicus</i>	Clark	1907	USNM	
<i>Cephalopyrus flammiceps</i>				
<i>C. f. flammiceps</i>				
<i>Ægitalus [sic] flammiceps</i>	Burton	1836	Lost?	16.

¹⁹ Dated 1844 in Snow (1967: 58). This appeared in issue 156 of the 1844 volume and is often cited from 1844. In issue 155 there is, on p. 885 a list of meteorites which bears the date 1st January 1845. Warren & Harrison (1971) dated Blyth's paper from April and considered that it had priority over the paper by Hodgson which appeared in May (see next line in the table). Hodgson (1845) is fully assessed in regard to priority by Dickinson & Walters (2006).

²⁰ Considered to be a primary homonym and thus permanently invalid. See Comments.

²¹ Dated 1870 by Snow (1967: 58). However, Peters (1934: 62) and Deignan (1964: 378, 434, 438) both used 1869 for other taxa named in this paper and no evidence has been located to suggest that they erred. Snow also cited p. 36, which is a *lapsus* for p. 39.

²² To conform with SNAB usage, here and below, we use the spelling Severtsov where Snow (1967) used Severtzov.

²³ Snow (1967: 63) used two dates for this publication, 1872 and 1873, and placed 1872 within brackets in the case of *coronatus* but not *macronyx*. The original publication has 1873 as the imprint date. Severtsov (1875b) wrote that it had appeared in December 1872, but no proof of this seems to exist and Severtsov may have been thinking of the Russian date in the Julian calendar, which by this time was running about 12 days behind the Gregorian calendar.

²⁴ Not a synonym of *coronatus* as in Snow (1967: 63), see Stepanyan (2003: 609).

<i>Dicaeum sanguinifrons</i>	Hay in Blyth	1846	Lost?	17.
<i>C. f. olivaceus</i>				
<i>Cephalopyrus flammiceps olivaceus</i>	Rothschild	1923	BMNH	
<i>Cephalopyrus flammiceps saturatus</i>	Whistler	1924	BMNH	
<i>Parus palustris</i>²⁵				
<i>P. p. brevirostris</i>				
<i>Poecilia</i> [sic] <i>brevirostris</i>	Taczanowski	1872	?	
<i>P. p. crassirostris</i>				
<i>Poecilia</i> [sic] <i>palustris crassirostris</i>	Taczanowski	1885	MPHN	
<i>Parus palustris mizunoi</i>	Yamashina	1939	YIO	
<i>P. p. jeholicus</i>				
<i>Parus communis jeholicus</i>	Kleinschmidt & Weigold in Kleinschmidt	1922b	MTD	
<i>P. p. hensoni</i>				
<i>Parus hensoni</i>	Stejneger	1892	USNM	
<i>Parus seebohmi</i> ²⁶	Stejneger	1892 ²⁷	USNM	
<i>P. p. hellmayri</i>				
[<i>Poecile</i>] <i>communis hellmayri</i>	Bianchi	1902 ²⁸	AMNH	
<i>Parus hypermelaenus</i>				
<i>Poecile hypermelaena</i>	Berezowski & Bianchi	1891	ZMMU	18.
<i>Parus Dejeani</i>	Oustalet	1897	Lost?	19.
<i>Lophophanes poecilopsis</i>	Sharpe	1902	BMNH	
<i>Parus montanus</i>²⁹				
<i>P. m. baicalensis</i>				
<i>Poecile baicalensis</i>	Swinhoe	1871	BMNH	
<i>Poecilia</i> [sic] <i>palustris macroura</i>	Taczanowski	1891 ³⁰	?	
<i>Poecile tunkanensis</i>	von Madarász	1909	Lost	20.
<i>Poecile baicalensis suschkini</i>	Hachlov ³¹	1912	ZMMU	21.
<i>Parus atricapillus changaicus</i>	Fediuschin	1927	ZISP	

²⁵ We believe *P. p. altaicus* Johansen, 1952 (type in ZISP) to be a valid subspecies, but for us it is extralimital. The same is true for *P. p. ernsti* Yamashina, 1933 (type in YIO), a new name for *Poecile palustris orii* Yamashina, 1927, which is preoccupied in *Parus* by *Sittiparus varius orii* Kuroda, 1923.

²⁶ The treatment of *seebohmi* as a synonym of *hensoni*, traditional since Orn. Soc. Japan (1942), should be viewed with some suspicion as Stejneger distinguished them clearly.

²⁷ The names *hensoni* and *seebohmi* are both dated Aug. 2, 1892 (see Editorial Divison, 1947) and appear on the same page. Hartert (1905a: 375) acted as first reviser as regards priority.

²⁸ This taxon is named by indication (see I.C.Z.N., 1999: 107). The indication is to 'Kleinschmidt, l.c. p. 77' and refers to Kleinschmidt (1897) where Kleinschmidt described an unnamed 'spec. nov.'. Hartert (1905a: 375) incorrectly cited the original generic name as *Parus*.

²⁹ We consider *P. m. anadyrensis* Belopolski, 1932 (type in ZISP) to be a valid form (a photograph comparing specimens with *baicalensis* has been examined), but for us it is extralimital. See Stepanyan (1990: 566).

³⁰ Sometimes dated 1893 (which refers to part 2 pp. 685-1278); part 1 had its own 1891 title page.

³¹ Rendered as 'Hachlor' by the journal and by Snow (1967: 79), but a misspelling; sometimes spelled Hachlow which is the normal German spelling; given as Khakhlov by Russian authors.

<i>P. m. shulpini</i>				
<i>P[enthestes]. m[ontanus]. shulpini</i>	Portenko	1954	ZISP	
<i>P. m. kamtschatkensis</i>				
<i>Poecila</i> [sic] (<i>P.</i>) <i>kamtschatkensis</i> ³²	Bonaparte	1850	RMNH	
[<i>Parus wiemuthi</i> 'Dybowski'] ³³	Stejneger	1885	-	
<i>P. m. sachalinensis</i>				
<i>Parus atricapillus sachalinensis</i>	Lönnberg	1908	NRM	22.
<i>P. m. restrictus</i>				
[<i>Parus palustris japonicus</i>] ³⁴	Seebohm	1879	BMNH	23.
[<i>Parus borealis</i>] <i>restrictus</i>	Hellmayr	1900a	AMNH	
<i>Parus atricapillus abei</i>	Mishima	1961	TPM	24.
<i>P. m. songarus</i>				
<i>Parus songarus</i>	Severtsov	1873a	ZISP	
<i>P. m. affinis</i>				
<i>Poecile affinis</i> ³⁵	Przewalski ³⁶	1876	ZISP	25.
<i>P. m. stoetzneri</i>				
<i>Parus Salicarius stötzneri</i>	Kleinschmidt	1921a	MTD	
<i>Parus weigoldicus</i>				
<i>Parus Salicarius weigoldi</i>	Kleinschmidt	1921a	MTD	
<i>Parus weigoldicus</i> nom. nov. ³⁷	Kleinschmidt	1921b	MTD	
<i>Parus superciliosus</i>				
<i>Poecile superciliosa</i>	Przewalski	1876	ZISP	
<i>Parus davidi</i>				
<i>Poecile Davidi</i>	Berezowski & Bianchi	1891	ZMMU	26.
<i>Parus cinctus</i>				
<i>P. c. sayanus</i>				
<i>Poecile cincta sayana</i>	Sushkin	1904 ³⁸	ZISP	

³² As we understand Bonaparte (see Appendix 1) the bold **P** which we represent above in parentheses should not have been used. Judging by all the other names listed *P.* seems to mean *Parus*, and here Bonaparte should have been repeated the full generic name *Poecila*, using bold type.

³³ Stejneger (1885) listed this name with 'MSS' in his synonymy of *Parus kamtschatkensis*. It has not been used as valid and is now a *nomen oblitum*.

³⁴ For comments on the name *Parus japonicus* Seebohm, 1879, and why it is permanently invalid (but requires elucidation), see Dickinson, Morioka & Walters (2001: 222) and Morioka et al. (2005: 67), also herein under Comments.

³⁵ Hartert (1905a: 367) in the synonymy of this name listed *Parus ouratensis*, which was Père David's MS name on a specimen in the Lazarist mission in Peking. Swinhoe (1870c) gave this a brief description which has been judged insufficient to determine the species.

³⁶ This is the spelling used by Snow (1967). Various other spellings are used including Przheval'skii, which appears to be the currently preferred spelling in the on-line library catalogue for the Natural History Museum, London.

³⁷ Proposed to replace *Parus weigoldi* Kleinschmidt due to preoccupation by *Parus cristatus weigoldi* Tratz, 1914.

³⁸ The issue is dated 26 January 1904. Given as 1903 in Snow (1967: 86) although he used 1904 for two forms of *Remiz pendulinus* some pages earlier (op. cit. pp. 62-63).

***P. c. cinctus* [Probably extralimital]**

<i>Parus cinctus</i>	Boddaert	1783	Plate	27.
<i>Parus (Poecila) [sic] obtectus</i>	Cabanis	1871	MPHN	
<i>Parus griseescens</i>	Sharpe & Dresser	1871	MMUM	
[<i>Poecila [sic] cincta alascensis</i>] ³⁹	Prazák	1895	-	
<i>P[oecile], kolymensis</i>	Buturlin	1908	ZMMU	

Parus rubidiventris***P. r. rubidiventris***

<i>P[arus]. rubidiventris</i> ⁴⁰	Blyth	1847	ZSI ?	28.
---	-------	------	-------	-----

P. r. beavani

<i>Lophophanes Beavani</i> 'Blyth' ⁴¹	Jerdon	1863	ZSI ?	29.
--	--------	------	-------	-----

Parus Atkinsoni

<i>Parus Atkinsoni</i>	Jerdon	1863	?	
------------------------	--------	------	---	--

P. r. whistleri

<i>Parus rufonuchalis whistleri</i>	Stresemann	1931	ZMB	
-------------------------------------	------------	------	-----	--

<i>Parus rufonuchalis szetschuanensis</i>	Meise in Stresemann, Meise & Schönwetter	1937	MTD	
---	--	------	-----	--

P. r. saramatii

<i>Parus rubidiventris saramatii</i>	Ripley	1961	YPM	
--------------------------------------	--------	------	-----	--

***Parus rufonuchalis*⁴²**

<i>Parus rufonuchalis</i>	Blyth	1849	ZSI ?	30.
---------------------------	-------	------	-------	-----

<i>Parus rufonuchalis blanchardi</i>	Meinertzhagen	1938	MVZB	
--------------------------------------	---------------	------	------	--

<i>Parus rufonuchalis parvirostris</i> ⁴³	Keve	1943	NMW	
--	------	------	-----	--

Parus ater***P. a. amurensis***

<i>Periparus ater amurensis</i>	Buturlin	1907	?	
---------------------------------	----------	------	---	--

<i>Periparus ater tyoosenensis</i> ⁴⁴	Momiyama	1927a, b	YIO	31.
--	----------	----------	-----	-----

P. a. pekinensis

<i>Parus pekinensis</i>	David in Swinhoe	1870a	MNHN	
-------------------------	------------------	-------	------	--

P. a. insularis

<i>Parus ater insularis</i>	Hellmayr	1902	AMNH	
-----------------------------	----------	------	------	--

<i>Periparus ater teraokai</i>	Kuroda	1922a	Lost	32.
--------------------------------	--------	-------	------	-----

<i>Periparus ater takahashii</i>	Momiyama	1927a, b	YIO?	33.
----------------------------------	----------	----------	------	-----

³⁹ This name, based on two specimens, one from 'Alaska' and one from 'Ochotsk', was included within an account of the subspecies *obtecta* [sic] and was proposed as a subset of that, i.e., as an infrasubspecific name (Art. 45.6.1); as such it is invalid.

⁴⁰ Variant spellings: *rudiventris* by Hellmayr and *rubidiventer* by Sharpe were reported by Nicholson (1906). The reference to Sharpe may have been intended to be to the *Catalogue of Birds of the British Museum* and thus for this volume to Gadow (1883).

⁴¹ Snow (1967: 90) did not mention that Jerdon credited this name to Blyth.

⁴² Snow (1967: 89) lumped this with *P. rubidiventris* following Vaurie (1950); Martens (1971) demonstrated that this was incorrect.

⁴³ Described on p. 21 and not on p. 18 as given by Snow (1967: 89). This name is preoccupied by *Parus ater parvirostris* Shelley, 1900 (see Snow, 1967: 100). We are not aware of a proposal to provide a new name.

⁴⁴ Placement here is somewhat tentative, not even Vaurie seems to have seen specimens, and nor have we.

<i>Parus ater takatsukasae</i>	Bergman ⁴⁵	1931	NRM	
<i>P. a. rufipectus</i>				
<i>Parus ater</i> var. <i>rufipectus</i> ⁴⁶	Severtsov	1873a	ZISP	
<i>Parus piceæ</i> ⁴⁷	Severtsov	1875	ZISP	
<i>P. a. eckodedicatus</i>				
<i>Parus ater eckodedicatus</i>	Martens, Tietze & Sun	2006	MTD	
<i>P. a. melanolophus</i>				
<i>Parus melanolophus</i> ⁴⁸	Vigors	1831	Lost	9.
<i>P. a. martensi</i>				
<i>Parus ater martensi</i>	Eck	1998	ZFMK	
<i>P. a. aemodius</i>				
<i>P[arus]. aemodius</i> 'Hodgson'	Blyth	1845 ⁴⁹	?	34.
<i>Lophophanes Humei</i>	Brooks	1873	BMNH	
<i>P. a. kuatunensis</i>				
<i>Parus ater kuatunensis</i>	la Touche	1923c	MCZ	
<i>P. a. ptilosus</i>				
<i>Parus ater ptilosus</i>	Ogilvie-Grant	1912	BMNH	
 <i>Parus venustus</i>				
<i>Parus venustus</i>	Swinhoe	1870b	BMNH	
<i>[Pardaliparus] potaninae</i>	Bianchi	1902	ZMMU	35.
 <i>Parus elegans</i>				
<i>P. e. edithae</i>				
<i>Pardaliparus edithae</i>	McGregor	1907	Lost	36.
<i>P. e. montigenus</i>				
<i>Pardaliparus elegans montigenus</i>	Hachisuka	1930	DMNH	37.
<i>P. e. gilliardi</i>				
<i>Parus elegans gilliardi</i>	Parkes	1958	AMNH	
<i>P. e. elegans</i>				
<i>Parus elegans</i>	Lesson	1831	MNHN	
<i>Parus quadrivittatus</i>	Lafresnaye	1840	MCZ	38.
<i>Pardaliparus elegans panayensis</i>	Mearns	1916	USNM	
<i>P. e. visayanus</i>				
<i>Pardaliparus elegans visayanus</i>	Hachisuka	1930	Lost	39.
<i>P. e. albescens</i>				
<i>Pardaliparus albescens</i> ⁵⁰	McGregor	1907	Lost	40.
<i>Pardaliparus elegans guimarasensis</i>	Mearns	1916	USNM	

⁴⁵ Not Bergmann as given by Snow (1967: 94).

⁴⁶ Following this name there is no 'nob.' (as there is in the case of other taxa newly described in Severtsov's work). Instead the name is followed by "(asiatica, Catal.)", making this look rather like a *nomen novum*. However, this is the citation usually given, and the 'Catal.' is presumably the tabular presentation of findings in the earlier pages of Severtsov (1873).

⁴⁷ In full this is described in *Stray Feathers* as "*Parus piceæ*, Sev., (*rufipectus*, Sev.)" (suggesting that the name was intended as a *nomen novum*, but *rufipectus* does not seem to be preoccupied). The name *piceæ* appeared earlier, in Severtsov, 1873b and 1875a, but only as a *nomen nudum*.

⁴⁸ Sometimes rendered as *melanolophos* (see Gadow, 1883: 28).

⁴⁹ Dated 1844 in Snow (1967: 93); but see footnote above on *Parus iouschistos*.

⁵⁰ *Parus albescens* Baird, 1858, is a *nomen nudum* (Parkes, 1963).

<i>P. e. mindanensis</i>					
<i>Pardaliparus elegans mindanensis</i>	Mearns	1905	USNM		
<i>P. e. suluensis</i>					
<i>Pardaliparus elegans suluensis</i>	Mearns	1916	USNM		
<i>P. e. bongaoensis</i>					
<i>Parus elegans bongaoensis</i>	Parkes	1958	ROMZ		
<i>Parus amabilis</i>					
<i>Parus amabilis</i>	Sharpe	1877	UMMZ		
<i>Parus dichrous</i>					
<i>P. d. kangrae</i>					
<i>Lophophanes dichrous kangrae</i>	Whistler	1932	BMNH		
<i>P. d. dichrous</i>					
<i>P[arus]. dichrous</i> 'Hodgson'	Blyth	1845 ⁵¹	ZSI ?	41.	
<i>[Parus dichrous]</i> ⁵²	Hodgson	1845a	-	41.	
<i>P. d. izzardi</i>					
<i>Parus dichrous izzardi</i>	Biswas	1955	ZSI		
<i>P. d. wellsi</i>					
<i>Parus dichrous wellsi</i>	Baker	1917	BMNH		
<i>Parus dichrous arceuthinus</i>	Bangs & Peters	1928	MCZ		
<i>P. d. dichroides</i>					
<i>Lophophanes dichroides</i>	Przewalski	1876 ⁵³	ZISP		
<i>Parus [major] major</i> ⁵⁴					
<i>P. m. kapustini</i>					
<i>P[arus]. m[ajor]. kapustini</i>	Portenko	1954	ZISP		
<i>P. m. bargaensis</i>					
<i>Parus major bargaensis</i>	Yamashina	1939	YIO	42.	
<i>P. m. bokharensis</i>					
<i>Parus bokharensis</i>	Lichtenstein	1823	ZMB	E	
<i>Parus bokharensis panderi</i>	Zarudny in Zarudny & Harms	1913	?	E	
<i>P. m. turkestanicus</i>					
<i>Parus boharensis</i> (sic) <i>turkestanicus</i>	Zarudny & von Loudon	1905	?		
<i>Parus cinereus ferghanensis</i>	Buturlin	1912	ZMMU		
<i>Parus major meinertzhageni</i>	Koelz	1939	AMNH		
<i>P. m. iliensis</i> ⁵⁵					
<i>Parus bokharensis iliensis</i>	Zarudny & Bilkewitsch	1912	TASU		
<i>P. m. dzungaricus</i>					
<i>Parus bokharensis dzungaricus</i>	Zarudny & Bilkewitsch	1912	TASU		

⁵¹ Dated 1844 in Snow (1967: 98). Blyth's paper is thought to have appeared one month before that of Hodgson which we list on the next line; see footnote above regarding *Parus iouschistos* Blyth for additional information.

⁵² A primary homonym and permanently invalid. See comments.

⁵³ Snow (1967: 98) dated this 1877 which does not agree with the date on the title page or the 1876 that Snow used for two other parids (*Poecile affinis* and *Poecile superciliosa*).

⁵⁴ The race *intermedius* of Zarudny (1890), described as a race of *Parus boharensis* (sic), is thought not to reach our region.

⁵⁵ Perhaps only extralimital; see Eck & Martens (2006).

Parus [major] minor***P. m. wladivostokensis***

<i>Parus wladivostokensis</i>	Kleinschmidt	1913	ZFMK	
<i>Parus tschiliensis</i> ⁵⁶	Kleinschmidt	1922a	MTD	
<i>Parus major kansuensis</i> ⁵⁷	Stresemann	1928	ZMB	
<i>P. m. dageletensis</i>				
<i>Parus major dageletensis</i>	Kuroda & Mori	1920	Lost	43.
<i>P. m. minor</i>				
<i>Parus minor</i>	Temminck & Schlegel	1848	RMNH	44.
<i>Parus major quelpartensis</i>	Kuroda	1917	Lost?	45.
<i>Parus major kagoshimae</i>	Taka-Tsukasa	1919	Lost	46.
<i>Parus major gotoensis</i>	Kleinschmidt	1922a	ZFMK	47.
<i>Parus major ogawai</i>	Momiyama	1923a	YIO	
<i>Parus major chimae</i>	Momiyama	1923b	YIO	
[<i>Parus major sidsiukara</i>] ⁵⁸	Momiyama	1927a, b	-	48.
<i>Parus major tatibanai</i>	Momiyama	1927c	YIO	
<i>Parus major takahashii</i>	Momiyama	1928 ⁵⁹	YIO	49.
<i>Parus major kurilensis</i>	Bergman ⁶⁰	1931	NRM	
<i>P. m. artatus</i>				
<i>Parus major artatus</i>	Thayer & Bangs	1909	MCZ	
<i>P. m. subtibetanus</i>				
<i>Parus major subtibetanus</i>	Kleinschmidt & Weigold	1922 ⁶¹	MTD	
<i>Parus major longipennis</i>	Rothschild	1922 ⁶²	AMNH	
<i>Parus major altarum</i>	la Touche	1922b	MCZ	
<i>P. m. tibetanus</i>				
<i>Parus major tibetanus</i>	Hartert	1905a	AMNH	
<i>P. m. amamiensis</i>				
<i>Parus major amamiensis</i>	Kleinschmidt	1922a	ZFMK	
<i>Parus major uchidae</i>	Kuroda	1923a	Lost	50.
<i>P. m. okinawae</i>				
<i>Parus major okinawae</i>	Hartert	1905a	AMNH	
<i>P. m. nigriloris</i>				
[<i>Parus</i>]. <i>nigriloris</i>	Hellmayr	1900b	ZMB	
<i>Parus stejnegeri</i>	Bangs	1901	MCZ	
<i>Parus major bangsi</i>	Kuroda	1923a	Lost	51.
<i>P. m. nubicolus</i>				
<i>Parus major nubicolus</i>	Meyer de Schauensee ⁶³	1946	ANSP	

⁵⁶ The placement of this in synonymy is taken from Eck & Quaiser (2004).

⁵⁷ Placement here in synonymy is taken from Eck & Quaiser (2004).

⁵⁸ Referred to as a *nomen emendatum* by Snow (1967), but see Comment 48.

⁵⁹ Not 1927 as given by Snow (1967: 109) as the name is there a *nomen nudum*. Note that this name is a secondary homonym of *Parus ater takahashii* Momiyama, 1927. We have not traced any proposed *nomen novum*.

⁶⁰ Not Bergmann as given by Snow (1967: 109).

⁶¹ Tentatively dated Sept. 1922 drawing on Hartert & Steinbacher (1933: 178).

⁶² Issue dated 27th Oct. 1922.

⁶³ This is the full family name (it was abbreviated in Snow, 1967).

Parus [major] cinereus***P. c. ziaratensis***

<i>Parus major ziaratensis</i>	Whistler	1929	BMNH	
--------------------------------	----------	------	------	--

P. c. decolorans

<i>Parus major decolorans</i>	Koelz	1939	AMNH	
-------------------------------	-------	------	------	--

P. c. caschmirensis

<i>Parus major caschmirensis</i>	Hartert	1905a	AMNH	
----------------------------------	---------	-------	------	--

P. c. nipalensis

<i>Parus Nipalensis</i>	Hodgson	1837 ⁶⁴	?	52.
-------------------------	---------	--------------------	---	-----

<i>Parus major planorum</i>	Hartert	1905b	AMNH	
-----------------------------	---------	-------	------	--

P. c. vauriei

<i>Parus major vauriei</i>	Ripley	1950	YPM	
----------------------------	--------	------	-----	--

P. c. stupae

<i>Parus major stupae</i>	Koelz	1939	FMNH	
---------------------------	-------	------	------	--

P. c. mahrattarum

<i>Parus major mahrattarum</i>	Hartert	1905b	AMNH	
--------------------------------	---------	-------	------	--

P. c. templorum

<i>Parus major templorum</i>	Meyer de Schauensee	1946	ANSP	
------------------------------	---------------------	------	------	--

P. c. ambiguus

<i>Turdus ambiguus</i>	Raffles	1822	Plate	53.
------------------------	---------	------	-------	-----

<i>Parus major malayorum</i>	Robinson & Kloss	1918	BMNH	
------------------------------	------------------	------	------	--

P. c. cinereus

<i>Parus cinereus</i>	Vieillot	1818	Lost?	54.
-----------------------	----------	------	-------	-----

<i>Parus atriceps</i>	Horsfield	1821 ⁶⁵	UMZC	55.
-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	------	-----

P. c. sarawacensis

<i>Parus cinerascens</i>	Slater	1885a	AMNH	
--------------------------	--------	-------	------	--

<i>Parus sarawacensis</i> nom. nov. ⁶⁶	Slater	1885b	AMNH	
---	--------	-------	------	--

P. c. hainanus

<i>Parus major hainanus</i>	Hartert	1905b	AMNH	
-----------------------------	---------	-------	------	--

P. 'm'. commixtus⁶⁷

<i>Parus commixtus</i> ⁶⁸	Swinhoe	1868	BMNH	
--------------------------------------	---------	------	------	--

<i>Parus major fohkienensis</i>	la Touche	1923a	MCZ	
---------------------------------	-----------	-------	-----	--

<i>Parus minor indochinensis</i>	Delacour	1927	MNHN	
----------------------------------	----------	------	------	--

<i>Parus major makii</i>	Momiyama	1927a, b	NSMT	56.
--------------------------	----------	----------	------	-----

⁶⁴ Snow (1967: 107) dated this 1838 but the issue, which comprised pp. 1-74, carries the date April 15, 1837 on page 52. Volumes were not based on the calendar year; vol. 1 part 12 appeared in March 1837. Two MS names have appeared in the synonymy of this form. The name *schistinotus*, in Hodgson (1844: 83), was introduced in that way by Gray & Gray (1847). Bonaparte (1850) treated both *nipalensis* and *schistinotus* of Hodgson, as well as *caesius* ?'Tickell', as synonyms of *P. cinereus* of Java (!). Both *schistinotus* and *caesius* were originally MS names used for Indian or Burmese specimens of *Parus major*. Neither name seems to have been made properly available.

⁶⁵ For reasons to date this 1821 see Raphael (1970).

⁶⁶ Replaces *Parus cinerascens* Slater which is preoccupied by *Parus cinerascens* Vieillot, 1818 (in use in Africa for a form of *Parus afer*).

⁶⁷ Hybrid populations. For details of areas where the different 'species' of Great Tit meet and hybridise see Eck & Martens (2006). The parentage in each such area requires clarification when these areas have been examined to determine their width and the exact forms that abut them.

⁶⁸ Also sometimes rendered *commixus* (see Gadow, 1883: 16).

Parus monticolus***P. m. monticolus***

<i>Parus monticolus</i>	Vigors	1831	Lost	9.
-------------------------	--------	------	------	----

P. m. yunnanensis

<i>Parus monticolus yunnanensis</i>	la Touche	1922a	MCZ	
-------------------------------------	-----------	-------	-----	--

<i>Parus monticolus lepcharum</i>	R. Meinertzhagen & A. Meinertzhagen ⁶⁹	1926	AMNH	
-----------------------------------	--	------	------	--

P. m. legendrei

<i>Parus monticolus legendrei</i>	Delacour	1927	MNHN	
-----------------------------------	----------	------	------	--

P. m. insperatus

<i>Parus insperatus</i>	Swinhoe	1866	BMNH	
-------------------------	---------	------	------	--

Parus nuchalis

<i>Parus nuchalis</i>	Jerdon	1845	BMNH	
-----------------------	--------	------	------	--

Parus xanthogenys***P. x. xanthogenys***

<i>Parus xanthogenys</i>	Vigors	1831	Lost	9.
--------------------------	--------	------	------	----

P. x. aplonotus

<i>P[arus]. aplonotus</i> ⁷⁰	Blyth	1847	Lost?	57.
---	-------	------	-------	-----

<i>P[arus]. Jerdoni</i>	Blyth	1856	Lost?	58.
-------------------------	-------	------	-------	-----

P. x. travancoreensis

<i>Machlolophus xanthogenys travancoreensis</i>	Whistler & Kinnear	1932	BMNH	
---	--------------------	------	------	--

<i>Machlolophus xanthogenys xanthonotus</i>	Koelz	1939	FMNH	
---	-------	------	------	--

Parus spilonotus***P. s. spilonotus***

<i>P[arus]. xanthogenys</i>	Blyth	1847	ZSI ?	59.
-----------------------------	-------	------	-------	-----

<i>P[arus]. xanthogenys</i> "Blyth, nec Vig. (<i>spilonotus</i> , Blyth)" ⁷¹	Bonaparte	1850	ZSI ?	59.
---	-----------	------	-------	-----

P. s. subviridis

<i>P[arus]. Griffithii</i>	Blyth	1847	BL	60
----------------------------	-------	------	----	----

<i>Parus subviridis</i> , 'Tickell'	Blyth	1855	ZSI ?	61.
-------------------------------------	-------	------	-------	-----

<i>Parus spilonotus evanescens</i>	Rothschild	1926	AMNH	
------------------------------------	------------	------	------	--

P. s. basileus

<i>Machlolophus xanthogenys basileus</i>	Delacour	1932	FMNH	
--	----------	------	------	--

P. s. rex

<i>Parus (Machlolophus) rex</i>	David	1874	MNHN ?	62.
---------------------------------	-------	------	--------	-----

Parus holsti

<i>Parus holsti</i>	Seebohm	1894	BMNH	
---------------------	---------	------	------	--

Parus cyamus

⁶⁹ Not Richard Meinertzhagen alone as inferred by Snow (1967: 111).

⁷⁰ Spelled *haplonotus* in Bianchi (1902: 246).

⁷¹ A standard citation of this would read *Parus spilonotus* 'Blyth' Bonaparte, 1850. Bonaparte cited this from Blyth "Journ. As. Soc. XVI, p. 444" but the name *spilonotus* was not used there by Blyth. It appeared in Blyth (1852: 103). See Comment 58 for further details.

<i>P. c. yenisseeensis</i>				
<i>Cyanistes cyanus yenisseeensis</i> ⁷²	Buturlin in Tugarinov & Buturlin	1911	ZMMU	
<i>P. c. tianschanicus</i>				
<i>Cyanistes cyanus</i> var. <i>tian-schanicus</i>	Menzbier ⁷³	1884	ZISP	
<i>Parus cyanus apeliotes</i>	Meise	1934	MTD	
<i>P. c. flavipectus</i>				
<i>Parus flavipectus</i>	Severtsov	1873a	ZISP	
<i>P. c. berezowskii</i>				
<i>Cyanistes berezowskii</i>	Pleske	1893	ZISP	
<i>Parus varius</i>				
<i>P. v. varius</i>				
<i>Parus varius</i>	Temminck & Schlegel	1845 ⁷⁴	RMNH	
[<i>Parus rubidus</i> 'Temm. & Schl.'] ⁷⁵	Blakiston	1862	-	
<i>Parus sieboldi</i> ⁷⁶	Seebohm	1890	RMNH	
<i>Parus varius hakodatensis</i>	Momiyama	1918	Lost	63.
<i>Parus varius utsurioensis</i>	Kuroda & Mori	1920	Lost	64.
<i>Parus varius saisiuensis</i>	Kuroda & Mori	1920	Lost	65.
<i>Sittiparus varius ijimæ</i>	Kuroda	1922a	Lost	66.
<i>Sittiparus varius korensis</i>	Kuroda & Mori	1924	Lost	67.
<i>Parus varius sataensis</i>	Kuroda	1953 ⁷⁷	YIO	
<i>P. v. sunsumpi</i>				
<i>Parus varius sunsumpi</i>	Kuroda	1919	Lost	68.
<i>Parus varius yakushimensis</i>	Kuroda	1919	YIO	69.
<i>P. v. namiyei</i>				
<i>Parus varius namiyei</i>	Kuroda	1918	Lost	70.
<i>P. v. owstoni</i>				
<i>Parus owstoni</i>	Ijima	1893	YIO	
<i>Parus rubidus masaakii</i>	Momiyama ⁷⁸	1940	YIO?	71.
<i>P. v. orii</i>				
<i>Sittiparus varius orii</i>	Kuroda	1923b	Lost	72.
<i>P. v. amamii</i>				
<i>Sittiparus varius amamii</i>	Kuroda	1922b	Lost	73.
<i>P. v. olivaceus</i>				

⁷² Not *Parus cyanus yenisseeensis* as given by Snow (1967: 116). A copy of the original description has been examined by one of us (V. Loskot); this begins on p. 50, not 51 as cited by Snow (1967).

⁷³ The name *tianschanicus* was coined by Severtsov (1873b: 347; 1875a: 172) but was a *nomen nudum*. It is now generally accepted that Menzbier provided the first description (Hartert, 1905a: 353).

⁷⁴ Not 1848 as cited by Snow (1967: 117), see Morioka et al. (2005: 131) and Holthuis & Sakai (1970).

⁷⁵ The name *rubidus* was cited from Blakiston (1862) by Stejneger (1887: 375), but Blakiston provided no description, just a reference to the *Fauna Japonica*. This was further discussed by Morioka et al. (2005: 140) who agreed with Hartert (1905a: 354) that the use of this name was a *lapsus*. The name, which we consider has not been validly introduced, may appear as an MS name on specimens in the RMNH.

⁷⁶ A *nomen novem* proposed to replace *Parus varius* Temminck & Schlegel, 1845, because this was seen to be antedated by *Parus varius* Bartram, 1791. However, Bartram did not consistently apply binomial nomenclature and his work has been rejected (I.C.Z.N., 1957).

⁷⁷ A description in Japanese appeared two years later (Kuroda, 1955).

⁷⁸ Although described in 1940, this name was first used in Momiyama (1931), and later in Momiyama (1939). In both cases it is a *nomen nudum* (Morioka et al. 2005: 83).

<i>Sittiparus varius olivaceus</i>	Kuroda	1923a	Lost	74.
<i>P. v. castaneiventris</i>				
<i>Parus castaneiventris</i> ⁷⁹	Gould	1863 ⁸⁰	MCM	
<i>Parus semilarvatus</i> ⁸¹				
<i>P. s. snowi</i>				
<i>Parus semilarvatus snowi</i>	Parkes	1971	AMNH	
<i>P. s. semilarvatus</i>				
<i>Melaniparus semilarvatus</i>	Salvadori	1865	MZUT	
<i>P. s. nehrkorni</i>				
<i>Micropus Nehrkorni</i>	Blasius	1890	AMNH	
<i>Melanochlora sultanea</i>				
<i>M. s. sultanea</i>				
[<i>Parus</i>] <i>Sultaneus</i>	Hodgson	1837 ⁸²	?	75.
<i>M. s. flavocristata</i>				
<i>P[arus]. flavo-cristatus</i>	Lafresnaye	1837 ⁸³	MCZ	
<i>Melanochlora Sumatrana</i>	Lesson	1839	?	76.
<i>Crataionyx flava</i>	Eyton	1839	?	
<i>Crataionyx ater</i>	Eyton	1839	?	
<i>M. s. seorsa</i>				
<i>Melanochlora sultanea seorsa</i>	Bangs	1924	MCZ	
<i>M. s. gayeti</i>				
<i>Melanochlora gayeti</i>	Delacour & Jabouille	1925	BMNH	
<i>Sylviparus modestus</i>				
<i>S. m. simlaensis</i>				
<i>Sylviparus modestus simlaensis</i>	Baker	1917	BMNH	
<i>S. m. modestus</i>				
<i>Sylviparus modestus</i>	Burton	1836	Lost?	16
<i>Parus seriophrys</i> ⁸⁴	Hodgson	1845a	Lost?	77.

⁷⁹ As noted by Stejneger (1887: 375), this name has been spelled *castaneiventris* by Swinhoe and *castaneiventer* by Gadow!

⁸⁰ Not 1862 as cited by Snow (1967: 119); see Duncan (1937).

⁸¹ Delacour (1946) reported on earlier names that had been considered as possibly applicable to this species.

⁸² Snow (1967: 122) gave 1837 and (1838) in his citation. This is from Vol. 2, part 1, containing pp. 1-74, and the date of publication, April 15, 1837, appears on p. 52.

⁸³ There have been disputes about whether this name has priority over that of Hodgson. Horsfield (1840: 162) gave priority to *flavocristatus*, dating this name from January 1837, and correctly dating *sultaneus* as April. Horsfield was followed by Blyth (1852: 102), but Horsfield & Moore (1854: 369) and succeeding authors gave priority to Hodgson's name. In the library of the Natural History Museum, London, bound into *Rev. Zool.* Vol. 7, opposite the 'Table Méthodique', is a note from Guérin-Ménéville, the editor, saying that publication during the year 1837 was delayed due to the liquidation of the society (but there is no information as to which issues were delayed and for how long), and that the 1839 year will start with a first issue on 30 January 1839. The note is dated 1 September 1838. This may be taken to imply that the December issue of the 1837 volume was 8 months late. It is therefore unwise to reject the assignment of priority to Hodgson's name, particularly as it seems to have been accorded to it throughout the 20th century.

<i>Sylvioparus saturator</i>	Rippon	1906	BMNH
<i>Sylvioparus modestus occultus</i>	Thayer & Bangs	1912	MCZ
<i>Sylvioparus modestus ricketti</i>	la Touche	1923b	MCZ
<i>Sylvioparus modestus tonkinensis</i>	Delacour & Jabouille	1930	AMNH
<i>S. m. klossi</i>			
<i>Sylvioparus modestus klossi</i>	Delacour & Jabouille	1930	BMNH

Comments

1. The introduction of this name by Seebohm (1890: 88) was tentative, but it has been taken into synonymies by later writers (e.g., Hartert, 1905a: 383). He said "In Central Siberia there is so much white on the tertials and of the outer webs of the secondaries, and the length of the tail is so great, that it is difficult to avoid recognizing an *Acredula caudata sibirica*." Seebohm seems to have seen his specimens as intergrades between "*Acredula rosea* and *Acredula trivirgata*" and used the name in this context. However, if it is felt that types should be recognized and extracted from the main collection; some or all of BMNH 98.9.20.387 to 391 seem to qualify.
2. Deignan (1961) did not list the presence of types in the USNM. For further details see Morioka et al (2005: 63); these have been agreed with staff at the USNM.
3. The specimen (BMNH 1858.12.2.31) listed by Warren & Harrison (1971: 207) is given as the holotype of Gould's name. Moore (1855: 140) described apparently the same specimen, using a different generic name. Two issues need to be addressed. First, which author has priority? Second, were both publishing with the intent to name it first? The issue of priority is by no means clear. Gould's name appeared with a plate in Part VII of his *The Birds of Asia*, dated 'April' 1855 (this being Part VII of the overall work, and not of the volume as citations sometimes seem to imply). This date appears in the List of Plates for Volume II. Unless an exact date in April is known, and it does not seem to be, this must be taken as April 30th (see Art. 21.3.1 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature; I.C.Z.N., 1999; hereafter 'The Code'). Moore's new name in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*, and the facts show that he published here with Gould's blessing, derived from the meeting on June 27th 1854. It made sense for Gould's specimen of this, and his specimen of *niveogularis*, to be described along with an East-India Company museum specimen of *leucogenys* because Gould wanted to figure all three in *The Birds of Asia*. Waterhouse (1885) and Duncan (1937) reported that the relevant pages were delivered from the printers on April 11th. As it seems to be general practice to accept these 'delivery dates' as dates of publication (although they are not), we follow Snow (1967: 55) in accepting Moore's name as the prior one. However, evidence of when these pages were "in existence as a published work" (see Art. 21.3, ICZN, 1999) remains desirable. Warren & Harrison (1971: 207), although accepting the April 11th date for

⁸⁴ Sometimes rendered as *sericophrys*, see Robinson & Kloss (1919: 608).

Moore's name, dated Gould's name from April 1st, which they appear to have taken from Baker (1930: 17). We know of no evidence that proves 1st April. The list of plates in the volumes of Gould's *Birds of Asia* mentions the part numbers and dates, and here only 'April' appears. In 1930 Baker probably used April 1st as a default date; but as mentioned above the Code sets all default dates at the end of the month. Because of the slight uncertainty in dating these two publications one might suppose that both names need listing in the type catalogue. There seems to be no doubt that the two authors thought they knew who was publishing first and that Gould accorded priority to Moore. Moore clearly published this as a new species. Gould, on the other hand, only referred to the meeting at which Moore had presented his paper and did not publish his text and plate with an indication that it was new. Gould's (later) name is merely a new combination. Thus the type catalogue of Warren & Harrison (1971) needs correction as to the author of this name and the citation. However, if Gould's name did in fact appear first then Moore's name is the new combination and Warren & Harrison's entry is correct.

4. Very few specimens from Kuroda's collection survived the war. The holotype of this Korean form, given as No. 3808 by Kuroda (1927: 701), was not found by Morioka et al. (2005) when working on their monograph and is considered lost.
5. Momiyama (1927b) mentioned two specimens as if each was a holotype; on p. 35 in Japanese he referred to his specimen 26.5710 (Takahashi No. 183) collected on 15th April 1926 by Eizo Takahashi, but on p. 89, in English, he referred to specimen 26.1571 collected on 18th April. In his table of measurements the specimen from 15th April was numbered 26.1471 (and neither 26.5710 nor 26.1571 appears), but no specimen therein is dated 18th April. Kuroda (1966) listed the type as 26.1571 and was probably correct; a specimen with this number is in the YIO.
6. Not listed by Morioka et al. (2005) because the author did not designate a type and there is no reliable basis for tracing one (Kuroda, 1932).
7. It is likely that paratypes are still extant, but it has not been possible to identify these (Morioka et al., 2005: 74).
8. The name of the collector was William Griffith, not Griffiths as given by Warren & Harrison (1971). This is the third species described by Moore (1855) but, before the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* appeared, he named this in Horsfield & Moore's first volume of *A catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East India Company* (1854).
9. The specimens, described by Vigors in connection with Gould's production of the *A Century of Birds from the Himalayan mountains* (Gould, 1830-33)⁸⁵, were almost cer-

⁸⁵ For notes on which names were introduced by Vigors and which by Gould see McAllen & Bruce.

tainly once in the collection of the Zoological Society of London since Gould reportedly presented them to the Society. However, when this collection was dispersed (Wheeler, 1997), those specimens that might have been types of these names were not acquired by the BMNH and their whereabouts are now unknown.

10. Baker (1920b) noted that the name *Parus erythrocephalus* had been used by Linnaeus (1758: 191) so that due to primary homonymy a new name was needed. The relevant type would be that of Vigors (see above).
11. Except for the names involved, in terms of priority, the case is identical to that of *Mecistura glaucogularis* and *Orites* (?) *glaucogularis* discussed in comment 3. Here, Gould's name is *Acanthiparus niveogularis* and Moore's is *Orites* (?) *niveogularis*. The two syntypes located are BMNH 1858.12.2.37 – that listed by Warren & Harrison (1971: 389) – and 1857.10.16.34. Both were purchased from Gould perhaps at the same time although accessioned a year apart. Moore's description implies that he saw two or more specimens in Gould's collection. In discussion with Michael Walters we conclude that both these specimens are syntypes of the name whether the prior author is Moore, as the facts suggest, or Gould. See discussion on the priority issue in Comment 3 above.
12. Blyth (1852a: 104) listed one specimen received in 1842 from Hodgson; this must be presumed to have been a type (and was probably the holotype). Sclater (1892) made no mention of it, implying either that it had not survived or, more probably, that he ascribed the birds described in this paper to Hodgson rather than to Blyth, and did not seek their types.
13. Hodgson (1845a) named six birds that he evidently believed Blyth had failed to describe. In fact, Blyth had described one of these in 1842 under another name (probably not based on Hodgson material), one in 1843, and three, including two of the three that were parids, in 1845. Hodgson's names, were they not primary homonyms, would deserve to be treated as junior synonyms and would then be open to linkage to types (indeed, if our evidence as to priority should be disproved types would need to be sought). Hodgson's written descriptions, which are entirely different from those of Blyth, were most probably based on his drawings and specimens available to him in England in 1844. However, it is appropriate to ask whether Blyth's types could also have been those of Hodgson (1845). Taking these names in the sequence that they were described by Hodgson, the following evidence unfolds. *Parus iouschistos* Blyth was noted by Blyth (1852a) to be represented by a specimen received from Hodgson in 1842. *Parus seriophrys* was listed by Blyth (1845) as a Hodgson MS name and as a synonym of *Sylviiparus modestus* Burton, and Blyth (1852a), spelling it *sericophrys*, listed a specimen received from Hodgson in 1844. *Parus dichrous* Blyth (1845) was reported by Blyth (1852a) to be represented by a specimen presented by Hodgson in 1843. If, as seems probable, they were Blyth's only Hodgson specimens of these three taxa when he described them then their continued existence in Calcutta in 1852 virtually precludes them from serving as types for Hodgson's names. To presume otherwise would oblige one to construct

the hypothesis that Hodgson wrote these descriptions before sending the specimens to Blyth, which would have been totally out of character. From what Warren & Harrison (1971: 267) wrote about 'types' signaled by Gadow (1883: 58), the BMNH might seem to hold types of *jouschistos* Hodgson. However, as long as the priority is correct Hodgson's name is a primary homonym of Blyth's, notwithstanding the one letter difference (see Art. 58.3 of the Code). It is thus permanently invalid and cannot have a type.

14. Although Hume named this it does not seem that he retained any specimens, or if he did none was among the Hume collection as it was received by the BMMH. The BMNH has what seems to be a female paratype, labelled as associated with Sir Douglas Forsyth's Second Yarkand Expedition. This was one of a consignment of over 400 duplicate specimens from the expedition acquired by exchange from the Indian Museum, Calcutta (as the Museum of the Asiatic Society of Bengal had then become) and registered in 1891. Hume described a male, but distinguished no female, although perceiving some specimens to be in winter plumage and others as approaching the breeding plumage. Any males from this expedition that survive in the ZSI will be syntypes (since we do not know whether Hume had more than one before him).
15. *Contra* Warren & Harrison (1971: 129) there were two syntypes; the other is at Liverpool (Wagstaffe, 1978).
16. Efforts to trace the collection once belonging to the Museum of the Army Medical Department and held at Chatham have so far been unsuccessful (Prys-Jones, 2001). No further information has surfaced (R. Prys-Jones pers. comm., 3 May 2006).
17. Described in a footnote to Blyth's paper, where Blyth placed Lord Arthur Hay's description in quotation marks and made clear that Hay chose the name. Blyth (1852b) re-identified this with *Aegithalus flammiceps* Burton. Specimens from this period of the life of Lord Tweeddale are not to be found in his collection register and would not have been in the bequest of the Tweeddale collection by R.G. Wardlaw Ramsay. Gould (1850, text to pl. 46) had possessed parts of this collection by 1849, but it is unlikely that this specimen reached the BMNH from him.
18. A lectotype was designated by Stepanyan & Loskot (1998).
19. Although Hartert (1905a: 376) mentioned seeing "3 Original-exemplare" in Paris, the type of *Parus dejeani* was not located during a recent search at the MNHN, Paris.
20. By writing in the *Annales Musei Nationalis Hungarici* von Madarász (1909) inferred that the collection that he had acquired was destined for his museum. Horváth (1970) confirmed the destruction of this type in 1956.
21. The specimens in ZMMU, Moscow, are perhaps only paratypes (Rossolimo, 2001: 151). This appears to be uncertain, but if it is shown to be so the entry in column 4 should be ignored.

22. Lönnberg (1908) listed two specimens, a female from south of the Susuya River and a male from Tretia Padi. Gyldenstolpe (1926) listed just one "Type", the bird from Tretia Padi. The first of the two is in the collection of the YIO and was listed as a type therein by Kuroda (1966). If either of these listings is to be considered as creating a lectotype then clearly, through priority of action, Gyldenstolpe (1926) made the Stockholm specimen one. The YIO specimen, then a paralectotype, is shown in our table simply because it may be more accessible to Asian researchers.
23. We list this name here following Orn. Soc. Japan (1942: 40). Warren & Harrison (1971: 271) listed one syntype and reported that the other is in the BMNH collection. Although no types were designated in the original description, Seebohm mentioned two birds from Japan. Later, Seebohm sent two specimens to Stejneger which the latter took to be the types (*vide* Stejneger, 1886: 394). These were Whiteley's specimen 97a and Blakiston's specimen 1121. One of us (ECD) has not been able to resolve to his complete satisfaction whether these two specimens are actually of the one species as their crowns do not seem equally matt⁸⁶. This is not of great importance since the name *Parus japonicus* Stephens (1817) renders Seebohm's name, a primary homonym, permanently invalid, and thus it cannot have types. This invalidity apparently remains in force, despite the fact that Stephens's description has been considered to leave his birds indeterminate (i.e., unidentifiable). Even so, both Seebohm's specimens should be identified and if one is found to be a different species it would be desirable to annotate the labels of both with the corrected identifications. Invalid names should generally not appear in synonymy (and, as in other cases, the name is included in this paper for historical reasons only).
24. See Morioka et al. (2005: 22). The listed holotype lacked Abe's original number on its label but by elimination is evidently the holotype.
25. In addition Sztolcman & Domaniewski (1927) listed a type in Warsaw. We have not been able to verify whether this is still extant.
26. A lectotype was designated by Stepanyan & Loskot (1998).
27. Boddaert's name was based on "Le Mésange à ceinture blanche" of Buffon, Pl. Enl. 708, fig. 3.
28. Although Blyth (1847) reported this from Nepal and Sikkim he may have had just the one specimen that he reported in 1852, which had come from Hodgson in 1842. Sclater (1892) listed two specimens from Hodgson in Nepal, and none from Sikkim; Finn (1901) referred to one of these as 'Calcutta 543'.

⁸⁶ Examined and discussed with Michael Walters, then of the Natural History Museum, Tring (BMNH).

29. Sclater (1892) listed one type specimen and Finn (1901) reported what was presumably the same specimen to be Calcutta 549 (d). Jerdon (1863) implied that the name *beavani* was a Blyth MS name. Jerdon's book probably appeared in January of that year as the Asiatic Society of Bengal recorded purchasing two copies (see p. 72 of the 1863 volume of their Journal). Three issues later, and no earlier than October 7th (see p. 442)⁸⁷, Blyth (1863: 459) described this as new. Priority has been correctly ascribed to Jerdon.
30. Sclater (1892) reported a single type specimen then extant and Finn (1901) reported this as 'Calcutta 541'.
31. Apart from early material destroyed in the 1923 earthquake (Morioka et al., 2005), and some 820 specimens purchased by the AMNH in 1963 (M. LeCroy *in litt.* 27 Mar. 2006), Momiyama's collection is almost all in the YIO, including the male holotype of *tyoosenensis* (Momiyama No. 24.0348) collected 12 May 1924 by Eizô Takahashi.
32. It is believed that the holotype and the one paratype were both lost in World War II (Morioka et. al., 2005: 125).
33. The male holotype (Momiyama No. 26.1489) collected 14 April 1926 by Eizô Takahashi should be in the YIO (see above). Quelpart Island was listed as part of Japan by Snow (1967), but has been restored to Korea and is now known as Cheju-do.
34. Warren & Harrison (1971: 4) listed a syntype (BMNH 1967.36.1). They stated that Gadow (1883: 43) had listed two specimens as types and that Blyth "used a Hodgson MS name". Later, we find that Blyth (1852a) did not list a specimen that could have come from Hodgson in time for description in 1845, so that no type specimen should be expected to be found in Calcutta. Blyth (1852a: 337) in fact listed this as a taxon of which the museum in Calcutta possessed no specimen at all, and although Blyth discarded poor specimens when he received better ones it is unlikely that he would have discarded the specimen he had described unless it had been seriously damaged by pests. Based on Blyth (1852a) it can be argued that Blyth may have returned the specimen to Hodgson before the latter left for England in February 1844. However, we then move onto dangerous ground. If we accept a specimen in the BMNH as a syntype, it is necessary that the specimen in question was available to the author when he described it. Blyth attributed many names to Hodgson. In the rare cases when Blyth attached a description supplied by Hodgson he enclosed it in inverted commas. Here Blyth did not use inverted commas and the description is his own. It was Hodgson's practice (see Appendix 2) to number his specimens with the number of his drawing, and Warren & Harrison mentioned the Hodgson number 830. This is correct (see Hodgson, 1844) and also appears to be on Hodgson's label

⁸⁷ The inclusion of actual dates of publication of the issues of the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* began in the 1864 volume.

which is still attached. We also know from Gray & Gray (1847) that one specimen of this was received by the museum in 1844-1845. This goes some way to satisfy us, but there remain some serious objections. First, the registration number does not come from the register of that period: instead it is a number "assigned later". The notes used in developing the BMNH type catalogue suggest that this previously unregistered tail-less specimen was found when searching for the two specimens listed by Gadow (1883: 43) as types of this name. At that period the degree of clarity now present in The Code was far in the future and Gadow would not have considered that the type must have been available to the author; and in any case he thought the author to be Hodgson. The fact that it was tail-less probably explains why this specimen had not been registered earlier, and it may be doubted that this was one of the two that Gadow listed. Other explanations are possible; it may have been among the specimens taken over from the Indian Museum, many of which were thought to be duplicates and were not registered. How are we to show that this particular tail-less specimen was the one before Blyth in 1844? It is most unlikely that Hodgson would knowingly have given the *aemodius* to the Indian Museum, and if so we have to presume that Hodgson then deliberately retrieved this from Blyth, which is even less likely. More general objections can be offered (see Appendix 2). Unless a convincing case can be made for this specimen (BMNH 1967.36.1) it is best not to consider this to be a type.

35. This name, for which a Latin description appears in a footnote, was given to the 'juvenile'.
36. The holotype was number 3475 in the old Philippine National Museum (PNM) before this burned to the ground in World War II, when this specimen was no doubt lost along with all that was there (Dickinson et al., 1991). Two apparent paratypes are in the USNM (Dickinson et al., 1991: 300).
37. Dillon Ripley acquired most of the Philippine collection of Masauji Hachisuka after World War II, and when Ripley was at Yale this was deposited in the Yale Peabody Museum. However, in 1963 "he took the Hachisuka Collection with him to the Smithsonian" (E. Stickney, *in litt.* 15 Oct. 1981). Subsequently several type specimens identified from amongst this material were deposited with the Delaware Museum of Natural History (DMNH). Enquiries, in fact, show that over 1000 specimens originally from the Hachisuka collection are now held by the DMNH (Gene Hess *in litt.* 23 Mar. 2006), versus just under 200 by the USNM (James Dean, *in litt.* 23 Mar. 2006).
38. The original description reported the type as from Manila or India. The restriction of the *terra typica* to Manila has not been traced, but the name *quadrivittatus* appeared in the synonymy of *Parus elegans* as early as Walden (1875).
39. The holotype was number 5510 in the old PNM and like the type of *edithae* was lost in the war (Dickinson et al. 1991). Manuel (1957) proposed a neotype, but this was from Cebu and not from the original type locality – Negros. This was rejected by

Parkes (1958) mainly on the grounds that no necessity had been shown for erecting a neotype.

40. The holotype was number 1000 in the old PNM (Dickinson et al., 1991).
41. Blyth (1845) did not quote a Hodgson description although he did use the latter's MS name. Blyth (1852a) listed a specimen presented by Hodgson in 1842 that would have been a type, and perhaps a holotype, and the Hodgson specimen in Calcutta thought to be this one was mentioned by Sclater (1892). Hodgson's name, which he published himself a matter of months later, would have been based not on the specimen before Blyth but on Hodgson's drawing and specimens available to him in London in 1844. Warren & Harrison (1971: 147) recognised that Blyth's was the prior name. Hodgson's name, a primary homonym and permanently invalid, thus has no type material. His name is included here only for historical completeness. For more background see comment 13 above, and Appendix 2.
42. Omitted by Snow (1967). Cheng (1987) considered this a synonym of *P. m. artatus* but photographs of the type in the YIO show that this is incorrect (see Eck & Martens, 2006).
43. The island once called Dagelet is now known as Ullung-do⁸⁸ and lies well east of Korea in the Sea of Japan. Like most of Kuroda's collection the holotype, given as Kuroda No. 4747 (Kuroda, 1927: 697), will almost certainly have been lost during World War II.
44. Morioka et al. (2005: 87) have remarked on the restriction of the type locality to northern Kyushu by Momiyama (1927a: 29). As no subspecific differences have been accepted within the Japanese population this restriction has no practical implication at the moment. Nor is it entirely clear that this restriction can be considered valid. In proposing it, Momiyama used a *nomen nudum* for the population that he separated (see also Comment 47 on *P. m. sidsiukara*).
45. That the type of this was in Seoul, originally in the "Seoul Higher Common School", where it was numbered 1470, comes from Kuroda (1927: 697). It seems almost certain that this specimen will not have survived the Korean War.
46. Morioka et al. (2005: 72) reported that all four syntypes were almost certainly destroyed in World War II.
47. Rheinwald & van den Elzen (1984) listed the specimen with Kleinschmidt No. 4176 as a 'holotype'. However, there were originally two syntypes, the other apparently being No. 4177. By their designation, therefore, No. 4176 must be considered a lectotype.

⁸⁸ In The Times Comprehensive Atlas of the World 10th Edition ('reprinted with changes'), 2000. One of us (Morioka) knows it, as others may, as Ulleung-gun, Gangwon-do.

48. Snow (1967: 109) listed this as a *nomen emendatum* "for *minor*". This implies an emendation rather than a *nomen novum* or new name. However, it is newly introduced not so much an emendation of *minor* as a proposed subdivision of it. Momiyama (1927) restricted *minor* to the birds of northern Kyushu, Iki and Tushima giving Tokyo as the *terra typica* for his new name although he gave no details of any type specimen and no description. Thus *sidsiukara* is a *nomen nudum*.
49. Most of Momiyama's collection is in the Yamashina Institute for Ornithology and types (Nos. 25.0335, male, and 25.0337, female) are included.
50. Morioka et al. (2005: 129) reported that the holotype was almost certainly lost in World War II and failed to discover whether any of the eight paratypes had survived. They also confirmed that Kuroda (1927: 697) erroneously transposed the specimen number of the holotype.
51. Morioka et al. (2005: 26) explained that the holotype was almost certainly lost in World War II, but that at least one paratype has been found in the AMNH.
52. Warren & Harrison (1971: 387, 543) gave the same specimen number for the types of *Parus nipalensis* and *Parus sultaneus*. The actual specimens selected by the BMNH as representative types ⁸⁹ and kept in the type collection have been examined and the number cited for *Parus sultaneus* is correct, while BMNH 1845.1.13.404 is the number on the label of the selected specimen of *Parus nipalensis*. As regards *nipalensis*, Warren & Harrison claimed that several specimens accessioned in 1843 were syntypes. However, there are problems proving that these specimens were those before Hodgson in 1837. First, although Gray & Gray (1847) asserted that the donations made by Hodgson "are the types of the specimens described in that gentleman's various scientific papers", Hodgson had made donations to the Zoological Society of London in 1834, 1835 and 1836 (Wheeler, 1997). He had sent skins to Jardine in 1837 (Datta & Inskipp, 2004: 148) and between 1841 and 1843 sent skins to Calcutta, making it likely that the words of Gray & Gray (op. cit.) were too great a generalisation ⁹⁰. This may seem insufficient to reject Warren & Harrison's claim, but one must take account of Hodgson (1844: 83) apparently having forgotten that he had named this *Parus nipalensis* and, according to Gray & Gray (op. cit.), introducing the name *Parus schistinotus* (a *nomen nudum* later listed by Bonaparte, 1850); also of the more general fact that Hodgson did not mention types. See Appendix 2.
53. Kinnear & Robinson (1927) related the story of how many of the specimens sent home by Raffles were lost when the Indiaman 'Fame' burned off the coast of Sumatra, and suggested that Raffles's drawing No. 616 in the India Office Library

⁸⁹ The selection conveys no special status and the space for the type collection is being expanded in order to house all specimens from the type series.

⁹⁰ A re-examination of the implications of this on the materials dealt with by Gray & Gray (1847) is in hand (Dickinson, in prep.).

- must be considered as the type of *Turdus ambiguus* Raffles. Under Art. 73.1.4, of The Code now in force their statement means that the immature specimen depicted in that drawing should be seen as the holotype. It seems that only with this contribution in 1927 was the name *malayorum*, proposed by Robinson & Kloss (1918), found to be unnecessary.
54. Rookmaaker (1993) reported that Temminck obtained a specimen from Batavia which he gave to Levaillant, but that this cannot now be traced. Vieillot's name was based on La Mésange Grise au Joue Blanche of Levaillant (1804; Plate 139 fig. 2; in volume 3 opposite p. 117).
55. Benson (1999: 135) claimed that Cambridge held the holotype. Although Horsfield (1821) did not indicate how many specimens were obtained, Horsfield & Moore (1854: 370) listed two specimens from "Dr Horsfield's collection". This must put Benson's claim in doubt, and the Cambridge specimen must be seen as a lectotype (Art. 74.6, The Code). The two specimens mentioned by Horsfield & Moore (1854) should have been included in the material that the Indian Museum passed on to the British Museum and, if not treated as duplicates and exchanged rather than catalogued, these paralectotypes may still be in the BMNH.
56. Maki's collection went to the Zoological Institute, College of Science, Kyoto Imperial University and has been transferred recently to the National Science Museum, Tokyo, together with this holotype (Maki's "No. 52").
57. Blyth (1852a) listed a Tickell specimen of 1842 from Chaibasa that was no doubt a type (see Blyth, 1842: 459, under *xanthogenys*). Sclater (1892) listed this as a species of which the type appeared to be missing in Calcutta when he was there.
58. Although we list *jerdoni* here it should be noted that the name was considered indeterminate by Whistler & Kinnear (1932: 520), who reported that the type could not be found, having probably only been 'sent on inspection' (i.e., loaned).
59. The history here is complicated. It is generally accepted that the origin of *Parus xanthogenys* Vigors, 1831, is the western Himalayas and that the name was first restricted to Murree by Baker (1920), and later to the Simla-Almora district by Ticehurst & Whistler (1924). We need not be concerned here with the rights and wrongs of these restrictions. On page 459 (not 59 as he later gave), Blyth (1842) used this name to refer to a specimen obtained by Tickell, which we learn from Blyth (1852a: 103) came from Chaibasa in Bengal ⁹¹. In 1847, Blyth decided that Tickell's bird was not that of the Himalayas and gave it the name *aplonotus*. As can be seen from Blyth (1852a), however, his comparison was with two new specimens from Darjeeling presented in 1847 by C.S. Bonnevie. It was left to Bonaparte (1850) to realise that

⁹¹ To which locality, in Singbhum district, the type locality was restricted, for the third time, by Whistler & Kinnear (1932).

Blyth's *xanthogenys* was a very different bird from that described by Vigors (1831) and depicted in Gould's *A Century of birds from the Himalayan mountains*. Blyth (1842) gave no description; his name is a *nomen nudum* as well as being preoccupied. In 1847 a description appeared because *aplonotus* is described in comparison with Blyth's *xanthogenys*, and thus *xanthogenys* Blyth is here validly introduced although still preoccupied. As a primary homonym Blyth's name *xanthogenys* is permanently invalid and can have no types. However, by renaming it *spilonotus*, and giving an indication to Blyth's comparative description, Bonaparte's name takes as its type the specimen that Blyth described as his *xanthogenys*. Sclater (1892) listed this as present, although citing the name from Blyth's Catalogue of '1849', p. 103, where indeed the name *spilonotus* appears. As shown by Dickinson (2004b) that Catalogue must be dated 1852, and Bonaparte's use of the name *spilonotus* antedates Blyth's use. The evidence suggests that Bonaparte drew this name from proof sheets of the Catalogue that Blyth sent him. Blyth (1852b) provided a plate showing its differences from *xanthogenys* Vigors. Finn (1901) gave the type number as Calcutta 539. Initially thought to be conspecific, it is now usually accepted that the names *xanthogenys* Vigors and *spilonotus* Bonaparte relate to two different species.

60. Blyth (1847) described this in terms that left later scientists unable to determine whether the name applied to a form of *P. xanthogenys* or of *P. pilonotus*. It was founded on a drawing and this was apparently never re-examined. Blyth (1852b) mentioned that Griffith had given the drawing to McClelland and so it should have been no surprise to discover it with the drawings that McClelland had made in Assam (reviewed by Dickinson, 2003). When examining these drawings at the BMNH Michael Walters identified this with *spilonotus*. The name *griffithii* has not been used for a recognized species or subspecies since 1899 and the name *spilonotus* has been used for the species. As required by Art. 23.9.1.2 of the Code (ICZN, 1999)⁹² and on the basis of Art. 23.9.2, therefore, the name *spilonotus* is declared valid and *griffithii* to be treated as a *nomen oblitum*. The holotype of *griffithii* is the specimen depicted in drawing NHD 6/871 in the British Library.
61. Sclater (1892) made no mention of this name. Finn (1901) listed the type as Calcutta 549.
62. Although the museum register of the MNHN, Paris, suggests that the syntypes should include C.G. 1874 – 885 and 886 (the last is GdO 10822bis in the old register) these specimens were not located when ECD visited.

⁹² The Code requires that evidence be shown that the name *spilonotus* has been used in at least 25 works by at least 10 authors in the immediately preceding 50 years (i.e., since 1956): such are Cheng (1958, 1964, 1976, 1987, 1994); Paynter (1963), Snow (1967), Ali & Ripley (1973), Lekagul & Cronin (1974), King & Dickinson (1975), Clements (1978), Howard & Moore (1980), Wolters (1980), Ripley (1982), Etchécopar & Hüe (1983), Meyer de Schauensee (1984), Sibley & Monroe (1990), Inskipp & Inskipp (1991), Monroe & Sibley (1993), Harrap (1996), Inskipp et al. (1996), Grimmett et al. (1998), Ohta et al. (2000), Robson (2000), Dickinson (2003), Rasmussen & Anderton (2005).

63. Morioka et al. (2005: 43) were unable to locate the type in what remains of the Momiyama Collection at the YIO and presumed that the specimen had been destroyed by the earthquake in 1923, as suggested by Orn. Soc. Japan (1942).
64. Described from Dagelet Island, now known as Ullung-do and in Korean territory. Like most of Kuroda's collection the type, given as No. 4744 by Kuroda (1927: 700), was almost certainly destroyed in World War II.
65. Described from Quelpart Island, now Cheju-do, Korea. Like most of Kuroda's collection the type, given as No. 4746 by Kuroda (1927: 700), was almost certainly destroyed in World War II.
66. Morioka et al. (2005: 50) accepted that the holotype was almost certainly destroyed in World War II, but mentioned two probable paratypes in the YIO.
67. From the Korean peninsula. The type, given as No. 2620 by Kuroda (1927: 699), was no doubt destroyed with almost all of Kuroda's collection in World War II.
68. Morioka et al. (2005: 122) accepted that the holotype was almost certainly destroyed in World War II.
69. That this holotype survived World War II is due to the fact that the specimen, obtained by Ogawa and described by Kuroda, was among specimens that had, by the war, reached the Zoological Museum of the Science College in Tokyo (Morioka et al. 2005: 132).
70. Morioka et al. (2005: 91) noted that the holotype was almost certainly lost in World War II and that there had been four paratypes, but they did not trace these.
71. In the original description Momiyama (1940) did not designate a type specimen, nor did he give the size of any type series, or supply information that would allow a type to be identified. Although in theory all specimens in the Momiyama collection from the type locality would qualify as syntypes nothing was found in the YIO that proves any to be his types, hence which would have allowed Morioka et al. (2005: 83) to list one.
72. Morioka et al. (2005: 24) reported that the holotype and three of the four paratypes were probably all lost in World War II, but that a paratype that was in Uchida's collection may have survived, although it has not been traced.
73. Morioka et al. (2005: 99) reported that the holotype was almost certainly lost in World War II, but that of the 13 paratypes at least three had been located (one in the AMNH and two in the YIO).
74. Morioka et al. (2005: 96) accepted that the holotype was almost certainly lost in World War II. Six paratypes once existed, but have not been traced.

75. Warren & Harrison (1971: 543) claimed that several specimens accessioned in 1843 were syntypes. However, there are problems proving that these specimens were at least available to Hodgson in 1837. As discussed earlier, in Comment 51, Gray & Gray (1847) over-claimed when they asserted that the donations made by Hodgson “are the types of the specimens described in that gentleman’s various scientific papers”.
76. It seems possible that Lesson’s specimen found its way into the hands of Lafresnaye and that it is Lafresnaye No. 4418 that is referred to by Bangs (1930: 351). If so, then MCZ needs to relate the specimen to both Lafresnaye’s name and to Lesson’s.
77. The type of this, described by Hodgson (1845a), should be in the BMNH. Hodgson (1855) said that in 1844 he was “immediately asked how many of the species had been named and described, one or both, in print” and that he replied that “a vast number of the new genera and species of birds had been described in a paper sent from Nepal just before I left it. But that paper, it was replied to me, had not appeared, and I was requested to recast it, as well as I could, from rough notes, not having retained a copy of the MS. I did so and the paper was printed.” This refers to a longer paper in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* (Hodgson, 1845b), but in these circumstances it seems likely that the basis for new taxa described in these 1845 papers would have been in the material available to Hodgson when he was in London in 1843-44, plus drawings. Such material is likely to have been included in his donations to the British Museum. There seems to be just one listed specimen of *Parus seriophrys* (BM 1845.1.9.794) that would have been in London when Hodgson was writing his paper. If so this would be the holotype.

Two appendices are provided that explain how we have interpreted work by Bonaparte and by Hodgson. These notes are intended to allow others to follow our logic.

Summary of types not found

The list below, in the same order as the table above, does not include types almost certainly lost in World War II, or those we think might still be in the ZSI.

Parus erythrocephalus Vigors, 1831; *Aegitalus flammiceps* Burton, 1836; *Dicaeum sanguinifrons* Hay, 1846; *Poecilia brevirostris* Taczanowski, 1872; *Parus Dejeani* Oustalet, 1897; *Poecilia palustris macroura* Taczanowski, 1893; *Poecile tunkanensis* von Madarász, 1909; *Parus Atkinsoni* Jerdon, 1863; *Periparus ater amurensis* Buturlin, 1907; *Parus melanolophus* Vigors, 1831; *P[arus]. aemodius* ‘Hodgson’ Blyth, 1845; *Parus bokharensis panderi* Zarudny in Zarudny & Harms, 1905; *Parus boharensis* (sic) *turkestanicus* Zarudny & von Loudon, 1905; *Parus major quelpartensis* Kuroda, 1917; *Parus Nipalensis* Hodgson, 1845; *Parus cinereus* Vieillot, 1818; *Parus monticolus* Vigors, 1831; *Parus xanthogenys* Vigors, 1831; *Parus aplonotus* Blyth, 1847; *Parus Jerdoni* Blyth, 1856; *Parus Sultaneus* Hodgson, 1837; *Melanochlora Sumatrana* Lesson, 1839; *Crataionyx flava* Eyton, 1839; *Crataionyx ater* Eyton, 1839; *Sylviparus modestus* Burton, 1836; *Parus seriophrys* Hodgson, 1845a.

Acknowledgements

We are most grateful for help with types or other specimens from Mark Adams, James Dean, Per Ericson, Jon Fjeldså, Gene Hess, Mary LeCroy, Henry McGhie, Christiane Quaiser and Michael Walters, and equally to Normand David, Stephen Gregory, Alison Harding, Storrs Olson and Gary Thorn for help in archival, bibliographic and historical matters. Anita Gamauf most kindly reviewed von Pelzeln's article in which the description of *Mecistura swinhoei* is found and confirmed that Zelebor should be recognised as author of this name. James Jobling helpfully lent his copy of Bonaparte's *Conspectus* which facilitated Appendix 1. Finally, thanks go to Gerry Losty for the invitation to ECD to examine the McClelland drawings, leading to the rediscovery of the drawing of *Parus griffithii*.

Acronyms

AMNH	American Museum of Natural History, New York.
BL	British Library, London.
BMNH	The Natural History Museum, Tring - formerly the British Museum (Natural History).
DMNH	Delaware Museum of Natural History, Greenville.
FMNH	Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.
MCZ	Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard.
MMUM	Manchester Museum, University of Manchester.
MNHN	Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.
MPHN	Polish Museum of Natural History, Warsaw.
MTD	Staatliche Naturhistorische Sammlungen Dresden, Museum für Tierkunde, Dresden.
MVZB	Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California.
MZUT	Turin University, Museum of Zoology.
NHD	Natural History Drawings.
NMW	Naturhistorisches Museum, Wien.
NRM	Swedish Natural History Museum, Stockholm.
NSMT	National Science Museum, Tokyo.
PNM	Philippine National Museum, Manila (destroyed 1945).
RMNH	National Museum of Natural History, Leiden - formerly Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie.
ROMZ	Royal Ontario Museum of Zoology, Toronto.
Seoul	Seoul Higher Common School, Korea.
TASU	Tashkent State University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
TPM	Tokushima Prefectural Museum, Tokushima, Japan.
UMMZ	University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.
UMZC	University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge.
USNM	United States National Museum, Washington D.C.
YIO	Yamashina Institute for Ornithology, Abiko City.
YPM	Yale Peabody Museum, New Haven, Connecticut.
ZFMK	Zoologisches Forschungsinstitut und Museum A. Koenig, Bonn.

ZISP	Zoological Institute, Russian Academy of Science, St. Petersburg.
ZMB	Zoologisches Museum, Berlin now the Institut für systematische Zoologie, Museum für Naturkunde der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
ZMMU	Zoological Museum, Moscow University.
ZMUC	Zoological Museum, University of Copenhagen.
ZSI	Zoological Survey of India, Calcutta.

References

- Ali, S. & S.D. Ripley, 1973. Handbook of the Birds of India and Pakistan. 9: i-xvi, 1-306.— Bombay.
- Baird, S.F. In: Baird, S.F., J. Cassin & G.N. Lawrence, 1858. Birds.— Rep. Expl. and Surv. R. R. Pacific., 9: i-lvi, 1-1005. (*albescens* p. xxxvii)
- Baker, E.C.S., 1917. [New subspecies of Indian and Siamese birds].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 38: 7-10. (*Sylviparus m. simlaensis* p. 8; *P. dichrous wellsii* p. 8)
- Baker, E.C.S., 1920a. New names for certain birds on the Indian list and certain new species and subspecies.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 41: 8-9. (*iredalei* p. 8)
- Baker, E.C.S., 1920b⁹³. Birds of the Indian Empire. Handlist of the Birds of India.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 27: 228-247.
- Baker, E.C.S., 1930. The Fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma. Birds. 7: i-viii, 1-484.— London.
- Balan, P.M., 1966. [Type specimens from the collection of N.A. Zarudny.] Pp. 107-121 In: Pozvonochnye zhivotnye Sredney Asii.— Tashkent. (In Russian.)
- Bangs, O.C., 1901. On a collection of birds from the Liu Kiu Islands.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 36 (8): 253-269. (*stejnegeri* p. 267)
- Bangs, O.C., 1924. A new form of *Melanochlora sultanea* from Fukien.— Proc. New Eng. Zool. Cl., 9: 23. (*seorsa* p. 23)
- 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. (*arceuthinus* p. 361, *scurrula* p. 363)
- Bartram, W., 1791. Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, the Cherokee Country, the extensive territories of the Muscogulges or Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Chactaws. i-xxxiv, 1-522⁹⁴ – Philadelphia.
- Belopolski, L., 1932. *Parus atricapillus anadyrensis* subsp. nova.— Orn. Monatsb., 40 (4), 122. (*anadyrensis* p. 122)
- Benson, C.W., 1999. Type specimens of bird skins in the University Museum of Zoology, Cambridge, United Kingdom. i-xiv, 1-221.— British Ornithologists' Club Occ. Publ. No. 4.
- Berezowski, M. & V.L. Bianchi, 1891. [Aves expeditionis Potanini per provinciam Gan-su et confinia 1884-1887.]. i-xl, 1-155 (in Russian).— St. Petersburg. (*hypermelana* p. 112; *Davidi* p. 113)
- Bergman, S., 1931. New birds from the Kurile Islands.— Arkiv for Zool., 23 B (3): 1-5. (*takatsukasae* p. 3, *kurilensis* p. 3)
- Bianchi, V., 1902. Catalogue of the known species of the Paridae or the family of tits.— Ann. Mus. Zool. Acad. Sci. Imp., St. Petersburg, 7: 235-262. (*hellmayri* p. 236)
- Biswas, B., 1955. Zoological Results of the "Daily Mail" Expedition 1954. Two new birds from Khumbu, Eastern Nepal.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 75: 87-88. (*izzardii* p. 88)
- Blakiston, T.W., 1862. On the ornithology of northern Japan.— Ibis, [1] 4: 309-333. (*rubidus* p. 321)

⁹³ Published 20 December 1920 (see Pittie, 2003).

⁹⁴ Details of pagination from <http://docsouth.unc.edu/nc/bartram/bartram.html>.

- Blasius, W., 1890. Die von Herrn Dr Platen und dessen gemahlin in Sommer 1889 bei Davao auf Mindanao gesammelten Vögel.— J. f. Orn., 38 (190): 144-149. (*nehorkorni* p. 147)
- Blyth, E., in Hodgson, B.H., 1845⁹⁵. "On the Leiotrichane Birds of the Subhemalayas" with some additions and annotations – a Synopsis of the Indian Pari, – and of the Indian Fringillidae by E. Blyth.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 13 (156): 933-944 (1844). (*iouschistos* p. 943, *aemodius* p. 943, *dichrous* p. 943)
- Blyth, E., 1847. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 16 (185): 428-476. (*xanthogenys sensu Blyth nec Vigors* p. 444; *aplnotus* p. 444; *griffithii* p. 445; *rubidiventris* p. 445)
- Blyth, E., 1849. A supplemental note to the Catalogue of the Birds in the Asiatic Society's Museum.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 18: 800-821. (*rufonuchalis* p. 810)
- Blyth, E., 1852a⁹⁶. *Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum [of the] Asiatic Society*. i-xxxiv, 1-403 (1849).— Calcutta.
- Blyth, E., 1852b. Illustrations of Indian Ornithology. I. Indian Pari, 48-52. Pl. 87-88.— Jardine's Contributions to Ornithology for 1852.
- Blyth, E., 1855. Curator's Report.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 24 (3): 252-281. (*subviridis* p. 267)
- Blyth, E., 1856. Curator's Report for the August Meeting, 1856.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 25 (5): 439-449. (*jerdoni* p. 445)
- Boddaert, P., 1783. Table des planches enluminées d'histoire naturelle, de M. d'Aubenton. i-xv, 1-58.— Utrecht. (*cinctus* p. 44)
- Bonaparte, C.L., 1850. Conspectus generum avium. 1: 1-543.— Lugduni Batavorum. (*spilonotus* p. 228; *caesius* 'Tickell' p. 229; *schistinotus* p. 229)
- Brooks, W.E., 1873. On an undescribed species of *Lophophanes*.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 42, Pt. 2 (1): 57. (*humei* p. 57)
- 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). (*flammiceps* p. 153; *modestus* p. 154)
- Buturlin, S.A., 1907. Neue Ost-Asiatische Formen.— Orn. Monatsber., 15 (5): 79-80. (*amurensis* p. 80)
- Buturlin, S.A., 1908. Bemerkungen über die geographische Verbreitung der Vögel in nordöstlichen Sibirien.— J. f. Orn., 56: 282-294. (*kolymensis* p. 284)
- Buturlin, S.A., 1911⁹⁷. *Cyanistes cyanus yenisseeensis* subsp. n. Pp. 50-51. In: Tugarinov, A. & S.A. Buturlin, 1911. Materialy po ptitsam Eniseyskoy gubernii (Materialien über die Vögel des Jenisseischen Gouvernements).— Otd. ottisk iz Zapisok Krasnoyarskogo Pototd. Russk. Geogr. Obsch. 1 (3-4): i-vi, 1-440. (In Russian.) (*yenisseeensis* p. 50)
- Buturlin, S.A., 1912. *Parus cinereus ferghanensis* nov. subsp.— Orn. Monatsber., 20 (5): 84-85. (*ferghanensis* p. 84)
- Cabanis, J., 1871 (May [31]⁹⁸). Protokoll der XXXIV. Monat-Sitzung, Deutsche ornithologische Gesellschaft.— J. f. Orn., 19: 237-239. (*obtectus* p. 237)

⁹⁵ This work begins as Hodgson's, so continuing until the date 'May 1843' on p. 941; there follows a P.S. which may begin as Hodgson's, but by p. 942 it has become Blyth's work and on p. 944 a new title arrives, 'Synopsis of Indian Fringillidae' which is again from Blyth. For the three new titmice named on p. 943 Blyth uses names supplied by Hodgson. The descriptions however are characteristic of Blyth and not at all in the style of Hodgson, nor are they presented within quotation marks (as Blyth introduced other descriptions that do seem to have been from Hodgson). These names are MS names of Hodgson and, in accordance with the Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999: Art. 50.1), authorship flows from the descriptions and is Blyth's. For comment on date of publication see earlier footnotes.

⁹⁶ For reasons to date this 1852 see Dickinson (2004).

⁹⁷ The original 1911 publication has been examined by one of us (VML); it does not seem to be available in London. Vaurie (1959: 507) was also unable to sight this. On p.vi in the Introduction it is affirmed that Buturlin dealt with the systematic and nomenclatural notes.

⁹⁸ This date of publication is inserted to confirm that this name has priority over *grisescens* Sharpe & Dresser, 1871 (q.v.)

- Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1958. A distributional list of Chinese birds II. Passeriformes. i-iv, 1-591 (in Chinese).— Beijing.
- Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1964. Distributional list of Chinese birds. i-xxvi, 1-374.— Beijing.
- Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1976. Distributional list of Chinese birds. i-xvii, 1-1218.— Beijing.
- Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1987. A synopsis of the Avifauna of China. i-xvi, 1-1223.— Beijing.
- Cheng, Tso-hsin, 1994. A complete checklist of species and subspecies of the Chinese birds. i-xx, 1-318.— Beijing.
- Clark, A.H., 1907. Eighteen new species and one new genus of birds from eastern Asia and the Aleutian islands.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus., 32: 467-475 (Publ. No. 1539). (*suffusus*, p. 474; *japonicus*, p. 475; *magna*, p. 475)
- Clements, J.F., 1978. Birds of the World: A Check List. i-xx, 1-532.— New York.
- Datta, A. & C. Inskipp, 2004. Zoology ... amuses me much. Pp. 134-153. In: D. M. Waterhouse. The origins of Himalayan studies: Brian Houghton Hodgson in Nepal and Darjeeling 1820-1858. i-xxiv, 1-280.— London.
- David, A. in: Swinhoe, R., 1870a. Letter to the Editor.— Ibis (2) 6: 154-156. (*pekinensis* p. 155)
- David, A., 1874. Description de quelques oiseaux de Chine.— Ann. Sci. Nat., Zool., Ser. 5, 19 (9): 1-5. (*rex* p. 4)
- Deignan, H.G., 1961. Type specimens of birds in the United States National Museum.— U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull., 221: i-x, 1-718.
- Deignan, H.G., 1964. Family Muscicapidae, Subfamily Timaliinae. Pp. 240-427. In: E. Mayr and R.A. Paynter, Jr (eds.) Check-list of Birds of the World. A continuation of the work of James L. Peters. 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., 1927. [40 new taxa from French Indochina].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 47: 151-170. (*indochinensis* p. 166, *legendrei* p. 166)
- Delacour, J., 1932. Etude systématique de quelques oiseaux nouveaux ou intéressants obtenus par la VIème Expédition en Indochine.— L'Oiseau, (3): 419-438. (*basileus* p. 428)
- Delacour, J., 1946. The name of the White-faced Titmouse of the Philippines.— Auk, 63: 433.
- Delacour, J. & P. Jabouille, 1925. [A new Sultan Tit from French Indochina].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 46: 5-6. (*gayeti* p. 6)
- Delacour, J. & P. Jabouille, 1930. Description de trente oiseaux de l'Indochine Française.— L'Oiseau, 11 (7): 393-408. (*klossi* p. 393; *s. m. tonkinensis* p. 394; *A. c. tonkinensis* p. 394)
- Dement'ev, G.P. & N.A. Gladkov, 1954. Birds of the Soviet Union. 5: 1-797.— Moscow.
- Dickinson, E.C., 2003. The Howard & Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World. 3rd Edition. 1-1039.— London.
- Dickinson, E.C., 2004a. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 46. 'A Catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East-India Company' by Horsfield & Moore.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 350: 149-165.
- Dickinson, E.C., 2004b. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 47. Blyth's 'Catalogue of the Birds in the Museum Asiatic Society'.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 350: 167-181.
- Dickinson, E.C. & R.W.R.J. Dekker, 2000. Introduction to Systematic notes on Asian birds.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 331: 5-9.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2000. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 5. Types of the Pittidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 331: 101-119.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2001a. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 12. Types of the Alaudidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 335: 85-126.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2001b. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 14. Types of the Hirundinidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 335: 145-166.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2002a. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 23. Types of the Campephagidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 340: 31-74.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2002b. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 26. Types of the Pycnonotidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 340: 115-160.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2003. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 37. Types of the Chloropseidae and Irenidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 344: 43-61.

- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2004a. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 43. Types of the Oriolidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 350: 65-84.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.W.R.J. Dekker, S. Eck & S. Somadikarta, 2004b. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 45. Types of the Corvidae.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 350: 111-148.
- 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.
- Dickinson, E.C., H. Morioka & M. Walters, 2001. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 19. Type material from Japan in the Natural History Museum, Tring, U.K.— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 335: 215-227.
- Domaniewski, J., 1933. Neue palaarktische Vogel.— Acta Orn. Mus. Zool. Polon., 1 (3): 79-82. (*A. kamtschaticus* p. 81)
- Dresser, H.E., 1902. A manual of Palæarctic birds. Pt. 1: 1-498.— Privately published, London.
- Duncan, F.M., 1937. On the dates of publication of the Society's "Proceedings", 1859-1926.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 71-83.
- Eck, S., 1998. *Parus ater martensi* subsp. nov. die Tannenmeise der Thakkhola, Nepal.— Zool. Abhandl. Staatl. Mus. Tierk. Dresden, 50 (8): 129-132. (*martensi* p. 130)
- Eck, S. & J. Martens, 2006. Systematic notes on Asian Birds. 49. A preliminary review of the Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae.— Zool. Med., Leiden, 80-5 (1): 1-63.
- Eck, S. & C. Quaisser, 2004. Verzeichnis der Typen der Vogelsammlung des Museums für Tierkunde in den Staatlichen Naturhistorischen Sammlungen Dresden.— Zool. Abh. Staatl. Mus. Tierk. Dresden, 54: 233-316.
- Editorial Division, Smithsonian Institution, 1947. A list and index of the publications of the United States National Museum (1875-1946).— Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus., 193: 1-306.
- Etchécopar, R.-D. & F. Hüe, 1983. Les Oiseaux de la Chine de Mongolie et de Corée. Passereaux. 2: 1-705.— Paris.
- Eyton, T.C., 1839. Catalogue of a collection of birds from Malaya, with descriptions of new species.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 100-107. (*flava* p. 104, *ater* p. 104)
- Fediuschin, A.V., 1927. Neue Formen palaarktischer Vögel.— J. f. Orn., 75 (3): 490-495. (*changaicus* p. 491)
- Finn, F., 1901. List of birds in the Indian Museum, I. Families Corvidae, Paradiseidae, Ptilonorhynchidae, and Crateropodidae. i-xv, 1-115.— Calcutta.
- Gadow, H., 1883. A Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum. VIII. Catalogue of the Passeriformes or perching birds, in the collection of the British Museum. Cichlomorphae: Part V. containing the families Paridae and Laniidae (Titmice and Shrikes) and Certhiomorphae (Creepers and Nuthatches). i-xiii, 1-386.— London.
- Gould, J., 1830-33. A Century of birds from the Himalayan mountains. 80 pls.— London.
- Gould, J., 1850. Pl. 46 (publ. in Pt. I of the work). In Gould, J., 1850-1883. Birds of Asia, 2.— London. (*Sitta leucopsis*)
- Gould, J. 1855. Pl. 65, 67, 69 (publ. in Pt. VII of the work). In: Gould, J., 1850-1883. Birds of Asia, 2.— London. (*Psaltria concinna*, *Acanthiparus niveogularis*, *Mecistura glaucogularis*)
- Gould, J., 1863. Descriptions of sixteen new species of birds from the island of Formosa, collected by Robert Swinhoe, Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Formosa.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 280-286 (1862). (*castaneoventris* p. 280)
- Gray, J.E. & G.R. Gray, 1847⁹⁹. 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 (1846).— London.

⁹⁹ Sherborn (1926) reported that this was placed before the Trustees of the British Museum on 9 January 1847. Gary Thorn of the British Museum has kindly located the minutes of the Standing Committee on 9 January 1847, which read as follows: "Mr Gray reported that the catalogue of Mr Hodgson's Collection was completed, and had been received from the printer. Mr Gray suggested that some copies should be sent to Mr Hodgson, and that a copy should be transmitted to each of the Collections to which Mr Hodgson's duplicate specimens were distributed. The Trustees ordered that twenty five copies should be presented to Mr Hodgson, and a copy to each of the institutions referred to by Mr Gray". It may be reasonably concluded that publication only took place after this meeting.

- Grimmett, R., C. Inskipp & T. Inskipp, 1998. Birds of the Indian Subcontinent. 1-888.— London.
- Gyldenstolpe, N., Count, 1926¹⁰⁰. Types of birds in the Royal Natural History Museum in Stockholm.— Arkiv for Zool., 19A (1): 1-116 ('1927').
- Hachisuka, M., 1930. Contributions to the birds of the Philippines. No. 2.— Orn. Soc. Japan, Suppl. Publ., 14: 139-222. (*montigenus* p. 200; *visayanus* p. 201)
- Hachlov, W., 1912. Über eine neue mattköpfige Sumpfmeise.— Orn. Monatsber. 20 (1): 8-10. (*suschkini* p. 8)
- Harrap, S., 1996¹⁰¹. Tits, Nuthatches and Treecreepers. 1-464.— London.
- Hartert, E., 1905a. *Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna*. 1 (Heft 3): 241-384.— Berlin. (*caschmirensis* p. 345; *okinawae* p. 346; *tibetanus* p. 346)
- Hartert, E., 1905b. Miscellaneous Ornithologica; Critical, nomenclatorial, and other notes, mostly on Palearctic birds and their allies. Part II.— Novit. Zool., 12: 497-503. (*mahrattarum* p. 499, *planorum* p. 499; *hainanus* p. 499)
- Hartert, E. & F. Steinbacher, 1933. *Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna: Ergänzungsband*. 2: 97-192.— Berlin.
- Hay, Lord Arthur. Text in footnote to page 44. In: Blyth, E. 1846. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal, 15 (169): 1-54. (*sanguinifrons* p. 44)
- Hellmayr, C.E., 1900a. Einige Bemerkungen über die Graumeisen.— Orn. Jahrb., 11 (5/6): 201-217. (*restrictus* p. 215)
- Hellmayr, C.E., 1900b. Über eine neue Meise, *P. nigriloris*.— Orn. Monatsber., 8 (9): 139-140. (*nigriloris* p. 139)
- Hellmayr, C.E., 1902. Untersuchungen über einiger paläarktische Vögel.— Orn. Jahrb., 13 (1/2): 26-43. (*insularis* p. 36)
- Hodgson, B.H., 1837. Indication of some new forms belonging to the Parianae [part 1].— India Rev., 2 (1): 30-34. (*nipalensis* p. 31, *sultaneus* p. 31)
- Hodgson, B.H., 1844. Catalogue of Nipalese Birds collected between 1824 and 1844.— [Gray's] Zoological Miscellany: 81-86.
- Hodgson, B.H., 1845a. Characters of six new species of Nepalese birds.— Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., (1) 15 (99): 326-327. (*iouchistos* p. 326; *seriophrys* p. 326; *dichrous* p. 326)
- Hodgson, B.H., 1845b. [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, 24 (7): 572-582.
- Horváth, L. 1970. The destroyed bird types of the Hungarian Natural History Museum.— Ann. Hist. nat. Mus. nat. Hung. 62: 363-372.
- Howard, R. & A. Moore, 1980. A complete checklist of the Birds of the World. i-viii, 1-701.— Oxford.
- Holthuis, L.B. & T. Sakai, 1970. Ph.F. von Siebold and Fauna Japonica. A history of early Japanese Zoology. [i-x], 1-323.— Tokyo.
- Horsfield, T., 1821. Systematic arrangement and description of birds from the island of Java.— Trans. Linn. Soc., London, 13: 133-200. (*atriceps* p. 160)
- Horsfield, T., 1840. List of Mammalia and Birds collected in Assam by John McClelland, Esp., 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., (1839): 146-167.
- Horsfield, T. & F. Moore, 1854. A catalogue of the birds in the Museum of the Hon. East India Company. Vol. 1: i-xxx, 1-451.— London.
- Hume, A.O., 1871. Stray notes on Ornithology in India. VII.— Ibis (3) 1: 403-413.
- Hume, A.O., 1874. Novelties.— Stray Feathers, 2 (6): 503-523. (*stoliczkae* p. 521)

¹⁰⁰ The separate is dated 1926. As this differs from the date of publication within the journal the work technically dates from 31 December 1926.

¹⁰¹ The dust jacket shows Harrap & Quinn, however, the title page shows Harrap as author and Quinn as illustrator.

- Hume, A.O., 1888. The birds of Manipur, Assam, Sylhet and Cachar.— *Stray Feathers*, 11 (1-4): i-v, 1-353. (*manipurensis* p. 254)
- Ijima, I., 1893. Description of a new species of *Parus* from Miyakeshima.— *Dobutsu Zasshi*, 5 (62): 445-446. (*owstoni* p. 445)
- Inskipp, C. & T.P. Inskipp, 1991. *A Guide to the Birds of Nepal* (2nd Edition). 1-400.— London.
- Inskipp, T.P., N. Lindsey & J.W. Duckworth, 1996. *An Annotated Checklist of the Birds of the Oriental Region*. [i-x], 1-294.— Sandy, Beds., UK.
- I.C.Z.N., 1957. Opinion 447. Rejection for nomenclatorial purposes of the original edition published at Philadelphia in 1791 and of the editions published in London and Dublin respectively in 1792 of the work of William Bartram entitled "Travels through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, the Cherokee country, the extensive territories of the Muscogulges or Creek Confederacy and the country of the Chactaws" as being a work in which the author did not apply the principles of binomial nomenclature.— *Opin. Declar.*, 15: 211-224.
- I.C.Z.N., 1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature*. i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
- James, H.F., P.G.P. Ericson, B. Slikas, F. Lei, F.B. Gill & S.L. Olson, 2003. *Pseudopodoces humilis*: a misclassified terrestrial tit (Paridae) of the Tibetan Plateau: evolutionary consequences of shifting adaptive zones.— *Ibis*, 145: 185-202.
- Jerdon, T.C., 1845. Second Supplement to the Catalogue of the birds of Southern India.— *Madras J. Lit. Sci.*, 13 (31): 116-144 (1844). (*nuchalis* p. 131)
- Jerdon, T.C., 1863. *The Birds of India: being a Natural History of all the Birds Known to Inhabit Continental India; with Descriptions of the Species, Genera, Families, Tribes, and Orders, and a Brief Notice of such Families as are not found in India, making it a Manual of Ornithology Specially Adapted for India*. 2, i, 1-439.— Calcutta. (*beavani* p. 275; *atkinsoni* p. 176)
- Johansen, H., 1952. Die Vogelfauna Westsibiriens. II Teil. Systematik und Verbreitung, Oekologie und Biologie der Einzelarten.— *J. f. Orn.*, 92 (1944) (3/4): 145-204. (*altaicus* p. 182)
- Kakizawa, R., 1980. A list of bird specimens donated by Dr Nagamichi Kuroda. 1. Type specimens and non-passerines.— *J. Yamashina Inst. Orn.*, 12 (3): 192-212.
- Keve, A., 1943. Einige neue Vogelrassen aus Asien.— *Anz. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math-Naturwiss.*, 80: 16-22. (*rufolateralis* p. 21, *parvirostris* p. 21)
- King, B.F. & E.C. Dickinson, 1975. *A field guide to the birds of south-east Asia*. 1-480.— London.
- Kinney, N.B. & H.C. Robinson, 1927. [Raffles's natural history drawings from Sumatra].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 47: 127-130.
- Kleinschmidt, O., 1897. Die palaerktischen Sumpfmeynen.— *Orn. Jahr.*, 8 (2/3): 45-103.
- Kleinschmidt, O., 1913. Noch eine neue Hohlmeisenform aus Ostasien.— *Falco*, 9 (2): 33. (*wladivostokensis* p. 33)
- Kleinschmidt, O., 1921a. *Parus salicarius*: VI. Die chinesischen Graumeisen.— *Berajah*, 18-21. (*weigoldi*, p. 19, *stötzneri*, p. 20)
- Kleinschmidt, O., 1921b. Neu. II.— *Falco*, 17 (2): 1-3 (*weigoldicus* p. 1)
- Kleinschmidt, O., 1922a. Neues.— *Falco*, 18 (1): 1-3. (*amamiensis* p. 2; *gotoensis* p. 2; *tshiliensis* p. 3)
- Kleinschmidt, O. & H. Weigold, in Kleinschmidt, O. 1922b. Neues.— *Falco*, 18 (1): 1-3. (*jeholicus* p. 2)
- Kleinschmidt, O. & H. Weigold, 1922. Zoologische Ergebnisse der Walter Stotznerschen Expeditionen nach Szetschwan, Osttibet und Tschili. 3 Teil. Aves. 1. Corvidae, Certhiidae, Sittidae, Paridae, Cinclidae.— *Abh. Ber. Mus. Tierk. Dresden*, 15 (3): 1-18. (*subtibetanus* p. 11)
- Koelz, W.N., 1939. New birds from Asia, chiefly from India.— *Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash.*, 52: 61-82. (*stupae* p. 61; *decolorans* p. 62; *meinertzhageni* p. 62; *xanthonotus* p. 63)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1917. On one new genus and three new species of birds from Corea and Tsushima.— *Tori*, 1 (5): 1-6. (*quelpartensis* p. 3)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1918. Description of a new subspecies of *Parus varius* from Nijijima, one of the Seven islands of Idzu ¹⁰².— *Dobutsu Zasshi*, 30 (358): 313-323. (In Japanese/English.) (*namiyei* pp. 316, 322)

¹⁰² This appeared as a separate paper following a longer one in Japanese (pp. 313-321) that is differently titled but in which is found the original description in Japanese of this form.

- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1919. Descriptions of three new birds from the southern islands of Japan.— *Dobutsu Zasshi*, 31: 229-233. (In Japanese and English.) (*sunsunpi* pp. 230, 232; *yakushimensis* pp. 230, 232)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1922a. Notes on the birds of Tsushima and Iki Islands, Japan.— *Ibis* (11) 4: 75-105. (*ijimæ* p. 98; *teraokai* p. 100)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1922b. Description of four new birds from the islands of Japan and Formosa.— *Annot. Zool. Jap.*, 10 (4): 115-118. (*amamii* p. 117)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1923a. [Descriptions of new subspecies from Japan].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 43: 86-91. (*uchiidae* p. 89; *bangsi* p. 90, *S. olivaceus* p. 90)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1923b. [Descriptions of apparently new forms of birds from the Borodino Islands, Riu Kiu group, Japan].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 43: 120-123. (*P. v. orii* p. 121)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1923c. Description of two apparently new forms of *Aegithalos caudatus* from Japan and Korea.— *Auk*, 40 (2): 312-313. (*shimokoriyamae* p. 312; *kisuiensis* p. 313)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1927. A list of the birds described by the author during the ten years from 1915 to 1925, with descriptions of two new forms.— *Ibis* (12) 3: 691-723.
- Kuroda, Nagamichi, 1932. A revision of the types of birds described by Japanese authors during the years 1923 to 1931.— *Novit. Zool.*, 37: 384-405.
- Kuroda, Nagamichi & T. Mori, 1920. A list of the birds of the Dagelet Is., Corea, with detailed reference to some species.— *Tori*, 2 (10): 265-276 (in Japanese); and Descriptions of five new forms of birds from Dagelet and Quelpart Islands.— *Tori*, 2 (10): 277-283. (In English.) (*dageletensis* pp. 270, 278; *utsurioensis* pp. 271, 280; *saisiuensis* pp. 272, 279)
- Kuroda, Nagamichi & T. Mori, 1924. Description of a subspecies of *Sittiparus varius* from the Korean Peninsula.— *Dobutsu Zasshi*, 36: 315-318. (In Japanese and English.) (*koreensis* pp. 316, 318)
- Kuroda, Nagahisa, 1953. A new race of *Parus varius* from South Kyushu.— *Tori*, 13 (63): 114-115. (*sataensis* p. 115)
- Kuroda, Nagahisa, 1955. Notes on some races of the Varied Tit.— *Tori*, 13 (65): 16-21. (In Japanese.)
- Kuroda, Nagahisa, 1966. [Type specimens of mammals and birds in the Yamashina Institute for Ornithology.]— *Spec. Publ. Yamashina Inst. Orn.*, 35th Ann.: 86-94. (In Japanese.)
- Lafresnaye, N.F.A.A., de, 1837. Mésange. Parus. Linné. M. à huppe jaune. *P. flavo-cristatus*.— *Mag. Zool. [Paris]*, 7: Pl. 80 and text pp. 81-82.
- Lafresnaye, N.F.A.A., de, 1840. Quelques nouvelles espèces d'oiseaux.— *Rev. et Mag. Zool.* 3: 129-130. (*quadrivittatus* p. 129)
- la Touche, J.D.D., 1922a. [New birds from S.E. Yunnan].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 42: 51-55. (*yunnanensis* p. 51)
- la Touche, J.D.D., 1922b. [New subspecies of Chinese birds].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 43: 41-44. (*altarum* p. 43)
- la Touche, J.D.D., 1923a. [Notes on the tits of the *Parus commixtus* group].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 43: 101-104. (*fohkienensis* p. 104)
- la Touche, J.D.D., 1923b. [A new subspecies of yellow browed tit].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 43: 104-105. (*ricketti* p. 104)
- la Touche, J.D.D., 1923c. [2 new forms from China].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.*, 44: 32-33. (*kuatunensis* p. 33)
- Lekagul, Boonsong & E.W. Cronin, 1974. Bird Guide of Thailand. 1-324.— Bangkok.
- Lesson, R.P., 1831. *Traité d'Ornithologie ou Tableau Méthodique des ordres, sous-ordres, familles, tribus, genres, sous-genres et races d'oiseaux.* Livr. 6 (pp. 401-480).— Strasbourg. (*elegans* p. 456)
- Lesson, R.P., 1839. Oiseaux rares ou nouveaux de la collection du Docteur Abeillé, à Bordeaux.— *Rev. Zool.* 2: 40-43. (*sumatrana* p. 42)
- Levaillant, F., 1804¹⁰³. *Histoire naturelle des Oiseaux d'Afrique.* 3: 1-144.— Paris.
- Lichtenstein, A.A.H., 1823. *Reise von Orenburg nach Buchara von Eduard Eversmann.* i-viii, 1-150.— Berlin. (*bokharensis* p. 131)

¹⁰³ The date 1804 is that is used by Rookmaaker (1993).

- Linnaeus, C., 1758. Systema Naturae per regna tria naturae, secundum classes, ordines, genera, species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis. 1: 1-824.— Holmiae. (*P. caudatus*, p. 190; *ater*, p. 190)
- Lönnerberg, A.J.E., 1908. Contributions to the ornithology of Saghalin.— J. Coll. Sci., Imp. Univ. Tokyo, 23 (14): 1-69. (*sachalinensis* p. 20)
- Manuel, C.G., 1957. Neotypes of some Philippine birds.— Phil. J. Sci., 85 (3): 315-321 (1956).
- Martens, J., 1971. Artstatus von *Parus rufonuchalis* Blyth.— J. f. Orn., 112 (4): 451-458.
- Martens, J. & S. Eck, 1995. Towards an ornithology of the Himalayas: Systematics, Ecology and Vocalizations of Nepal Birds.— Bonner Zool. Monogr., 38: 1-445.
- Martens, J., Tietze, D.T., & Sun Yuehua., 2006. Molecular phylogeny of *Parus* (*Periparus*), a Eurasian radiation of tits (Aves: Passeriformes: Paridae).— Zool. abhandl. Staat. Mus. Tier Dresden 55: 9-26. (*eckodedicatus* p. 116)
- Mayr, E., in Stanford, J.K. & E. Mayr, 1940. The Vernay Cutting Expedition to Northern Burma, Part I.— Ibis (14) 4: 679-711. (*A. iouschistos obscuratus* p. 705)
- McAllan, I.A.W. & M.D. Bruce, 2002. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 27. On the dates of publication of John Gould's "A century of Birds from the Himalaya Mountains".— Zool. Verh., Leiden, 340: 161-177.
- McGregor, R.C., 1907. Descriptions of four new Philippine birds.— Phil. J. Sci., 2: 292-294. (*albescens* p. 293; *edithae* p. 294)
- Mearns, E.A., 1905. Descriptions of a new genus and eleven new species of Philippine birds.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash., 18: 1-8. (*mindanensis* p. 8)
- Mearns, E.A., 1916. On the geographical forms of the Philippine Elegant Titmouse, *Pardaliparus elegans* (Lesson), with descriptions of three new subspecies.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus., 51: 57-65 (Publ. No. 2142). (*panayensis* p. 57; *guimarasensis* p. 58; *suluensis* p. 59)
- Meinertzhagen, R., 1938. [Four new races].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 58: 94-96. (*blanchardi* p. 95)
- Meinertzhagen, R. & [A.C.] Meinertzhagen, 1926. [New forms of birds from the Himalayas and Kashmir].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 46: 96-101. (*lepcharum* p. 97)
- Meise, W., 1934. Die Vogelwelt der Mandschurei.— Abh. Ber. Mus. Tierk. Dresden, 18 (2): 1-86. (*apeliotes* p. 31)
- Meise, W. In: Stresemann, E., W. Meise & M. Schönwetter, 1937. Aves Beickianae. Beiträge zur Ornithologie von Nordwest-Kansu nach den Forschungen von Walter Beick (†) in den Jahren 1926-1933.— J. f. Orn., 85 (3): 375-576. (*szetschwanensis* p. 514)
- Menzies, M., 1884. Mémoires sur les Paridae I. Le groupe des mésanges bleues (*Cyanistes* Kaup).— Bull. Soc. Zool., France, 9: 239-302. (*tianschanicus* p. 276-7)
- Meyer de Schauensee, R., 1946. On some forms of *Parus major* found in eastern and southern Asia.— Notulae Naturae, Philad., 169: 1-9. (*templorum* p. 2; *nubicolus* p. 8)
- Meyer de Schauensee, R., 1984. The birds of China. 1-602.— Washington D.C.
- Mishima, T., 1961. Notes on some birds of Shikoku.— Japan Wildlife Bull., 18 (1): 157-172 (in Japanese). (*abei* p. 160; *pallidolumbo* p. 164)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1918. [A new subspecies of *Parus varius* from Hokkaido.— Dobutsu Zasshi, 30: 345-346. (In Japanese.) (*hakodatensis* p. 345)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1923a. [On the birds of Idzu Oshima, with descriptions of two new subspecies.]— Tori, 3 (14): 196-213. (In Japanese.) (*ogawai* p. 207)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1923b. New forms of birds from the Izu Islands.— Dobutsu Zasshi, 35 (417/422): 400-415. (In Japanese.) (*chimaie* p. 410)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1927a. Some new and unrecorded birds from Japanese territories. I.— Annot. Orn. Orient., 1: 1-79. (In Japanese.) (*sidsiukara* p. 25; *makii* p. 26; *P.m. takahashii* p. 28 – *nomen nudum*; *tyoosenensis* p. 31, *Periparus a. takahashii* p. 31, *enaga* p. 33, *tarihoae* p. 34)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1927b¹⁰⁴. Descriptions of twenty five new birds and three additions from Japanese territories.— Annot. Orn. Orient., 1 (1): 81-102. (In English.) (*sidsiukara* p. 85; *makii* p. 85; *tyoosenensis* p. 87, *P. a. takahashii* p. 87, *enaga* p. 88, *tarihoae* p. 89)

¹⁰⁴ A second part appeared in Annot. Orn. Orient. 1 (3): 201-239.

- Momiyama, T.T., 1927c. [Six new birds from Japan, Korea, and Sakhalin].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 48: 19-22. (*tatibanai* p. 20)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1928. A catalogue of the bird-skins made by Mr Matakiti Tatibana in southern Sakhalin during May 1926 to January 1927.— Annot. Orn. Orient., 1 (2): 171-200 ¹⁰⁵. (*P. m. takahashii* p. 191)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1931. Dialectical names in Hachijo Island (animals).— Amoeba, 3 (1/2): 140-147. (In Japanese.)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1939. Avifauna Hatiziosimensis (I) A list of the birds of Hatizyo-zima, southern Seven Islands.— Kagaku no Nogyo, 20 (1/2): 9-23. (In Japanese.)
- Momiyama, T.T., 1940. Avifauna Hatiziosimensis (II). On the resident birds of Hatizyo-zima, southern Seven Islands.— Kagaku no Nogyo, 20 (3/4): 31-44. (In Japanese.) (*masaakii* p. 41)
- Monroe, B.L. & C.G. Sibley, 1993. A World Checklist of Birds. i-xix, 1-393.— New Haven and London.
- Moore, F. 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. (*leucogenys* p. 374)
- Moore, F., 1855. Descriptions of three new species of titmice.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 139-140 (1854). (*Orites glaucogularis* p. 140, *Orites niveogularis* p. 140)
- Morioka, H., E.C. Dickinson, T. Hiraoka, D. Allen & T. Yamasaki, 2005. Types of Japanese birds.— Nat. Sci. Mus. Monographs (Tokyo), 28: 1-154.
- Nazarenko, A.A., O. Valchuk & J. Martens, 1999. Secondary contact and overlap of *Parus major* and *Parus minor* populations in the Middle Amur river basin.— Zool. Zhurn., 78 (3): 371-381. (In Russian; English summary.)
- Nicholson, F., 1906. Notes on the Palæarctic species of Coal-Tits.— Manchester Memoirs, 1 (13): 1-21.
- Ogilvie-Grant, W.R., 1912. [Four new species from Formosa].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 29: 107-109. (*ptilosus* p. 108)
- Ohta, N., S. Kusuhara & R. Kakizawa, 2000. A study on genetic differentiation and phylogenetic relationships among East Asian titmice (Family Paridae) and relatives.— Jap. J. Orn., 48: 205-218.
- Orn. Soc. Japan, 1942. A hand-list of the Japanese birds, 3rd ed., i-viii, 1-238.— Orn. Soc. Japan, Tokyo.
- Oustalet, J.-F.E., 1892. Contributions à la faune de la Chine et du Tibet. Descriptions d'espèces et de races nouvelles d'oiseaux données récemment au Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle par le Prince Henri d'Orléans.— Ann. Sci. Nat., Zool., (7) 12 (9): 271-318 (1891). (*Acredula bonvaloti* p. 286)
- Oustalet, J.-F.E., 1893. Catalogue des oiseaux provenant du voyage de M. Bonvalot et du Prince Henri d'Orléans à travers le Turkestan, le Tibet et la Chine occidentale.— Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, (3) 5: 115-220.
- Oustalet, J.-F.E., 1897. Notice sur quelques oiseaux de la Chine occidentale.— Bull. Mus. Nat. Hist. Nat., Paris, 3: 208-211. (*dejeani* p. 209)
- Parkes, K.C., 1958. A revision of the Philippine Elegant Titmouse (*Parus elegans*).— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash., 71: 95-106. (*gilliardi* p. 98; *bongaensis* p. 105)
- Parkes, K.C., 1963. Additional notes on the Philippine Elegant Titmouse, *Parus elegans*.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 83 (8): 148-150.
- Parkes, K.C., 1971. Taxonomic and distributional notes on Philippine birds.— Nemouria, 4: 1-67. (*snowi* p. 26)
- Paynter, R.A., Jr., 1963. Taxonomic notes on some Himalayan Paridae.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 59 (3): 951-956.
- Peters, J.L., 1934. Check-list of Birds of the World. 2: i-xvii, 1-401.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Pleske, T., 1893. [Some new species of tits].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 3 (xiii): xiii. (*A. calva* p. 13; *C. berezowskii* p. 13)
- Portenko, L.A., 1954. Birds of the USSR. 3: 1-254.— Moscow. (In Russian.) (*A. c. brachyurus* p. 96; *kapus-tini* p. 109; *shulpini* p. 117)

¹⁰⁵ The original descriptions are in Japanese in Momiyama (1927a); the English text is not a translation but is complementary.

- Prys-Jones, R. 2001 What happened to the bird collection of the Museum of the Army Medical Department?— Bull. Brit. Orn. Club 121: 147-8.
- Pražák, J.P., 1895. Versuch einer Monographie der Palaearktischen Sumpfmehsen (Poecile Kaup).— Orn. Jahrb., 6 (2): 65-99. (*alascensis* p. 92)
- Pražák, J.P., 1897. Materialien zur einer Ornithologie Ost-Galiziens.— J. f. Orn., 45 (3): 225-347. (*A. c. japonica* p. 291)
- Przewalski, N.M., 1876. Mongoliya i strana Tangutov trekhletnee puteshestvie v vostochnoy nagornoy Azii. (In Russian.) [Mongolia and the Tangut Country, a three year journey in the eastern highlands of Asia]. 2 (2) Ptitsy [Aves], i-iv, 1-176.— St. Petersburg. (*affinis* p. 52; *superciliosa* p. 53, *di-chroides* p. 54)
- Raffles, T.S., Sir, 1822. Second part of the descriptive catalogue of a zoological collection made in the island of Sumatra and its vicinity.— Trans. Linn. Soc., London, 13: 277-331 (Birds). (*ambiguus*)
- Raphael, S., 1970. The publication dates of the Transactions of the Linnean Society, Series I, 1791-1875.— Biol. J. Linn. Soc., Lond., 2: 61-76.
- Rasmussen, P.C. & J.C. Anderton, 2005. Birds of South Asia. The Ripley Guide. 1. Field Guide: 1-378.— Washington D.C. and Barcelona.
- Rheinwald, G. & R. van den Elzen, 1984. Die Wirbeltiersammlungen des Museums Alexander Koenig und ihre Typusexemplare II. Vögel.— Bonner Zool. Monogr., (19): 49-150.
- Ripley, S.D., 1950. Notes on Indian Birds. III. Birds from Assam.— Postilla, (1): 1-4. (*vauriei* p. 2)
- Ripley, S.D., 1961. Some bird records from northern Burma with a description of a new subspecies.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 58 (1): 279-283. (*saramatii* p. 283)
- 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.
- Rippon, G., 1900. [New species obtained in the Shan States].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 11: 11-12. (*pulchellus* p. 11)
- Rippon, G., 1903. [A new species of tit from Western Yun-nan].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 14: 18. (*talifuensis* p. 18)
- Rippon, G., 1904. [New species of birds from the Southern Chin Hills].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 14: 83-84. (*sharpei* p. 84)
- Rippon, G., 1906. [Some new species of birds from Mt. Victoria, S. Chin Hills, Burma].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 16: 87. (*saturationis* p. 87)
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1918. Results of an Expedition to Korinchi Peak, Sumatra.— J. Fed. Mal. St. Mus., 8: 81-284. (*malayorum* p. 226)
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1919. On birds from South Annam and Cochin China. Part II. Pycnonotidae – Dicæidae.— Ibis (11) 1: 565-625. (*annamensis* p. 606)
- Robson, C., 2000. A Field Guide to the Birds of South-east Asia. 1-504.— London.
- Rookmaaker, L.C., 1993. Asian and Australian birds in the Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux d’Afrique by François Levaillant.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 90 (2): 193-205.
- Rossolimo, O.L. (Editor in chief), 2001. Types of vertebrates in the Zoological Museum of Moscow University. 1-250.— Moscow (in Russian and English).
- Rothschild, Lord, 1922. [Some new Yunnan birds collected by Mr G. Forrest].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 43: 9-12. (*longipennis* p. 11)
- Rothschild, Lord, 1923. On a third collection of birds made by Mr George Forrest from north west Yunnan.— Novit. Zool., 30: 247-267. (*C. olivaceus* p. 263)
- Rothschild, Lord, 1926. On the avifauna of Yunnan, with critical notes.— Novit. Zool., 33 (3): 189-400. (*evanesens* p. 313)
- Salvadori, T., 1865. Descrizione di altre nuove specie di uccelli.— Atti. Soc. Ital. Sci. Nat. Milano, 8: 375-389. (*semilarvatus* p. 375)
- Sclater, W.L., 1892. On the Indian Museum and its collection of birds.— Ibis (6) 4: 65-87.
- Seebohm, H., 1879. Remarks on Messrs. Blakiston and Pryer’s Catalogue of the Birds of Japan.— Ibis (4) 3: 18-43. (*japonicus*, p. 32)
- Seebohm, H., 1890. The birds of the Japanese Empire. i-xxiv, 1-386.— London. (*sieboldi* p. 85, *sibirica* p. 88)

- Seebohm, H., 1894. [Two new species of birds from the interior of Formosa collected by Mr Holst].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 4: vii. (*holsti* p. 7)
- Severtsov, N.A., 1873a. Vertikal'noe i gorizonta'lnoe raspredelenie Turkestanskikh zhivornykh. (in Russian) [Vertical and horizontal distribution of Turkestan animals.] – Izdanie obshchestva. Izvestiya imperatorskago obshch. lyubiteley estestvoznaniya, antropologii i etnografii sostoyashchego pri Moskovskom universitete, Moskva, 8 (2): i-ii, 1-157. (In Russian.) (*flavipectus* p. 133, *songarus* p. 134; *rufipectus* p. 134; *coronatus* p. 136; *atricapillus* p. 137)
- Severtsov, N.A., 1873b. Allgemeine Uebersicht der aralo-tianschanischen Ornis, in ihrer horizontalen und verticalen Verbreitung.— J. f. Orn., 21 (124): 321-389.
- Severtsov, N.A., 1875a. Allgemeine Uebersicht der aralo-tianschanischen Ornis, in ihrer horizontalen und verticalen Verbreitung.— J. f. Orn., 23: 58-104, 168-200.
- Severtsov, N.A., 1875b. [Letter to the Editor].— Stray Feathers, 3 (5): 420-431. (*piceae* p. 423)
- Sharpe, R.B., 1877. On the birds collected by Professor J.B. Steere in the Philippine Archipelago.— Trans. Linn. Soc., London, (2) 1, (6): 307-355. (*amabilis* p. 338)
- Sharpe, R.B., 1902. [Some interesting species of birds from Yunnan, collected by Colonel G. Rippon].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 13: 11-12. (*poecilopsis* p. 11)
- Sharpe, R.B. & H.E. Dresser, 1871¹⁰⁶ (August¹⁰⁷). A History of the Birds of Europe, part 6 (*Parus cinctus* p. 5). Bound in volume 3, page 129.— Privately published, London. (*grisescens* p. 129)
- Sherborn, C.D., 1926. Dates of publication of early catalogues of natural history issued by the British Museum.— Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist (9) 17: 271-272.
- Sibley, C.G. & B.L. Monroe, Jr., 1990. Distribution and taxonomy of birds of the world. i-xxiv, 1-1111.— New Haven, Conn.
- Slater, H.H., 1885a. On two new birds from Borneo.— Ibis (5) 3: 121-124. (*cinerascens* p. 122)
- Slater, H.H., 1885b. [Letter to the Editor].— Ibis (5) 3: 327. (*sarawacensis* p. 327)
- Snow, D.W., 1967. The families Aegithalidae, Remizidae and Paridae. Pp. 52-124. In: R.A. Paynter, Jr (Ed.). Check-list of Birds of the World. A continuation of the work of James L. Peters. XII: i-ix, 1-495.— Cambridge, Mass.
- Stejneger, L., 1885. Results of ornithological explorations in the Commander Islands and Kamtschatka.— U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 29: 1-382.
- Stejneger, L., 1887. Review of Japanese birds. II. Tits and nuthatches.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus., 9: 374-394 (1886).
- Stejneger, L., 1892. Notes on a collection of birds made by Mr Harry V. Henson in the island of Yezo, Japan.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus., 15: 289-359 (Publ. 904). (*hensoni* p. 342, *seebohmi* p. 343)
- Stepanyan, L.S., 1983. Nadvidy i vidy-dvoyniki v avifauna SSSR. (Superspecies and sibling species in the avifauna of the USSR). 1-296.— Moscow. (In Russian.)
- Stepanyan, L.S., 1990. Conspectus of the ornithological fauna of the USSR. 1-727.— "Nauka", Moscow. (In Russian.)
- Stepanyan, L.S., 2003. Conspectus of the ornithological fauna of Russia and adjacent territories (within the borders of the USSR as a historic region). 1-808.— Moscow. (In Russian.)
- Stepanyan, L.S. & V.M. Loskot, 1998. Name bearing types of species group taxa in the collection of birds made by M. M. Berezovsky during the Gansu expedition of G.N. Potanin in 1884-1887.— Zool. Zhurnal, 77 (8): 947-951. (In Russian, English summary.)
- Stephens, J.F. in * G. Shaw, 1817, General Zoology or Systematic Natural History, X, pt. 1: i-xix, 1-317.— London. (*japonicus* p. 55)
- Stresemann, E., 1928. Neue formen aus Nord-Kansu II.— Orn. Monatsber., 36 (2): 41-42. (*kansuensis* p. 41)
- Stresemann, E., 1931. Neue formen aus Nord-Kansu, VII.— Orn. Monatsber., 39 (4): 105-108. (*whistleri* p. 107)

¹⁰⁶ Although often referred to as by Dresser, the earlier parts of this work were by Sharpe & Dresser and the wrapper to this part confirms this (H. McGhie *in litt.* 3.1.06). See also citation by Dresser (1902).

¹⁰⁷ This date of publication is given to demonstrate that this name is junior to *obtectens* Cabanis, 1871.

- Sushkin, P.P., 1904¹⁰⁸ [New subspecies of birds from Palæarctic Asia].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 14: 42-46. (*sayana* p. 44, *yeniseensis* p. 44, *centralasiae* p. 45)
- Swinhoe, R., 1866. Ornithological notes from Formosa.— Ibis (2) 2: 292-316. (*insperatus* p. 308)
- Swinhoe, R., 1868. Ornithological notes from Amoy.— Ibis (2) 4: 53-65. (*commixtus* p. 63; *anophrys* p. 64)
- Swinhoe, R., 1870b. Descriptions of seven new species of birds procured during a cruise up the River Yangtze (China).— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 131-136. (*consobrinus* p. 133; *venustulus* p. 133)
- Swinhoe, R., 1870c. Zoological notes of a journey from Canton to Peking and Kalgan.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 427-451.
- Swinhoe, R., 1871. On four new species of Asiatic Birds.— Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., (4) 7: 257. (*baicalensis* p. 271)
- Sztolcman, J. & J. Domaniewski, 1927. Les types d'oiseaux au Musée Polonais d'Histoire Naturelle.— Ann. Zool. Mus. Polonici Hist. Nat., 6 (2): 95-194.
- Taczanowski, L., 1872. Bericht über die ornithologischen Untersuchungen des Dr Dybowski in Ost-Sibirien (contd.).— J. f. Orn., 20: 433-454. (*brevirostris* p. 444)
- Taczanowski, L., 1885. Liste des oiseaux reçus récemment du sud-ouest du pays Oussieurien.— Bull. Soc. Zool., France, 10: 463-478. (*crassirostris* p. 470)
- Taczanowski, L., 1891. Faune ornithologique de la Sibérie Orientale. 1ère partie.— Mém. Acad. Imp. sci. St. Pétersb., (7) 39: 1-684. (*macroura* p. 436-8)
- Taka-Tsukasa, N., 1919. On birds from Kagoshima Prefecture (II). [In Japanese].— Dobutsu Zasshi, 31: 55-59 (in Japanese). (*kagoshimae* p. 55)
- Temminck, C.J., 1836, *Psaltria exilis*, pl. 600, fig. 4 and text, in: Temminck, C.J. & M. Laugier de Chartrouse, 1820-1839. Nouveaux Recueil de Planches coloriées d'Oiseaux, pour servir de suite et de complément aux planches enluminées de Buffon.— Paris. (*Psaltria exilis* pl. 600)
- Temminck, C.J. & H. Schlegel, 1844-1850. Fauna Japonica – Aves. 1-141.— Lugduni Batavorum. (*trivirgatus* p. 71, *varius* p. 71)
- Thayer, J.E. & O.C. Bangs, 1909. Descriptions of new birds from Central China.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 52 (8): 139-141. (*artatus* p. 140)
- Thayer, J.E. & O.C. Bangs, 1912. Some Chinese Vertebrates: Aves.— Mem. Mus. Comp. Zool., 40 (4): 137-200. (*occultus* p. 185)
- Ticehurst, C.B., 1925. [Descriptions of hitherto unrecognized races of Himalayan birds].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 46: 22-23. (*rubricapillus* p. 22)
- Ticehurst, C.B. & H. Whistler, 1924. On the type locality of certain birds described by Vigors.— Ibis (11) 6: 468-473.
- Vaurie, C., 1950. Notes on some Asiatic Titmice.— Amer. Mus. Novit., 1459: 1-66.
- Vaurie, C., 1957. Systematic Notes on Palearctic Birds. No. 28. The families Remizidae and Aegithalidae.— Amer. Mus. Novit. 1853: 1-21.
- Vaurie, C., 1959. The birds of the Palearctic Fauna. Order Passeriformes: i-xii, 1-762.— London.
- Verreaux, J.P., 1869. Notes sur quelques oiseaux considérés comme nouveaux provenant du voyage de M. l'Abbé Armand David.— Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 5, Bull.: 33-36. (*fuliginosa* p. 36)
- Verreaux, J.P., 1870. Note sur les espèces nouvelles d'oiseaux recueillis par M. l'Abbé Armand David dans les montagnes du Thibet Chinois.— Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 6, Bull.: 33-40. (*M. vinacea* p. 39)
- Verreaux, J.P., 1871. Description des oiseaux nouveaux ou incomplètement connus, collectés par M. l'abbé Armand David pendant son voyage dans le Thibet oriental et la partie adjacente de la Chine.— Nouv. Arch. Mus. Hist. Nat. Paris, 7, Bull.: 25-66.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1818. MESANGE: pp. 303-331. In: J.J. Virey, 1818. Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle. 20. MED-MIN: 1-586.— Paris. (*cinereus* p. 316)
- Vigors, N.A., 1831. Observations on a collection of birds from the Himalayan Mountains, with characters of new genera and species (contd.).— Proc. Commit. Sci. Corresp. Zool. Soc. Lond.: 22-23. (*monticolus* p. 22; *erythrocephalus* p. 23, *melanolophus* p. 23, *xanthogenys* p. 23)

¹⁰⁸ Issue date: 26 January 1904.

- von Madarász, J., 1909. Contribution to the Mongolian Ornis with description of some new species.— Ann. Mus. Nat. Hungarici, 7: 175-178. (*tunkanensis* p. 177)
- Wagstaffe, R., 1978. Type specimens of birds in the Merseyside County Museums: 1-32.— Liverpool.
- Walden, A., Viscount, 1875. A list of the birds known to inhabit the Philippine Archipelago.— Trans. Zool. Soc. London, 9: 125-252.
- 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.
- Waterhouse, F.H., 1885. The dates of publication of some of the zoological works of the late John Gould, F.R.S., i-xi, 1-59.— London.
- Wheeler, A., 1997. Zoological collections in the early British Museum: the Zoological Society's Museum.— Arch. Nat. Hist., 24 (1): 89-126.
- Whistler, H., 1924. [A new species of Firecap].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 45: 15. (*saturatus* p. 15)
- Whistler, H., 1929. [The grey tits of the NW frontier of India].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 50: 6-7. (*ziaratensis* p. 7)
- Whistler, H., 1932. [A new subspecies of Crested Tit from the Western Himalayas].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl., 53: 20-21. (*kangrae* p. 20)
- Whistler, H. & N.B. Kinnear, 1932. The Vernay Scientific Survey of the Eastern Ghats I.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc., 35 (3): 505-524. (*travancoreensis* p. 520)
- Wolters, H.E., 1980. Die Vogelarten der Erde. Eine systematische Liste mit Verbreitungangaben sowie deutschen und englischen Namen. Pt. 5. 321-400.— Hamburg.
- Yamashina, Y., 1927. [Two new subspecies of birds from Sakhalin].— Dobutsu Zasshi, 39 (465): 281-282 (in Japanese). (*orii* p. 281)
- Yamashina, Y., 1933. Change of the subspecific name of the Sakhalin Marsh-Tit.— Tori, 8 (37): 168. (*ernsti* nom. nov. in footnote)
- Yamashina, Y., 1939. Notes on the specimens of Manchurian birds chiefly made by Mr Hyojiro Orii in 1935.— Tori, 10 (49): 446-544. (*bargaensis* p. 481; *mizunoi* p. 484)
- Yamashina, Y., 1944. Two new subspecies of birds from Formosa and Yunnan.— Bull. Biogeog. Soc. Japan, 14 (2): 3-4. (*taiwanensis* p. 3)
- Zarudny, N.A., 1890. Recherches zoologiques dans la contrée Trans-Caspienne.— Bull. Soc. Imp. nat. Moscou, N.S. 3 (4): 740-842 (1889). (*P. b. intermedius* p. 789)
- Zarudny, N.A. & S.I. Bilkevitch, 1912. *Parus bokharensis* Licht. und ihre Rassen.— Messenger Ornith. ¹⁰⁹, 2: 132-150. (In Russian.) (*iliensis* p. 132; *dzungaricus* p. 132)
- Zarudny, N.A. & M. Härms, 1913. Über *Parus bokharensis* Licht. und seine nächsten Verwandten.— Orn. Monatsber., 21 (9): 141-143. (*panderi* p. 142)
- Zarudny, N.A. & H. von Loudon, 1905. Beschreibung dreier neuen paläarktischen Meisen.— Orn. Monatsber., 13: 108-110. (*turkestanicus* p. 109)
- Zebebor, J. In: von Pelzeln, A., 1865. Reise der Osterreichischen Fregatte 'Novara' um die Erde in den Jahren 1857, 1858 und 1859. Zool. Theil. 1, 2. Vogel: i-iv, 3-176.— Wien. (*Mecistura swinhoi* p. 66)

Final draft received: 15.vii.2006

Accepted 7.viii.2006

Edited: D.R. Wells

¹⁰⁹ Now Orn. Vestnik.

Appendix 1

Comments on the interpretation of type face used in Bonaparte's *Conspectus Generum Avium* (1850).

In this series we have already had contact with 44 names introduced in this work: four pitta names in Dickinson et al. (2000: 101-119), one lark name in Dickinson et al. (2001a: 85-126), one hirundine name in Dickinson et al. (2001b: 145-166), four campephagid names in Dickinson et al. (2002a: 31-74), sixteen bulbul names in Dickinson et al. (2002b: 115-160), two names for ioras in Dickinson et al. (2003: 17-24), two leafbird names in Dickinson et al. (2003: 43-61), six oriole names in Dickinson et al. (2004a: 65-84) and eight corvid names in Dickinson et al. (2004b: 111-148). Despite this amount of experience we are only now beginning to take exceptional care over the representation of the names used by Bonaparte.

When citing scientific names we use parentheses around the author and date to signal that the author used a generic name different from that we now use. It is precisely to help in such cases that we give the original spellings, if not the exact orthography, in our tables. In order to determine whether parentheses are needed around 'Bonaparte, 1850' it is necessary to understand from case to case how Bonaparte signalled the generic name that he considered valid and whether he signalled it correctly. It will be seen from page 1 of his book that he numbered the genera and used bold type for these names. In the species that he listed and numbered he used the same bold type for the generic name only when the original author that he cited used the same name. Hence in **Conurus**, on his first page, his two species are given as "1. **PSITTACUS** *carolinensis*" and "2. **Conurus** *xanthogenius*" and, in fact, the second is a bird that he described here. In the tables in our series we would enter the first of these in column 1 as *Conurus* (*Psittacus*) *carolinensis* – except that it would not need listing as the name would be attributable, not to Bonaparte, but to the original author, Linnaeus.

This system can be seen to hold through the *Conspectus Generum Avium* to page 54 when in the genus *Nyctale* the species *Nyctale richardsoni* seems to have accidentally appeared without the use of bold type for *Nyctale*. Beginning on page 59 Bonaparte begins to abbreviate generic names. Within the genus *Caprimulgus*, the generic names of the species listed are all, except one, abbreviated to "C." (for *Caprimulgus*), each one in bold type. The last caprimulgid name, perhaps a last minute insertion, appeared as **CAPRIMULGUS** *macrourus* – another accidental break in the system, as one would expect to see *Caprimulgus macrourus*. No doubt there are other exceptions, but generally the basic system seems to hold.

Looking at names already listed in our series, note that in 2000, under Pittidae (pp. 253-256 in Bonaparte), *Brachyurus maculata* appeared in the *Conspectus* in the genus **Brachyurus** but listed as **PITTA** *maculata*, also in the genus **Brachyurus** the name *forsteni* Bp. appeared in brackets after 'PITTA MELANOCEPHALA Forsten nec Wagl.' and is evidently a new name. Similarly and again in **Brachyurus**, *Pitta mulleri* Bp. appeared after 'PITTA ATRICAPILLA Müll, nec. Temm.' and is a *nomen novum*. **PITTA** *schwaneri* listed in the genus **Pitta** should surely have been entirely in bold type. In 2001, in the Alaudidae (pp. 242-246 in Bonaparte), we misrepresented Bonaparte's usage. The only Bonaparte name we cited was *Otocoris albigula* 'Brandt' but the full original usage by

Bonaparte, in the genus **Otocoris**, was ALAUDA *albigula* Brandt (*Otocoris albigula* Bp.). In the Hirundinidae (pp. 337-343 in Bonaparte) we listed *Chelidon dasyypus* where Bonaparte listed HIRUNDO *dasyypus* in the genus **Chelidon**.

In summary, we have not always understood the way that Bonaparte used bold type to indicate his chosen generic name and this is partly because of what appear to be his errors. In the case of the Paridae (pp. 228-231 in Bonaparte), although his system seems to work for the genera **Certhiparus**, **Lophophanes** and **Parus** it fails twice and one finds all the species listed under the genus **Melaniparus** allowed a bold "P." (for Parus) to signal their original generic names. The same holds for the species listed under **Cyanistes**. On p. 230 where one comes to *Poecila* he consistently used a bold initial P (for Parus) without explaining that the P did not stand for *Poecila*, except that his system should demand that he give **Poecila** in full for his newly described *P. kamtschatkensis* based on Leiden material labelled *Parus palustris*. In the case of the name *silonotus* no bold type was used at all except for the initial "P." which was followed by XANTHOGENYS, Blyth, nec Vig. (*silonotus*, Blyth) and a citation. There are probably other cases in the *Conspectus Generum Avium* where there are errors (perhaps from abbreviated generic names but also of other kinds; for example on p. 290 Bonaparte used 'PH. *trochiloides* Sundev.' implying that Sundevall used the generic name *Phylloscopus*, but in fact Sundevall used *Acanthiza*). It is thus essential to riddle out Bonaparte's intent for each of his newly described forms or new names.

Appendix 2

Comments on Hodgson names and type material

Benson (1999: 189-190) discussed some of the problems of dealing with Hodgson's material and his cautionary words have been most beneficial for our work. On a slightly different topic, Dickinson et al. (2001: 115-124) referred to the list of Hodgson (1844) and the new names introduced therein, which were *nomina nuda* but which, in some cases, have since been provided with descriptions, leading to the use of Hodgson's name with attribution to the author of the eventual description. Such names relate to Hodgson's unpublished drawings and to his specimens, but locating the relevant type material is challenging.

In this paper we have dealt with a number of Hodgson names based on Hodgson's own descriptions after 1844; also with some birds named by Blyth based on Hodgson's MS names to which Blyth appended his own descriptions. In each case we have had to consider whether Hodgson specimens in the BMNH can be claimed to be types and whether Blyth's names are at all likely to be represented by type material in the BMNH. Most of Blyth's relevant material had been donated by Hodgson to the Asiatic Society of Bengal in Calcutta and would normally have passed to the eventual Indian Museum (and now to the Zoological Survey of India collection).

We have noted above in Comment 13 on *Parus jouschistos* that Hodgson's written descriptions are visibly different from those of Blyth, and the difference is apparently characteristic of the individual author, not a result of Hodgson having to write a description all over again. Thus the distinction between authors is assisted by the styles of writing, but rests on whether Blyth made clear that the description was Hodgson's, which he did by placing the description in quotation marks.

In Comment 34, relating to *Parus aemodius*, we discuss the question of whether a specimen that was once in front of Blyth is really the one now in the BMNH and thought to be his type specimen. The issue is clouded by the general problem with Hodgson's material, lack of information. If the original Hodgson label survives, or its information has been copied onto a new label, two pieces of data become available. First, there will be a "Hodgson number", which is that of the drawing that Hodgson retained as his master collection. The drawing number should then lead to the unpublished drawing, which should represent the species. Second, there will be a BMNH accession number which begins with the year; usually this will be the year that the specimen was received, or the year after. No collection date is available, and only very rarely will the information on the back of a drawing yield more than the day and month. And this information is in no sense tied to a specimen unless it is apparent that Hodgson never had more than a single specimen. Understandably, Hodgson used this drawing number for every comparable specimen, but in the case of new taxa a hunt for types it is impossible without knowing a date of collection, to be sure which specimen was collected before and which after the new taxon was described.

Nor is it clear that Hodgson's types were, in fact, amongst his many specimens donated to the BMNH. Like many others at that time he had no concept of 'type specimen'. In Comment 51 we note that Hodgson's earliest descriptions, up to 1842, ap-

peared before Hodgson contacted the BMNH and that a 'type' of any of these could have been sent to Sir William Jardine, the Zoological Society of London or the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

