

Systematic notes on Asian birds. 22.¹

A preliminary review of the Campephagidae

E.C. Dickinson & R.W.R.J. Dekker

Dickinson, E.C. & R.W.R.J. Dekker. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 22. A preliminary review of the Campephagidae.

Zool. Verh. Leiden 340, 27.xii.2002: 7-30.— ISSN 0024-1652/ISBN 90-73239-84-2.

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

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

Keywords: cuckoo-shrikes; cicadabirds; trillers; minivets; Campephagidae; review.

The taxonomic treatment of Asian taxa of cuckoo-shrikes and minivets and their allies (Campephagidae) is discussed and recommendations are made for further evaluation or awareness of competing hypotheses as to treatment.

Introduction

In preparing the text for a planned 'Synopsis of the Birds of Asia' (see Introduction to 'Systematic notes on Asian birds': Dickinson & Dekker, 2000) we compare treatment in the Check-list of Birds of the World (Peters et al., 1960), in this case of the cuckoo-shrikes and minivets and their allies, with more recent treatments and we comment on points arising from the Check-list itself. Proposals made in some recent works have been examined, and in the case of some of these the context is clarified. Our recommendations, as to the treatment to adopt in the Synopsis, are intended to be consistent with the tradition of requiring the publication of convincing evidence for change, in as much detail as is needed from case to case. Our recommendations are explained where other views are preferred in major publications.

In this review of the Campephagidae there has been no recent monograph on the group to provide a framework for us. The major reviews of some or all of the Asian cuckoo-shrikes (Ripley, 1941; Voous & van Marle, 1949; Delacour, 1951) antedate Peters et al. (1960) but are helpful reading for a detailed understanding of the subject. Most thorough reviews of individual species treated here also preceded Peters et al. (1960). Two regional works have been very helpful: White & Bruce (1986) laid the ground for our treatment of the Wallacean species, and Schodde & Mason (1999) have provided valuable relevant background information in their accounts of the genera and of the Australian species.

We refer to Peters et al. (1960) throughout here, however the author of the sections on *Pericrocotus*, *Hemipus* and *Tephrodornis* was Deignan, while Mayr worked only on

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

Coracina (and on that genus it is not wholly clear where Peters stopped and Mayr began) and *Lalage*. In their list of references the important work of Stresemann (1930) on the genus *Pericrocotus* was unfortunately not mentioned.

Our list, in the accompanying paper on types (Dickinson et al., 2002, this issue) includes the following which have been described since Peters's Check-list (1960): *Coracina striata boholensis* Rand & Rabor, 1959; *Coracina coerulescens deschauenseei* duPont, 1972; *Coracina morio lecroyae* Parkes, 1971; *Coracina morio ripleyi* Parkes, 1971; *Coracina melaschistos quyi* Dao Van Thien, 1961; *Pericrocotus flammeus gonzalesi* Ripley & Rabor, 1961; *Pericrocotus flammeus nigroluteus*, Parkes, 1981 (originally named *neglectus* by Parkes, 1974).

It should be noted that within this series of papers we retain the family limits used by Peters et al. (1960). We do this solely for convenience; we accept that the genus *Tephradornis* is not now considered part of this family.

The cuckoo-shrikes and cicadabirds require further work to establish the plumage sequences (as do the minivets, although the specific limits of these seem better resolved). This work is made difficult by the rather small number of specimens held, in major collections such as Tring (BMNH)² and New York (AMNH), of several of the taxa. Some specimens are almost certainly mis-sexed, and occasional specimens, with plumages that seem intermediate between male and female plumage, are probably confusing examples of the moult sequence that awaits elucidation.

Generic treatment

Peters et al. (1960) accepted the genera *Pteropodocys* (monotypic Australian species), *Coracina* and *Campochaera* (endemic to New Guinea). Both before then and since, there has been a progressive acceptance of a broader genus. Schodde & Mason (1999) included the ground-dwelling species (*maxima* Rüppell, 1839) in *Coracina*, giving *Pteropodocys* subgeneric rank only.

The species of the genus *Coracina* Vieillot, 1816, are called cuckoo-shrikes or cicadabirds. The former, *Coracina sensu stricto*, are larger, broader billed and usually sexually monomorphic (Schodde & Mason, 1999), while the latter, the *Edolisoma* group, are smaller, more slender-billed and usually sexually dimorphic. A third group, also small, and once treated as a genus *Volvocivora*, seems distinguishable and may form a link to the trillers (*Lalage*) (Mayr & Ripley, 1941) although Wolters (1977) disagreed and treated *Volvocivora* within his subgenus *Ceblepyris*. Peters et al. (1960) apparently preferred not to treat these as subgenera but provided footnotes to demarcate these groups.

Our ability to understand whether these are two or three natural groups deserving generic recognition has been hampered by the combination of limited taxonomic study and significant conflicts of view between authors who usually only reviewed part of the assemblage. Efforts have been made to hypothesise a history of distribution (Voous & van Marle, 1949). Following Mayr (1944: 189), in the case of the *Coracina novaehollandiae* group (including *macei* and *javensis*), they postulated the relatively recent colonisation of Australia via Timor. More recently Schodde & Mason (1999)

² A key to the acronyms we use will be found in the accompanying type paper (Dickinson et al., 2002).

pointed out that the greatest species density is in Australia-New Guinea and Wallacea and that radiation into south-east Asia may have been from there. The pattern is not unlike that in the genus *Dicrurus*.

There appears to be some evidence of differing brooding behaviour between the groups and data on voice are somewhat supportive. As genetic information becomes available it is likely that present arrangements will require some revision and that several separate genera will be well supported.

Coracina macei (Lesson, 1831) and *Coracina javensis* (Horsfield, 1821)

Peters et al. (1960) employed a broad species *Coracina novaehollandiae* (J.F. Gmelin, 1789). This broad species has not been accepted by recent authors and although several species are accepted there has been no detailed subsequent study of the relationships of the different taxa and "there is little agreement on species limits" (Schodde & Mason, 1999). One reason for the rejection of the broad species concept appears to lie in evidence put forward by Mason & McKean (1982) associating *personata* (S. Müller, 1843) with "other allospecies" (Schodde & Mason, 1999). White in White & Bruce (1986) considered the arrangement by Ripley (1941), the one accepted in Peters et al. (1960), to be "somewhat arbitrary" and considered the group better treated as a superspecies of which *novaehollandiae* should be seen as an essentially Australian component species. He mentioned *personata*, *atriceps* (S. Müller, 1843) and *schistacea* (Sharpe, 1878) as other members of the superspecies. Bruce in the Addenda appeared to expand the superspecies beyond the concept adopted by White and indicated that he would treat *macei* (Lesson, 1831) and *javensis* (Horsfield, 1821) as two separate component species. Here then we have fresh arbitrary arrangements reflecting the view that lumping had gone too far. What we do not have is scientific evidence as to specific limits.

Whether *C. macei* and *javensis* really belong to separate species is unresolved. At the heart of this lies the question of whether the form *larutensis* (Sharpe, 1887) of peninsular Malaysia belongs with *macei* or with *javensis*. Here is a typical case where previous workers have reached conclusions based on the geographical focus of their own expertise. Workers on Indian birds based their wider view on their knowledge of *macei*. Further east *javensis* was treated as a valid species, only binomials then being employed and eventually Robinson (1928) perceived *larutensis* as a form of *javensis* in which he has been followed, since the break-up of *C. novaehollandiae*, by Robson (2000).

Kuroda (1933) united *C. macei* and *javensis* (the latter is then, of course, the prior name). Ripley (1941) felt that the Malay and Javan forms resembled "*macei* more closely than they do any of the other forms" and supported this; he also mentioned the absence of Sumatran and Bornean representatives. Ripley did not discuss the possibility that *javensis* may be endemic to Java with all forms on the Asian mainland better treated as races of *macei*. Deignan (1963) considered that Thai birds, of the race *siamensis* (Baker, 1918), ranged south to the Isthmus of Kra. The gap between the isthmus and the range of *larutensis* appears far less than the gap between the Malay Peninsula and Java. We suggest tentatively that either *javensis* should subsume *macei*, or that *javensis* should be seen as endemic to Java and Bali, as Sibley & Monroe (1990: 479) treated it. On this we await the conclusions of Wells (in prep.) with great interest.

We accept the view of Ripley (1982), and earlier of Baker (1918), that birds from north and south of the Brahmaputra are best united and we consider *lushaiensis* Koelz, 1954, a synonym of *nipalensis* (Hodgson, 1836). However, frequently birds north and south of the Brahmaputra do belong to different races; a detailed study might reveal this.

***Coracina novaehollandiae* (J.F. Gmelin, 1789)**

Schodde & Mason (1999) reviewed this Australian species; within the species *sensu stricto* they considered that *didimus* Mathews, 1912, did not deserve subspecific recognition, but accepted three Australian subspecies. Peters et al. (1960) treated *kuehni* Hartert, 1916, as a synonym of *didimus* so it now becomes a synonym of *melanops* (Latham, 1802)³. The species is known from our area from apparent migrants reaching much of Wallacea (White & Bruce, 1986). There would appear to be no evidence yet to suggest that any form save *melanops* occurs in our area, however Bruce in White & Bruce (1986) urged that Wallacean specimens be re-checked if *subpallida* were to be recognised. Schodde & Mason (1999) do recognise that as a valid form; the colouration of the breast 'silvery grey to whitish grey' versus 'light to mid grey' in other Australian birds, may be distinctive enough to allow differentiation and skins from Wallacea should now be re-examined. It should be noted that Tasmanian birds may be the longest distance migrants and this should be considered too.

***Coracina personata* (S. Müller, 1843)**

Peters et al. (1960) included this within *C. novaehollandiae* – listing five Lesser Sunda races that can be interpreted as the core of what we now call *C. personata* and treated *C. pollens* (Salvadori, 1874) as a polytypic species with forms inhabiting Tanimbar and the Kai Islands. White & Bruce (1986), decoupling *C. novaehollandiae*, reduced the Lesser Sunda races to four by the submergence of *lettiensis* (Meyer, 1885) and attached allopatric *pollens* and *unimoda* (P.L. Slater, 1883). We are not aware of reasons to disagree, although Ripley (1941) remarked on the apparent similarities of *pollens* to *caledonica* (J.F. Gmelin, 1788).

***Coracina fortis* (Salvadori, 1878)**

Ripley (1941) did not lump *C. fortis* with *novaehollandiae*, having no specimens of *fortis* available, but anticipated that its affinities would prove to be with *C. atriceps* (S. Müller, 1843), an allopatric Moluccan relative. White in White & Bruce (1986) would have placed *fortis* within the species *C. personata*, but Bruce disagreed and revised the species account to reflect Ripley's provisional separation. In the light of Ripley's lack of specimens it may be helpful to a future study to know that Leiden (RMNH) has four specimens, all of which have been sexed as females.

³ For reasons to use 1802 in place of 1801 see the accompanying type paper - Dickinson et al. (2002).

Coracina schistacea (Sharpe, 1878)

The race *petersi* Neumann, 1939, was recognised in Peters et al. (1960). White & Bruce (1986) did not feel it merited recognition based on the material available. We follow them.

Coracina striata (Boddaert, 1783)

The treatment in Peters et al. (1960) was that of Ripley (1941) with the exception that *crissalis* (Salvadori, 1894) of the Mentawai Islands was placed in the synonymy of *sumatrensis* (S. Müller, 1843). Since Peters et al. (1960) a new race *boholensis* Rand & Rabor, 1959, has been described from Bohol, but the unification of this assemblage has not been strongly challenged.

In fact, however, Ripley (1941) emphasised the distinctness of *dobsoni* (Ball, 1872) from the Andamans, which should be re-evaluated, and noted some discordance in *vordermani* (Hartert, 1901) from Kangean.

There are also differences of varying degree between the Philippine forms, initially discussed by Ogilvie-Grant (1896). These no doubt reflect stages of progressive colonisation from Borneo, when at times of different glaciations lowered sea levels afforded several opportunities for this. Ripley (1941), discussing the races *mindorensis* (Steere, 1890) and *guillemardi* (Salvadori, 1886), stated that Raven (1935) had referred to Mindoro and the Sulu Islands as "remnants of an old continental area along with the Greater Sunda Islands". Recent geological evidence, discussed in Dickinson et al. (1991), would admit that the Sulu Islands may represent an island arc that was associated with the Bornean mainland, but would certainly not see Mindoro as possessed of such a history. Voous & van Marle (1949) presented an historical scenario for differentiation in this species with which we would largely agree (although we would not necessarily consider the distinct races of the west Sumatran islands as amongst the "ancestral" forms). But these authors did not examine the Andaman form (*dobsoni*). They did suggest that *vordermani* of the Kangean islands, which has a different pattern of difference between males and females, seems to be a later relict perhaps due to the early isolation of these islands when sea levels increased again.

In summary, it seems likely that this species remains over-lumped.

Coracina papuensis (J.F. Gmelin, 1788)

The population of the Moluccas, named *melanolora* (G.R. Gray, 1860), was accepted in Peters et al. (1960) but was considered doubtfully distinct by Mees (1982) and was submerged by White & Bruce (1986). The latter authors, in a second disagreement with Peters et al. (1960), submerged *timorlaensis* (Meyer, 1884) in *hypoleuca* (Gould, 1848), presuming that birds that had been taken in Tanimbar and the Kai Islands were vagrants from the Australian population.

Coracina coerulescens (Blyth, 1842)

No change since Peters et al. (1960), except that a new race *deschauenseei* duPont, 1972, has been described from Marinduque.

***Coracina dispar* (Salvadori, 1878)**

Peters et al. (1960) treated this as a race of *tenuirostris* (Jardine, 1831), however White & Bruce (1986) felt that *dispar* should be treated as a species. In support of this they reported limited evidence of possible sympatry. They reported that in Seram Laut (Maar) where *dispar* is resident an immature male that may be attributable to the race *C. t. amboinensis* (Hartlaub, 1865) has also been collected. We know of no recent information about possible sympatry. White & Bruce also remarked on the unusual island arc distribution of this form.

***Coracina tenuirostris* (Jardine, 1831)**

Peters et al. (1960) accepted 33 races, twelve of them from Wallacea, but these included *dispar*, which is now considered a monotypic species, and the birds of the Sangihe and Talaud Islands, respectively *salvadorii* (Sharpe, 1878) and *talautensis* (Meyer & Wigglesworth, 1895). Eck (1976) considered these two races resembled each other closely and that their derivation might as easily be from the northern Moluccas as from Sulawesi. White & Bruce (1986) considered that the balance of probability favoured association with Sulawesi birds and united them with *C. morio* (S. Müller, 1843).

Among the remaining nine named races, and an unnamed form they listed from Seram Laut, White & Bruce (1986) perceived two groups of subspecies. One of these groups has unbarred females; this comprises only *obiensis* (Salvadori, 1878) and *pelingi* (Hartert, 1918). The other larger group, 7 named forms and one unnamed, has females differing markedly from males and barred below. White & Bruce (1986) felt the distinction was insufficient to justify splitting the species but this complex obviously needs further study.

Sulawesi holds one key to understanding the relationship between *C. tenuirostris* and *C. morio*. The latter is the common species there, but White & Bruce (1986) listed both species from southern Sulawesi because of a single female specimen of *tenuirostris* collected in November 1931 at Barong, near Maros and named *edithae* (Stresemann, 1932). Whether this represents breeding sympatry or post-breeding dispersal of the insular species to the large island is not clear.

***Coracina mindanensis* (Tweeddale, 1879)**

Peters et al. (1960) treated three Philippine forms as part of the species *C. morio*. Two additional forms (*lecroyae* and *ripleyi*) were described by Parkes (1971).

White & Bruce (1986) treated *morio* as the Sulawesi Cicadabird, listing just three races with a range encompassing Sulawesi and neighbouring small islands, and reaching out to the Sangihe group and the more distant, but associated, Talaud group. They did not explain their decision to separate *morio* from *mindanensis* and in this way to differ from Peters et al. (1960), except to say that they had not explored whether *mindanensis* and *incerta* (Meyer, 1874) should be seen as components of a species *ceramensis* (Bonaparte, 1850). Of course Hartert (1918) had previously suggested that the two groups should be treated as separate from a third group that he named *obiensis*. The

change of species concept by White & Bruce (1986) was quite simply overlooked by Dickinson et al. (1991), partly due to too tight a focus on Philippine taxa. In keeping the Philippine forms within *morio* Dickinson et al. (1991) just followed past practice, they did not reassess Philippine forms versus the forms listed by White & Bruce. This situation was eventually re-examined. In 1999 ECD reviewed specimens at the AMNH and found the female plumage in the two quite different⁴. In consequence of that Kennedy et al. (2000) accepted *mindanensis* as an endemic species. Where there are perceptible links between Philippine avian taxa and birds from the Moluccas and New Guinea these are at generic level with virtually no case of conspecificity in the case of polytypic species.

***Coracina morio* (S. Müller, 1843)**

The broad species of Peters et al. (1960) has since been split into five parts by White & Bruce (1986): *C. mindanensis*, as explained above, *morio sensu stricto*, *sula* (Hartert, 1918) and *ceramensis* as treated below and a monotypic Papuan *incerta* with which we are not here concerned, and which was also outside their scope. It was White & Bruce too who submerged *wiglesworthi* (van Oort, 1907) on the grounds that Sulawesi birds varied in a clinal way and that more than the one name for them was unnecessary. The reason they put forward the detachment of *talautensis* and *salvadorii* (Sharpe, 1878) from *tenuirostris* and their attachment to *morio* was noted in our brief comments on *tenuirostris*.

***Coracina sula* (Hartert, 1918)**

Peters et al. (1960) treated this as a form of *C. morio*. White & Bruce (1986) removed both this and *ceramensis* from *C. morio*. White wrote "on general faunistic grounds one would expect that *C. sula* might be closely related to *C. t. pelingi*, and this I believe is really the case as indicated by the reddish juvenile plumage". However, he also argued that the extreme masculinisation of the female plumage⁵ demanded specific recognition in the same way that Mayr in Peters et al. (1960) had recognised *dohertyi* (Hartert, 1896) and that Galbraith & Galbraith (1962) had recognised *salomonis* (Tristram, 1879).

***Coracina ceramensis* (Bonaparte, 1850)**

White & Bruce (1986) noted that this species occurs in Seram and Obi as do races of *C. tenuirostris* and said that they "saw no clear ground for linking *C. morio* to *C. ceramensis*" as had been done by Peters et al. (1960).

⁴ In *C. morio* all females are barred below over a more or less rufous (*C. m. morio*) or buffy (*C. m. wiglesworthi*) wash, and have rufous under tail coverts. Females of *C. mindanensis* have the unbarred underparts greyish white, whitest on the under tail coverts.

⁵ Both sexes are blue-grey not grey, the females are paler than the males, but much more similar than in the case of other species.

***Coracina ostenta* Ripley, 1952**

Parkes (1971) explained that Ripley (1952a) had correctly proposed a new name for *C. panayensis* (Steere, 1890). This is further explained in Dickinson et al. (2002, this issue).

***Coracina mcgregori* (Mearns, 1907)**

The race *peterseni* (Salomonsen, 1953) was recognised in Peters et al. (1960), but was placed in synonymy by Ripley & Rabor (1961).

***Coracina melaschistos* (Hodgson, 1836)**

For many years the two names *melaschistos* and *lugubris* (Sundevall, 1837) were both dated from 1837 and some authors ascribed priority to Sundevall's name. Baker (1930) cited Hodgson's paper as from November 1836 and we do not believe this has been refuted.

Dao Van Thien (1961) proposed a new subspecies named *quyi*. This was based on a single April specimen marginally longer winged than *saturata* (Swinhoe, 1870). Allowing for differences that arise due to differing measuring techniques and for the comments of Delacour (1951), who wrote of *saturata*: "Some specimens are very blackish, almost glossy above, but there seems to be a great deal of individual variation in color", this proposed subspecies cannot be accepted on the basis of a single specimen.

***Coracina melanoptera* (Rüppell, 1839)**

Until it was discovered by Delacour (1951) that the type of *C. melanoptera* was of smaller size, and not, as had been thought a large bird such as *C. melaschistos*, this species was called *sykesi* (Strickland, 1844).

***Lalage nigra* (Forster, 1781)**

There have been some years of confusion here. They flow from the original description of *Turdus niger* by Forster (1781). Peters et al. (1960) considered that *niger* was associated with a terra typica of the East Indies (India Orientale) and that it had been restricted by Bangs (1922) to Singapore. However Baker (1923) said that Forster's type locality was "India" and, apparently unaware of the remarks of Bangs (1922) restricted the type locality to Camorta, Nicobars "the only locality within India proper where this species is found". In fact Forster mentioned his source: "Br. [= Brisson] II. 248" and as explained by Stresemann (1952) Brisson (1760) used the vernacular names "Le Merle des Indes" and "Terat-Boulan" and had received his material from Pierre Poivre. On the available evidence Stresemann argued that Singapore could not be accepted and that Manila should be treated as the corrected type locality. This view was footnoted by Peters et al. (1960), but was not accepted. This was probably due to a reluctance to make the necessary consequent changes to the nomenclature (yet these

too were footnoted). In many of the cases examined by Stresemann (1952), but not all, the conclusions reached have been accepted. In the course of our series the disputed cases will be mentioned.

In this instance, probably because of the way Stresemann's views were handled by Peters et al. (1960), there was much delay in accepting the change. Deignan (1963) accepted it and used *striga* (Horsfield, 1821) as appropriate for birds from south peninsular Thailand, but, without explanation, Medway & Wells (1976) retained the name *nigra* for this population. As pointed out by Mees (1986), Smythies (1957) adopted Stresemann's views and used the name *nigra* for the Bornean population. Mees did not reach a conclusion then on whether to accept Stresemann's view; he was hoping for news from the Philippines on whether "terat-boulan" was a known name. McGregor (1910) gave several local names for this species but none resembles this. Mees (1986) confirmed that Bornean specimens match Philippine birds. Later Mees (1996) reported that a closely similar vernacular name in one of the Philippine languages did seem to relate to one or more shrikes of the genus *Lanius* and recommended acceptance of the transfer of the name *nigra* to the Philippine and Bornean population. Dickinson et al. (1991) followed Peters et al. (1960) and employed the name *chilensis* (Meyen, 1834) for the Philippine population. Mees (1996) pointed out that there was a misunderstanding here, but Kennedy et al. (2000) did not read Mees's fresh views in time to correct the name they used. We have now reconsidered Stresemann's argument in the light of the comments by Mees (1986, 1996). We agree with Mees that the reasons given by Bangs for accepting Singapore were unsatisfactory and in view of the important role played by Poivre in early Philippine ornithology we can see no good reason to disagree with Stresemann (1952). We thus adopt the name *nigra* for the populations of Borneo and the Philippines and *striga* for the population of the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra and Java.

Escott & Holmes (1980) reported that *L. sueurii* (Vieillot, 1818a) was expanding in southern Sulawesi "possibly" in competition with this species. Mees (1986) noted this co-existence of *leucopygialis* Walden, 1872, and *sueurii* in southern Sulawesi and that they cannot be lumped. His evidence from Java did not demonstrate overlap between *nigra* and *sueurii* nor could he report any intergrades. In his opinion "judging by plumage characters, *L. sueurii* is closer to *L. nigra* than *L. leucopygialis* is". Despite this we tentatively follow Peters et al. (1960) and treat *leucopygialis* of Sulawesi as a subspecies of *L. nigra* - although it may indeed deserve specific status (White & Bruce, 1986).

Lalage sueurii (Vieillot, 1818)

We have discussed above the need to treat this as distinct from *leucopygialis* and the nature of evidence from Java. White & Bruce (1986) suggested that this occurred "probably sympatrically with *L. nigra*" in central Java, but Mees (1986) showed that the evidence is not available to support this conclusion and Mees (1996) had no fresh information in respect of possible overlap or intergrades.

Although it is extralimital to our region perhaps it should be noted that *L. tricolor* (Swainson, 1825) which Peters et al. (1960) treated as a subspecies is now treated as a valid species (White & Bruce, 1986; Schodde & Mason, 1999).

Pericrocotus cantonensis Swinhoe, 1861

For some years the prevailing view was that of Stresemann (1930) who linked *cantonensis* and *roseus* (Vieillot, 1818b) with *divaricatus* (Raffles, 1822) and *tegimae* Stejneger, 1887) in a single species. Peters et al. (1960) treated this as a superspecies with these two groups in it. Morioka (2000) agreed that the difference in wing pattern between *roseus* and *divaricatus* was sufficient for recognition of two species.

Stresemann (1930) had referred to *stanfordi* Vaughan & Jones, 1913, as a "hybrid form" – a cross between a lipochromatic *roseus* and *cantonensis* which appears to lack the lipochromes. There is a widespread problem in ornithological literature that derives from occasional use of the term 'hybridisation' as if it is interchangeable with 'meeting and interbreeding' and yet birds that meet and interbreed may, when enough evidence has been collected, be shown to be intergrades between two forms where the gene flow does not demonstrate a persistent demarcation. In general writers to-day distinguish such cases, and they do so based on the increased clarity brought to the subject by various debates about hybrid swarms and the exact effects of observed cases of taxa meeting. In other cases, including this one, the necessary field studies are still needed or are insufficiently documented. Peters et al. (1960) treated *stanfordi* as a subspecies, but mentioned that it was an unstable race (probably a good indicator that there was in fact hybridisation). Meyer de Schauensee (1984) treated *cantonensis* as separate from *roseus* and said that *stanfordi* "may well be a hybrid" suggesting a narrow band of hybridisation "from Canton along the West River to Teching". Cheng (1987) did not split *cantonensis* from *roseus* but nevertheless referred to *stanfordi* as a "hybrid population" between the two; an example of the point made above. Inskipp et al. (1996) preferred the treatment of Meyer de Schauensee and we agree that on the limited evidence so far published this seems the better hypothesis.

Pericrocotus divaricatus (Raffles, 1822)

Brazil (1991) argued that *tegimae* should be recognised at specific level, but Morioka (2000) had no doubt that *tegimae* was "a dark, insular race of *P. divaricatus*, males being much darker but females only slightly so and approaching nominate *divaricatus*." He pointed out that greater saturation is a common phenomenon in the Ryukyu forms of Japanese species. Although the two both breed in Kyushu the breeding occurrence there of *tegimae* is recent, sporadic and local and Morioka implied that sympatry had not been established.

Pericrocotus cinnamomeus (Linnaeus, 1766)

Stresemann (1930) reminded his readers that he had earlier (Stresemann, 1923a) shown that the specific name *peregrinus* (Linnaeus, 1766) must yield to *cinnamomeus* on grounds of page priority. This argument, which depended on the description of *cinnamomeus* being determinable, was not accepted by Whistler & Kinnear (1933) for they considered that the matter had been examined and decided by Hume (1877). Nor did Deignan (1947) accept it, but he did accept it in Peters et al. (1960), and it has been universally used since. The evidence is now virtually conclusive; Linnaeus (1766) based

the name *Motacilla cinnamomea* on a drawing made for Governor Loten of Ceylon. The Loten collection, of which the birds are now in The Natural History Museum, has two drawings of male minivets. One, of a bird hanging dead from a branch by a thread, was known by a local name and this is *cinnamomeus*; the other, a depiction of a live bird, is of *flammeus*. These two plates are copied into a single plate, the images being virtually overlaid one upon the other, in Forster (1781) and the upper, live, bird is the subject of his name *Muscicapa flammea*.

Stresemann (1930) listed five subspecies: within India he accepted four forms, *pallidus* Baker, 1920, from Sind and the northwest plains, *peregrinus* from the north and north-west, *vividus* Baker, 1920, from eastern India and northern mainland south-east Asia and *cinnamomeus* from southern India and Ceylon. His fifth race was the disjunct *saturatus* Baker, 1920 from Java and Bali.

Whistler & Kinnear (1933) reported on the various treatments of Baker (1920, 1924, 1929, 1930) and argued that there is more variation than was admitted by Stresemann or Baker: "this species is unusually susceptible to climatic and geographic influences. In Sindh it is a pale desert bird. In the Malabar rain area it is as richly coloured as any tropical species. In Ceylon an island race approximates to another richly coloured bird of Burma and the Andamans. Whilst in the greater part of India an intermediate connects these variant forms, remaining unchanged throughout the immense area of the Peninsula ... and on its edges grading into the other races. To this intermediate the name of *peregrinus* must apply." They added that Hume (1877) had been "prepared to accept, with some reservation, Ceylon as the correct type locality" for *cinnamomeus*, but in the event Hume concluded that the description was inadequate and the name indeterminate. Central to this, however, is Hume's decision that the name *peregrinus* must attach to northern birds. So Whistler & Kinnear (1933) argued that as the type locality had been restricted to Ambala, Punjab, and that it did not apply to either the desert birds of Sind or the more saturated birds of the south, this must be the name that should be applied to their wide-ranging intermediate population. Not having accepted the availability of the name *cinnamomeus* they were obliged to provide a name for the southern form and called it *ceylonensis* Whistler & Kinnear, 1933. They also recognised the race from the west coast – the Malabar rain area – as *malabaricus* J.F. Gmelin, 1789. Except for the acceptance of *cinnamomeus* and the placement of *ceylonensis* in its synonymy this arrangement is that followed for the subcontinent in Peters et al. (1960).

Deignan (1947) decided that the races east of India needed review. He noted that Riley (1940) had recently named southern Indochinese birds, and he considered that birds from eastern Burma and north and east Thailand should be named (although they might eventually be found to intergrade with, and require to be united with, *vividus*), as should those of the northern part of the Malay Peninsula. Deignan's two new races were reviewed and confirmed by Hall (1953).

The separation of *peregrinus* (as he called it) and *igneus* Blyth, 1846 was not re-examined by Deignan (1947). But in Peters et al. (1960) Deignan decided that he would treat them as conspecific, in spite of the constant difference between the glossy black heads in one group and the dull black heads in the other. He footnoted his decision as follows: "Where representatives of the two groups meet, at the Isthmus of Kra, I find no evidence for true sympatry; *separatus* Deignan, 1947, seems to be restricted to

the mangrove association, while *igneus*, when found in coastal districts is a bird of the casuarinas that line the sandy beaches." He also mentioned a single specimen from Prachuab Khiri Khan, which he judged to be intermediate.

Although Medway & Wells (1976) accepted the united species, it was not accepted by King & Dickinson (1975), Lekagul & Round (1991), Inskipp et al. (1996) or Robson (2000). We follow this convention because of the apparent near total lack of intergrading specimens, but the neatly fitting allopatric ranges demand that this puzzle continue to be reviewed from time to time.

The identity of the population of the Andaman islands has been a matter of dispute. Baker (1920) included the Andamans in the range of *viduus*, but Snouckaert van Schauburg (1930) considered them likely to prove distinct. Whistler & Kinnear (1933) disagreed in this view and accepted the views of Baker, as later did Hall (1953) and Deignan in Peters et al. (1960). Earlier however Deignan (1947) discussed the Andaman population and was inclined to believe it was distinct, however he lacked sufficient material and he did not know where Snouckaert van Schauburg's specimens were to be found. They are in fact in Amsterdam and recently Roselaar & Prins (2000: 109) offered a name for the specimen that Snouckaert van Schauburg discussed, but they did not affirm that it is distinctive, they merely promised future evaluation. We look forward to this.

Pericrocotus igneus Blyth, 1846

As explained above we recognise this species. However, further research is needed in peninsular Thailand to confirm that the two forms that meet there do behave as valid species. Molecular studies would also be informative.

Pericrocotus solaris Blyth, 1846

Until Deignan (1938) the populations of the highlands of western Malaysia, Sumatra and Borneo were treated as a species *P. montanus* Salvadori, 1879. Deignan's reason for uniting the two was the intermediate appearance of the population of south-east Thailand. There remains a significant range gap between the birds of the Malayan hills and the nearest population to the north. Logic suggests that uniting these and not uniting *Coracina macei* and *C. javensis* must be doubtful, although we presently retain these different treatments, and both situations deserve molecular study.

Pericrocotus ethologus Bangs & Phillips, 1914

It will be remembered that Mayr (1940) revealed this "sibling species". When writing about this at the beginning of the war Mayr did not have access to specimens in Europe and some of his conclusions were incomplete or unverified. We have not found evidence that these matters have been sufficiently revisited since then and we can now report on some progress⁶.

⁶ Part of which is discussed in the Appendix to Dickinson et al. (2002: this issue).

First, Mayr (1940) restricted the name *Phoenicornis affinis* McClelland, 1840, to his "species B", which is *P. brevirostris* (Vigors, 1831). There had long been agreement that McClelland's two type specimens represented the females of two different species and that one was a female of *brevirostris*, but Mayr's conclusion required that this be validated. There was a need to show which one was a match for his definition of the species *brevirostris*. Hume (1877) like Horsfield & Moore (1854), thought the two types to be a female of *brevirostris* and a female of *solaris*. Mayr (1940) wondered whether the two species represented were *brevirostris* and *ethologus*. The identity of these two types is discussed in the accompanying paper on types (Dickinson et al., 2002, this issue).

Second, Mayr noted that "the names *yvettae*" Bangs, 1921, "and *tonkinensis*" Delacour, 1927, "and possibly *neglectus*" Hume, 1877, "were given to composite type series" and in "every one of these cases" Mayr restricted the name to the male type. On this basis he was able to confirm, first that Hume's description of the male of *neglectus* identified it with *brevirostris*, second to assign *yvettae* to *ethologus* (the taxon had anyway been based on a holotype), and third to state that the male of *tonkinensis* "Delacour, 1927, seems to be *brevirostris*". However he specified that he had not seen the types of *tonkinensis*.

We have examined a female type specimen (BM 1927.6.5.8; coll. No. 2108) of *Pericrocotus brevirostris tonkinensis*. It has a broad area of yellow over the crown and not simply a very narrow frontal band, and this seems to confirm that it belongs to the species *brevirostris*. Both the two selected types of Delacour (1927) are *brevirostris*. Whether this name was applied to a composite series would require the examination of the whole type series. We have looked at a second female (BM 1927.6.5.660, coll. No. 2109), doubtless from the original type series, and this is a good match for the female type. There may be other specimens from Delacour's type series that are representative of *ethologus*, if so should a male be found among them then a male that represents *P. b. tonkinensis* must be designated as the lectotype. Due to Mayr's restriction of the name, to the male, females that prove to be *ethologus* need not concern us.

In Indochina King & Dickinson (1975) reported *brevirostris* from N Laos and from Tonkin and reported *ethologus* from S Annam, N and S Laos and Tonkin. South Laos may have been an error for Central Laos; ECD's notes from the preparation of that work suggest that only Savannakhet material was confirmed. But Mayr (1940) had examined five males and three females of *brevirostris* from N Laos and Tonkin, and specimens of nominate *ethologus* from Tonkin, and had assigned *annamensis* Robinson & Kloss, 1923a, to the species *ethologus*. Robson (2000), like King & Dickinson (1975), did not list *brevirostris* from Annam.

Kloss took 16 specimens of '*brevirostris*' in southern Annam (essentially from the Langbian Plateau) in April and May (Robinson & Kloss, 1919); one female from this series became the holotype of *annamensis*. The collection was shared between the British Museum (BM 1919.12.20.208-211) and the Raffles Museum, Singapore. The holotype was originally retained in the Raffles Museum but has since been transferred and numbered BM 1959.3.1.

Robinson & Kloss (1919) noted considerable variation: "the females of this series have the crown black, in two cases glossy; the light colour of the under parts of the body orange yellow suffused with red. Four have the tails pinky red and one yellowish; the latter has the wing-patches yellow and the rump orange, while in the others

the rump and the wing patches are as the under surfaces of the tail, but more brilliant. Young birds are clear yellow without any hint of red." We have sought to reassemble the Tring component of his series. No. 208 could not be located. 209 is a male, 210 is female with a narrow orange frontal area and the wing speculum, rump, and parts of the rectrices pale reddish, the back has a slight greenish tinge; 211 is a female just beginning to moult into first summer plumage, the head and back are still barred. There is an unsigned note in a tray in the cabinet at Tring suggesting that 208 and 209 are of *brevirostris* type and are not *ethologus*.

We had expected that two species might be included in the overall material in Tring from southern Annam, so we took the above-mentioned note seriously. After reading the note one of us examined No. 209 carefully and wrote "Colour: orange-red; black area of throat perhaps a little more extended than other males; the second inner pair of tail feathers does not have a narrow red outer edge, but the red angles across the feather from the outer web to the inner, almost reaching the tip of the feather on the inner web. No black margin evident on the distal half of the inner secondaries. In the folded wing the speculum appears as a single block that is equally wide; in three others supposed to be *annamensis* the speculum varies in width, so that in the folded wing it varies from wide to narrow to long; the gloss on the upper parts is more purplish than in other adult males". The varying apparent width of the "speculum" is consistent with the illustrations in pl. 39 in King & Dickinson (1975) and pl. 63 in Robson (2000) of *ethologus*. Telling against this might seem to be the orange red coloration but no comparative colour was noted for the other specimens. On balance No. 209 would appear not to represent *ethologus* the species to which *annamensis*, based on the description of its female type, was assigned by Mayr; so there do indeed seem to be two species represented, and there is a clear need to bring more specimens together. No. 210, a female, is a good match for the female type. A later specimen (BM 1928.6.26.1003) collected by Delacour and others is also a good match. As stated No. 211 is a young female moulting into a later plumage, this could not be reliably associated with either species.

Turning from the Kloss material to the Delacour specimens, we also found BM 1928.6.26.1005, in which the speculum is orange like the underparts not red, and the rump brighter orange but also not red, to be difficult to assign. Mayr (1940) assembled 15 adult males, six immature females and six adult females from southern Annam. These would seem not have included specimens from Kloss's trip, unless some were available in an American museum that the Raffles Museum had passed on. Of these Mayr wrote there "are some very puzzling specimens which might possibly belong rather to *brevirostris* than to *ethologus*. Most of the specimens are moulting and are unsuitable for a thorough study".

Some detailed questions will need to be addressed. Why do some males reportedly have glossy heads and others not? Are 'birds of the year' of both sexes yellow (or does this apply in one species and not in the other)? There is a Delacour male collected 17.3.27 [No. 3998], which seems to be moulting directly from a yellow plumage to a red.

A detailed and more complete study bringing together almost all the available material from the Langbian Plateau should allow us to resolve this, but on the limited evidence available in Tring all we feel comfortable saying is that both species seem to be represented there.

One of the races that Mayr (1940) named was *cryptus* from northern Thailand and the Shan States, but Deignan (1945) suggested that the trinomial from the name *P. solaris ripponi* Baker, 1924, might be applicable and Hall (1953) confirmed this to be so.

Pericrocotus brevirostris (Vigors, 1831)

Mayr (1940) reported that the "exact range of *P. brevirostris* cannot be given until the material of the European museums has been studied critically"⁷ and he placed the names *affinis* McClelland, 1840, *neglectus* Hume, 1877, *pulcherrimus* Salvadori, 1887, *anthoides* Stresemann, 1923b, and *tonkinensis* Delacour, 1927, in synonymy.

Peters et al. (1960) recognised four races: *brevirostris*, *affinis*, *neglectus* (with *pulcherrimus* in synonymy) and *anthoides* (with *tonkinensis* in synonymy). This was not the subject of a preliminary paper, except that of Hall (1953) who urged the recognition of the race *neglectus*, and Ripley (1961, 1982) preferred to retain *affinis* as a synonym of *brevirostris*. After dealing with the selection and designation of a lectotype of *affinis*, see Dickinson et al. (2002: this issue), several specimens were examined of birds that might be attributed to *affinis*. Based on the few females checked the characters given by Baker (1924) for distinguishing females of *affinis* from females of *brevirostris* did not seem convincing and we suspect Ripley may well be right, but a more detailed review is needed.

Pericrocotus flammeus (Forster, 1781)

Looking solely at the Indian subcontinent, there appears to be an orange species *flammeus* of Ceylon and peninsular India, and mainly of western peninsular India, which is quite distinct, and disjunct, from the scarlet races of the subcontinent – which could be conveniently treated as another species, *speciosus* (Latham, 1790).

This was how Ticehurst in Stanford & Ticehurst (1931) and Whistler & Kinnear (1933) understood it. Just a few years earlier however Stresemann (1930) provided a basis for understanding the whole complex throughout south and south-east Asia, listing 16 races; however, apart from indicating the ranges of wing lengths for males of ten of the 16 races, Stresemann provided little supporting detail.

These three previous arrangements, two limited in their geographic coverage, did not agree and paid scant attention to south-east Asia. Deignan (1946) brought together over 300 specimens (he said 408, but our count of the sum of his subsets does reach that number) and re-appraised the situation. His 18 races included the recently proposed race *semiruber* Whistler & Kinnear, 1933, and two wholly new races *insulanus* Deignan, 1946, and *suchitrae* Deignan, 1946. Compared with Stresemann's 16 races the addition of three forms should make 19. The reduction was of a previously recognised race in the swathe of territory running from Assam in the west to Hainan in the east. Here we accept Deignan's view that this territory is best seen as occupied by one form, but his opinion on the nomenclature of this population has sometimes been rejected.

⁷ As regards the type locality of *brevirostris* we follow Mayr (1940). See also Dickinson et al. (2002).

In fact it was not Deignan (1946) but Ticehurst in Stanford & Ticehurst (1931) who reintroduced the name *elegans* (Horsfield, 1840) for the birds of Assam and Burma. He stated "somewhere it may grade into *fraterculus*" Swinhoe, 1870, "as it certainly does into *flammifer*" Hume, 1875, "in the Peninsular of Burma, which again grades into *xanthogaster*" (Raffles, 1822) "further south still". However, Deignan (1946) in using the name *elegans*, with *fraterculus* in synonymy, wrote that it had "long been recognised that the Scarlet Minivet of Assam cannot be separated from that of Hainan, and Assamese populations have been called *fraterculus*." The use of *fraterculus* Swinhoe, 1870 had been the position of Baker (1924); but Stresemann (1930) had limited *fraterculus* to Hainan and listed *bakeri* La Touche, 1922, as the name for the population from Assam to Indochina and southern Yunnan.

To understand why Ripley (1961, 1982) did not accept Deignan's views, and continued to use *fraterculus* for this extensive population, it is necessary to know the factual details and understand the logic that each used in the decision process.

Phaenicornis elegans was described from Assam. The collector, and apparent author of the paper⁸, was John McClelland, who led a deputation to investigate the tea industry in Assam in 1836. It has been accepted that the name *elegans* is attached to a specimen⁹ that belongs to the species *Pericrocotus flammeus sensu lato*. The Himalayan population of this has the trinomial *speciosus* Latham, 1790. Deignan (1946) reviewed the broad species *flammeus* and concluded that while the west and central Himalayas are occupied by *speciosus* the birds of Assam differed. He restricted the type locality of *elegans* to Sadiya, northeastern Assam (just south of the Brahmaputra in the central valley of Assam).

Ali & Ripley (1948) reporting on the birds of the Mishmi Hills (in the eastern Himalayas north of the Brahmaputra), and later (Ripley, 1952b) reporting on the birds of the Naga Hills (in Assam south of the Brahmaputra and well to the west of Sadiya), argued that birds north of the Brahmaputra were closest to *speciosus*, and that it was those from the Naga Hills that were indeed different. Arguing that there was no evidence that McClelland had ever visited Sadiya Ripley re-restricted the type locality to Shillong in the Khasi Hills (west of the Naga Hills), the acknowledged centre for McClelland's stay.

Deignan in Peters et al. (1960) accepted Ripley's view that the type locality of *elegans* should be set as Shillong and gave a distribution for it running from the Khasi Hills east through Burma to Indochina, SE Yunnan and Hainan Island. This range included the type localities of two newer names: *fraterculus* from Hainan and *bakeri* La Touche, 1922, from southern Yunnan. Peters et al. (1960) listed the latter as a synonym, but did not list *fraterculus*.

Ripley (1961) changed his mind. He had found a paper published by Kinnear (1937) which stated that McClelland did visit Sadiya. This meant, he said, that his grounds for re-restricting the type locality had been shown to be incorrect and that Deignan's earlier restriction should stand. This led him to place *elegans* in the syn-

⁸ But in this case, and some others, the description was wholly that of Horsfield.

⁹ In this connection see Dickinson et al. (2002: this issue) for a discussion on the troubled history of the type material and how this may have clouded judgements by those seeking to determine a type locality.

onymy of *speciosus* presumably on the view that birds from Sadiya were closer to *speciosus* than they were to those in most of Assam south of the Brahmaputra. Ripley then used *fraterculus* as the name for the wide-ranging population running from the Khasi Hills to Hainan. In fact birds labelled Sadiya are quite likely to be *speciosus* from the Himalayan foothills that reach the plains there in winter (Hume, 1877).

Deignan (1963) may have been unaware that Ripley had changed his mind, which is unlikely, or have believed that one could not retract the correction of a type locality. More probably he simply disagreed that Sadiya birds were *speciosus*, and he retained the name *elegans* for the eastern population (a winter visitor to northern Thailand). Ripley (1982) retained *fraterculus* and so we have two names in "current" use for the same population.

A decision in this context is made against the background of Art. 76 of the Code (ICZN, 1999). This provides for the correction of a type locality that is found to be erroneous; but it does not pronounce on whether a correction may be retracted and if so in what circumstances.

Ticehurst in Stanford & Ticehurst (1931) argued that *fraterculus* should have the central tail feathers wholly black and should not, on this account, be united with what older writers had called *elegans*. Deignan (1946) showed that tail patterns are much more variable than was previously thought, giving details of no less than eight populations, including *fraterculus*. Dickinson et al. (2002; this issue) report on the type material relative to *elegans*. We find that the tail proportions, whether of the paralectotype, or of the specimen erroneously treated as its type by previous authors, suggest that it is indeed of *speciosus* stock and in these circumstances we agree with Ripley's treatment and retain Deignan's original restriction of the type locality to Sadiya. We regret this as we suspect that across the range now ascribed to *fraterculus* there may be several recognisable disjunct populations and if this is so then the name *fraterculus* will eventually relate to an eastern form perhaps restricted to the Hainan based population, much as in Stresemann (1930). We note too that Deignan's own considerable material did not include any specimens from Hainan.

Since Peters et al. (1960) the only races newly described are *gonzalesi* Ripley & Rabor, 1961, and *nigroluteus* Parkes, 1981, from the Philippines.

Whether this whole assemblage is truly one species, as suggested by the lack of overlap of any subspecies, is open to further investigation. It is clear however that the choice is not between one species and two, rather it is between one and many.

Tephradornis virgatus (Temminck, 1824)

Baker (1924, 1930) continued to treat a species *pelvica* (Hodgson, 1837) either ignoring or choosing not to unite the birds of the Sundas, although this was a rearguard action because Robinson & Kloss (1923b) had already united the two under the name *Tephradornis gularis* (Raffles, 1822). Whistler & Kinnear (1933) accepted this broader species, as did Peters et al. (1960).

Peters et al. (1960) used the name *Tephradornis gularis* (Raffles, 1822), with *Tephradornis virgatus* (Temminck, 1824) in synonymy. However, Ripley (1961) used the name *Tephradornis virgatus* and Deignan (1963), who had dealt with this genus in Peters et al. (1960) and retained *gularis* in his list of bird types in the U.S. National Museum

(Deignan, 1961), changed his mind. He too now used *virgatus* as his specific epithet.

Alan Peterson and Richard Banks kindly examined the Richmond card index for us and found that *Lanius gularis* Raffles is preoccupied by *Lanius gularis* Bechstein, 1811. From his years at the Smithsonian Deignan was very familiar with the value of the Richmond cardex and no doubt checked it after discovering that Ripley (1961) disagreed. The Richmond card index records “*L[anius] gularis* “mihi” J.M. Bechstein, 1811.// Allgemeine Uebersicht der Vogel, IV, Theil 1// Kurze Uebersicht aller bekannten Vogel, 1811, 57.”

Ripley (1961) and Deignan (1963) were followed by King & Dickinson (1975), Ripley (1982) and Lekagul & Round (1991), but not by Medway & Wells (1976), nor by Sibley & Monroe (1990), nor subsequent writers dealing with south and south-east Asia (e.g. Inskipp et al., 1996; Grimmett et al., 1998; Robson, 2000). Inskipp et al. (1996) stated that the name *gularis* Raffles, 1822, had priority over *virgatus* Temminck, 1824; this however does not dispose of the fact that the name *gularis* is preoccupied. There may be reasons to set this objection aside, but, as far as we know, no case has been put forward to the International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature, to suppress Bechstein’s name and we believe the replacement of *gularis* by *virgatus* was well founded.

Acknowledgements

We should like to thank Nigel Collar and Jon Riley for responding to questions on the possible sympatry on Sulawesi of *Coracina tenuirostris* and *C. morio*, Alan Peterson and Richard Banks for accessing the Richmond cardex and reporting to us on its contents relative to the name *Lanius gularis* and Murray Bruce and Richard Schodde for contrasting opinions on whether to retain the name *gularis* or accept *virgatus*. We have also most kindly been afforded access to the “Loten drawings” by Carol Gokçe at The Natural History Museum, South Kensington, and the McClelland drawings at the British Library (Oriental and India Office Collections) by Jerry Losty through a loan of them to Tring to compare with type material. As usual we also owe a debt of gratitude to the librarians of The Natural History Museum (Ann Datta, Alison Harding and, during preparatory work, Effie Warr) for their help with finding the more obscure references.

A draft of this paper was kindly read by Murray Bruce and Cees Roselaar and we are grateful for their helpful comments. Where their views differ we believe they plan to publish them and we expect to be able then to cite them.

References

- Ali, S. & S.D. Ripley, 1948. The birds of the Mishmi Hills.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 48(1): 1-37.
 Baker, E.C.S., 1918. On the species *Graucalus macei*.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 38: 66-70.
 Baker, E.C.S., 1920. [Remarks on some Oriental species.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 40: 112-117.
 Baker, E.C.S., 1923. [New races of Flycatchers and Shrikes and remarks on these two families.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 44: 7-14.
 Baker, E.C.S., 1924. The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma. Birds (2nd edition). 2: i-xxiii, 1-561.— London.
 Baker, E.C.S., 1929. [Note on *Pericrocotus peregrinus*.].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 49: 63-64.

- Baker, E.C.S., 1930. The Fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma. Birds (2nd edition). 7: i-viii, 1-484.— London.
- Ball, V., 1872. Notes on a collection of birds made in the Andamans by Asst. Surgeon G.E. Dobson M.B. during the months of April and May.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 41: 273-290.
- Bangs, O.C., 1921. The birds of the American Museum of Natural History's Asiatic Zoological Expedition of 1916-1917.— Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist. 44: 575-612.
- Bangs, O.C., 1922. Notes on Philippine birds collected by Governor W. Cameron Forbes.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 65: 77-84.
- Bangs, O.C. & J.C. Phillips, 1914. Notes on a collection of birds from Yunnan.— Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. 58: 267-302.
- Bechstein, J.M., 1811. Kurze Uebersicht aller bekannten Vögel oder ihre kennzeichen der Art nach Latham's General Synopsis of Birds und seinem Index ornithologicus: i-iv, 1-576.— Nürnberg.
- Blyth, E., 1842. Curator's Report for April.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 11(125): 444-470.
- Blyth, E., 1846. Notices and descriptions of various new or little known species of birds.— J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal 15(172): 280-315.
- Boddaert, P., 1783. Table des Planches Enluminées d'Histoire naturelle, de M. d'Aubenton: i-xvi, 1-58 + 9.— Utrecht.
- Bonaparte, C.L., 1850. Conspectus Generum Avium. 1: 1-543.— Lugduni Batavorum.
- Brazil, M., 1991. The birds of Japan: i-xiii, 1-466.— London.
- Brisson, A.D., 1760. Ornithologia sive synopsis methodica sistens Avium divisionem in ordines. Sectiones, genera, species, ipsarumque varietates: 2. i-lxvii, 1-516.— Leiden.
- Browning, M.R. & B.L. Monroe Jr., 1991. Clarifications and corrections of the dates of issue of some publications containing descriptions of North American birds.— Arch. Nat. Hist., 18(3): 381-405.
- Cheng, Tso-hsin., 1987. A Synopsis of the Avifauna of China. 1-1223.— Beijing.
- Dao Van Tien, 1961. Recherches zoologiques dans la région de Thai-Nguyen (Nord Vietnam).— Zool. Anz. 166: 298-308.
- Deignan, H.G., 1938. Two new birds from the Kingdom of Siam.— Auk 55: 509-510.
- Deignan, H.G., 1945. The birds of northern Thailand.— U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 186: i-v, 1-616.
- Deignan, H.G., 1946. The races of the Scarlet Minivet (*Pericrocotus flammeus*) (Forster).— Auk 63: 511-533.
- Deignan, H.G., 1947. The races of the minivet *Pericrocotus peregrinus* (Linnaeus) in southeastern Asia.— J. Wash. Acad. Sci. 37(7): 254-256.
- 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., 1963. Checklist of the Birds of Thailand.— U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 226: i-x, 1-263.
- Delacour, J., 1927. [40 new taxa from French Indochina].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 47: 151-170.
- Delacour, J., 1951. The Lesser Graybirds of Asia and Malaysia.— Am. Mus. Novit. 1497: 1-15.
- 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, 2002. Systematic notes on Asian birds. 23. Types of the Campephagidae.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 340: 31-74.
- Dickinson, E.C., R.S. Kennedy & K.C. Parkes, 1991. The Birds of the Philippines. An annotated Checklist. B.O.U. Check-list ser. 12: 1-507.— Tring.
- duPont, J.E., 1972. Notes on Philippine Birds (no. 3). Birds of Marinduque.— Nemouria 7: 1-14.
- Eck, S., 1976. Die Vögel der Banggai-Inseln, insbesondere Pelengs.— Zool. abh. Staat. Mus. Tier Dresden 34(5): 53-100.
- Escott, C.J. & D.A. Holmes, 1980. The avifauna of Sulawesi, Indonesia: faunistic notes and additions.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 100(3): 189-194.
- Forster, J.R., 1781. Indische Zoologie oder systematische Beschreibungen seltener und unbekannter Thiere aus Indien, mit 15 illuminirten Kupfertafeln erläutert: i-iv, 1-42.— Halle.
- Galbraith, I.C.J. & E.H. Galbraith, 1962. Land birds of Guadalcanal and the San Cristoval group, Eastern Solomon Islands.— Bull. Brit. Mus. (Nat. Hist.), Zool. 9(1): 1-80.

- Gmelin, J-F., 1788. *Systema Naturae, per regna tria Natura: secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, Differentiis, Synonymis, Locis*. 13th edition. Tome 1, pars I: 1-500.— Lyon (and Leipzig).
- Gmelin, J-F., 1789. *Systema Naturae, per regna tria Natura: secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, Differentiis, Synonymis, Locis*. 13th edition. Tome 1, pars II: 501-1032.— Lyon (and Leipzig).
- Gould, J., 1848. On seven new species of Australian Birds.— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 16: 38-40.
- Gray, G.R., 1860. List of birds collected by Mr. Wallace at the Molucca Islands, with descriptions of new species, etc.— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 28: 341-366.
- Grimmett, R., C. Inskipp & T. Inskipp, 1998. *Birds of the Indian Subcontinent: 1-888*.— London.
- Hall, B.P., 1953. Notes on some minivets in the British Museum.— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 73(6): 63-65.
- Hartert, E., 1896. An account of the collections of birds made by Mr. William Doherty in the eastern archipelago.— *Novit. Zool.* 3: 537-590.
- Hartert, E., 1901. [Descriptions of four new birds].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 12: 32-33.
- Hartert, E., 1916. [A new form of *Coracina*.].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 36: 65.
- Hartert, E., 1918. [Notes on *Edolisoma*.].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 38: 27-29 (1917).
- Hartlaub, G., 1865. *Monographische Studien über die Gruppe der Campephaginen*.— *J. f. Orn.* 13(75): 153-173.
- Hodgson, B.H., 1836. On some new species of the Edolian and Ceblypyrine subfamilies of the Laniidae of Nepal.— *Indian Rev.* 1: 324-329.
- Hodgson, B.H. 1837. On some new species of the more typical Laniidae of Nepal.— *Indian Rev.* 1: 445-447.
- Hodgson, B.H. 1845. [On Nepalese birds.].— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 13: 22-37.
- Horsfield, T., 1821. A systematic arrangement and description of birds from the island of Java.— *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* 13: 133-200.
- Horsfield, T., 1840. List of Mammalia and Birds collected in Assam by John McClelland, Esq., Assistant-Surgeon in the service of the East India Company, Bengal Establishment, Member of the late Deputation which was sent into that country for the purpose of investigating the nature of the Tea Plant.— *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond.* 7 (1839): 146-167.
- 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.
- Hume, A.O., 1875. A second list of the birds of Tenasserim.— *Stray Feathers* 3(4): 317-326.
- Hume, A.O., 1877. Remarks on the Genus *Pericrocotus*.— *Stray Feathers* 5(3/4): 171-198.
- Inskipp, T.P., N. Lindsey & W. Duckworth, 1996. An annotated checklist of the birds of the oriental region. 1-294.— Sandy, Beds., UK.
- ICZN, 1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature* (4th edition): i-xxix, 1-306.— London.
- Jardine, W., 1831. Descriptions of new or little known species of birds.— *Edinburgh J. Nat. Geog. Sci.*, N.S. 3: 209-212.
- Kennedy, R.F., P.C. Gonzales, E.C. Dickinson, H.C. Miranda & T.H. Fisher, 2000. *A guide to the birds of the Philippines: i-xx, 1-369*.— Oxford.
- King, B.F. & E.C. Dickinson, 1975. *A Field Guide to the Birds of South-East Asia*. 1-480.— London.
- Kinnear, N.B. *In* Ludlow, F. & N.B. Kinnear, 1937. The birds of Bhutan and adjacent territories of Sikkim and Tibet.— *Ibis* (14)1: 1-46, 249-293, 467-504.
- Koelz, W.N., 1954. *Ornithological studies. I. New birds from Iran, Afghanistan and India*.— *Contr. Inst. Reg. Expl., Ann Arbor* 1: 1-32.
- Kuroda, N., 1933. *Birds of the Island of Java*. 1: i-xv, 1-370.— Tokyo.
- Latham, J., 1790. *Index ornithologicus, sive systema ornithologiae; complectens avium divisionem in classes, ordines, genera, species, ipsarumque varietates: adjectis synonymis, locis, descriptionibus &c. Studie et opera*. 1. i-xviii, 1-466.— London.
- Latham, J., 1802. *Supplementum Indicis ornithologici sive Systematis ornithologiae: i-lxxiv* (1801).— London.
- La Touche, J.D.D., 1922. [New birds from S.E. Yunnan].— *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 42: 51-55.

- Lekagul, B. & P.D. Round, 1991. A guide to the birds of Thailand: 1-457.— Bangkok.
- Lesson, R.P., 1830-31. Traite d'Ornithologie ou Tableaux Methodique: i-xxxii, 1-659.— Paris.
- Linnaeus, C., 1766. Systema Naturae per Regna Tria Naturae secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis. Tome 1. 1-532.— Stockholm.
- Mason, I.J. & J.L. McKean, 1982. Taxonomic status of the Timor cuckoo-shrike *Coracina personata* (Müller).— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 102: 127-129.
- Mathews, G.M., 1912. Additions and corrections to my Reference List to the Birds of Australia.— Austral. Av. Rec. 1(2): 25-52.
- Mayr, E., 1940. *Pericrocotus brevirostris* and its double.— Ibis (14)4: 712-722.
- Mayr, E. & S.D. Ripley, 1941. Birds collected during the Whitney South Sea expedition. XLIV. Notes on the genus *Lalage*.— Amer. Mus. Novit. 1116: 1-18.
- McClelland, 1840. See Horsfield, 1840.
- McGregor, R.C., 1910. A manual of Philippine Birds. Pt. II. Passeres. 2: xii-xvii, 413-769.— Manila.
- Mearns, E.A., 1907. Descriptions of a new genus and nine new species of Philippine birds.— Phil. J. Sci. 2: 355-360.
- Medway, Lord & D.R. Wells, 1976. The Birds of the Malay Peninsula. A general account of the birds inhabiting the region from the Isthmus of Kra to Singapore with adjacent islands. 5. Conclusion, and survey of every species: i-xxxi, 1-448.— London.
- Mees, G.F., 1982. Birds from the lowlands of southern New Guinea (Merauke and Koembe).— Zool. Verh. Leiden 191: 1-188.
- Mees, G.F., 1986. A list of the birds recorded from Bangka Island, Indonesia.— Zool. Verh. Leiden 232: 1-176.
- Mees, G.F., 1996. Geographical variation in birds of Java.— Nuttall Orn. Cl, Cambridge, Mass., USA: i-viii, 1-119.
- Meyen, F.J.F., 1834. Beiträge zur Zoologie gesammelt auf einer Reise um die Erde. 4. Vögel.— Ver. K. Leop. Carol. Akad. Naturf. 16: 59-109.
- Meyer, A.B., 1874. Ueber neue und ungenügend bekannte Vögel von Neu-Guinea und den Inseln der Geelvinksbai.— Sitzungsber. K. Akad. Wiss. Wien, Math.-Naturwiss. Cl. 69: 386-402.
- Meyer, A.B., 1884. Ueber neue und ungenügend bekannte Vögel im Königl. Zoologischen Museum zu Dresden.— Z. ges. Ornithol. 1: 193-219.
- Meyer, A.B., 1885. Ueber neue und ungenügend bekannte Vögel, Nester und Eier aus dem Ostindischen Archipel im Königl. Zoologischen Museum zu Dresden.— Sitzungsber. Abh. Naturwiss. Ges. Isis, Abh. 1 (1884): 3-58.
- Meyer, A.B. & L.W. Wigglesworth, 1895. Eine zweite Sammlung von Vögeln von den Talaut Inseln.— Abh. Ber. König. Zool. Mus. Dresden 5(9): 1-9.
- Meyer de Schauensee, R., 1984. The birds of China: 1-602.— Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- Morioka, H., 2000. Taxonomic notes on Passerine species: 291-325.— In: Ornithological Society of Japan, Check-list of Japanese Birds. 6th revised edition: i-xii, 1-345.
- Müller, S., 1843. Bijdragen tot de kennis van Timor en eenige andere naburige eilanden: Eerste afdeeling. Aardrijks- en geschiedkundig gedeelte. III. Tocht naar het binnenland, door de Vorstendommen Sonabay, Ambenoë en Amfoang. 180-240.— In: C.J. Temminck, 1840-1847. Land- en Volkenkunde. Verhandelingen over de Natuurlijke Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche overzeesche bezittingen, door de Leden der Natuurkundige commissie in Indië en andere Schrijvers. 6. Leiden.
- Neumann, O., 1939. A new species and eight new races from Peleng and Taliaboë.— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 59: 89-94.
- Ogilvie-Grant, W.R., 1896. On the birds of the Philippine Islands. Part 8. The highlands of Negros.— Ibis (7)2: 525-565.
- Parkes, K.C., 1971. Taxonomic and distributional notes on Philippine birds.— Nemouria 4: 1-67.
- Parkes, K.C., 1974. Geographic variation in the Flame Minivet (*Pericrocotus flammeus*) on the island of Mindanao.— Ann. Carnegie Mus. 45(3): 35-41.

- Parkes, K.C., 1981. A substitute name for a Philippine minivet (*Pericrocotus*).— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 101(4): 370.
- Peters, J.L., E. Mayr & H.G. Deignan, 1960. Family Campephagidae: 167-221.— In: E. Mayr & J.C. Greenway jr., (eds). Check-list of Birds of the World. IX. Cambridge, Mass.
- Raffles, Sir T.S., 1822. Second part of the descriptive catalogue of a zoological collection made in the island of Sumatra and its vicinity.— Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond. 13: 277-331.
- Rand, A.L. & D.S. Rabor, 1959. Three new birds from the Philippine Islands.— Fieldiana, Zool. 39(26): 275-277.
- Raven, H.C., 1935. Wallace's line and the distribution of Indo-Australian mammals.— Bull. Amer. Mus. 68(4): 179-293.
- Riley, J.H., 1940. Five new forms of birds from southern Annam.— Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash. 53: 47-49.
- Ripley, S.D., 1941. Notes on the genus *Coracina*.— Auk 58: 381-395.
- Ripley, S.D., 1952a. Additional comments on Philippine birds and a new record from the Archipelago.— Condor 54(6): 362.
- Ripley, S.D., 1952b. A collection of birds from the Naga Hills.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 50(3): 475-514.
- Ripley, S.D., 1961. A synopsis of the birds of India and Pakistan together with those of Nepal, Sikkim, Bhutan and Ceylon: i-xxxvi, 1-703.— Bombay.
- Ripley, S.D., 1982. A synopsis of the birds of India and Pakistan together with those of Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka: i-xxvi, 1-653. (2nd edition).— Bombay.
- Ripley, S.D. & D.S. Rabor, 1961. The avifauna of Mt. Katanglad.— Postilla 50: 1-20.
- Robinson, H.C., 1928. The Birds of the Malay Peninsula. 2. The birds of the hill stations: i-xxii, 1-310.— London.
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1919. On birds from South Annam and Cochin China.— Ibis (11)1: 392-453, 565-625.
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1923a. [A new race of Minivet from Annam].— Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl. 43: 119-120.
- Robinson, H.C. & C.B. Kloss, 1923b. A nominal list of the birds of Sumatra.— J. Fed. Mal. St. Mus. 8: 319-362.
- Robson, C., 2000. A field guide to the birds of South-east Asia. 1-504.— London.
- Roselaar, C.S. & T.G. Prins, 2000. List of type specimens of birds in the Zoological Museum of the University of Amsterdam (ZMA), including taxa described by ZMA staff but without types in the ZMA.— Beaufortia 50(5): 95-126.
- Rüppell, E., 1839. Monographie der Vogelgattung deren Typus Levaillant unter dem namen "les Eche-nilleurs" zuerst bekannt gemacht hat, und welche in neuerer Zeit unter den verschiedenen Gattungs-namen *Ceblepyris*, *Campephaga*, *Graucalus* oder als *Coracina*, *Galgulus*, *Lanius*, *Corvus* und anderen Bezeichnungen beschrieben wurden; nebst beschreibung von zwei neuen Arten, *Ceblepyris melanoptera* (Rüpp.) und *C. maxima* (Rüpp.).— Mus. Senckenbergianum 3: 17-39.
- Salomonsen, F., 1953. Miscellaneous notes on Philippine birds.— Vidensk. Medd. Dansk. naturh. For. 115: 205-281.
- Salvadori, T., 1874. Nuove specie di uccelli delle isole Aru e Kei.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova 6: 73-80.
- Salvadori, T., 1878. Descrizione di trentuna specie nuove di uccelli della sottoregione Papuana, e note intorno ad altre poco conosciute.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova 12: 317-347.
- Salvadori, T., 1879. Catalogo di una collezione di uccelli fatta nella parte occidentale di Sumatra dal Prof. Odoardo Beccari.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova 14: 169-253.
- Salvadori, T., 1886. On some Papuan, Moluccan, and Sulu birds.— Ibis (5)4: 151-155.
- Salvadori, T., 1887. Diagnosi di nuove specie di uccelli del Tenasserim, raccolte dal Sig. Leonardo Fea.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova Ser. 2(5): 514-516.
- Salvadori, T., 1894. Viaggio del Dr. Elio Modigliani nelle isole Mentawai; catalogo di una collezione di uccelli di Si-pora.— Ann. Mus. Civ. Stor. Nat. Genova, Ser. 2(14): 588-601.
- Schodde, R. & I. Mason, 1999. The Directory of Australian Birds. Passerines: i-x, 1-851.— Collingwood, Vic., Australia.

- Sclater, P.L., 1883. On birds collected in the Timor-laut or Tenimber Group of islands by Mr. Henry O. Forbes.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1883): 48-57.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1878. On the collections of birds made by Dr. Meyer during his expedition to New Guinea and some neighbouring islands.— Mitt. K. zool. Mus. Dresden 1(3): 349-372, pl. xxviii-xxx.
- Sharpe, R.B., 1887. On a second collection of birds formed by Mr. L. Wray in the mountains of Perak, Malay Peninsula.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1887): 431-443.
- Sibley, C.G. & B.L. Monroe Jr., 1990. Distribution and taxonomy of birds of the world: i-xxiv, 1-1111.— New Haven, Conn.
- Smythies, B.E., 1957. An annotated checklist of the birds of Borneo.— Sarawak Mus. J. 7: i-xv, 523-818.
- Snouckaert van Schauburg, R., 1930. The forms of *Pericrocotus cinnamomeus* (L.).— Treubia 11: 309-312.
- Stanford, J.K. & C.B. Ticehurst, 1931. The birds of the Prome District, Lower Burma. II.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 34(4): 901-915.
- Steere, J.B., 1890. A list of the birds and mammals collected by the Steere Expedition to the Philippines: 1-30.— Ann Arbor, Michigan.
- Stejneger, L., 1887. On a collection of birds made by Mr. M. Namiye in the Liu Kiu Islands, Japan, with descriptions of new species.— Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus. 9 (1886): 634-651.
- Stresemann, E., 1923a. Zur Nomenklatur indo-australischer Vögel.— Orn. Monatsber. 31(2): 40-41.
- Stresemann, E., 1923b. Neue Formen aus Sud-China.— J. f. Orn. 71(2/3): 362-365.
- Stresemann, E., 1930. Beiträge zur Ornithologie der indo-australischen Region. III.— Mitt. zool. Mus. Berlin 15(3/4): 635-645.
- Stresemann, E., 1932. Vorläufiges über die Ornithologischen Ergebnisse der Expedition Heinrich 1930-1932. VII. Zur Ornithologie von Südost Celebes.— Orn. Monatsber. 40(4): 104-115.
- Stresemann, E., 1952. On the birds collected by Pierre Poivre in Canton, Manila, India and Madagascar (1751-1756).— Ibis 94(3): 499-523.
- Strickland, H.E., 1844. Notes on Mr. Blyth's List of Birds from the vicinity of Calcutta.— Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., Ser. 1, 13: 32-40.
- Sundevall, C.J., 1837. Foglar från Calcutta, samlade och beskrifne.— Physiogr. Sällskapets Tidskr. 1: 54-96, 161-192.
- Swainson, W., 1825. On the characters and natural affinities of several new birds from Australasia; including some observations on the Columbidae.— Zool. J. 1: 463-484.
- Swinhoe, R., 1861. Notes on the ornithology of Hongkong, Macao, and Canton made during the latter end of February, March, April and the beginning of May, 1860.— Ibis (1)3: 23-57.
- Swinhoe, R., 1870. On the ornithology of Hainan.— Ibis (2)6: 77-97, 230-256, 342-367.
- Temminck, 1824. See Temminck & Laugier, 1820-1839.
- Temminck, C.J. & Baron M. Laugier de Chartrouse, 1820-1839. Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées d'oiseaux, pour servir de suite et de complement aux planches enluminées de Buffon. 102 livr., 600 pls.— Paris.
- Tristram, H.B., 1879. On a collection of birds from the Solomon Islands and New Hebrides.— Ibis (4)3: 437-444.
- Tweeddale, A., Marquis of, 1879. Contributions to the ornithology of the Philippines, No. XI. On the collection made by Mr. A. H. Everett at Zamboanga, in the island of Mindanao.— Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. (1878): 936-954.
- van Oort, E.D., 1907. On *Edoliisoma morio* (S. Müller).— Notes Leyden Mus. 29(8): 77-78.
- Vaughan, R.E. & K.H. Jones, 1913. A further note on certain species of *Pericrocotus* which occur in South-eastern China, with a description of a new species of the genus.— Ibis (10)1: 383-384.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1816. Analyse d'une nouvelle ornithologie élémentaire: i-iv, 1-70.— Paris.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1818a. Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle 20: 1-586.— Paris.
- Vieillot, L.P., 1818b. Nouveau Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle 21: 1-612.— Paris.
- Vigors, N.A., 1831. [Observations on a collection of birds from the Himalayan Mountains, with characters of new genera and species.]— Proc. Commit. Zool. Soc. Lond. 1: 7-9, 22-23, 35, 41-44, 54-56.
- Voous, K.H. & J.G. van Marle, 1949. The distributional history of *Coracina* in the Indo-Australian Archipelago.— Bijdr. Dierk. 28: 513-529.

- Walden, A., Viscount, 1872. A list of the birds known to inhabit the island of Celebes.— Trans. Zool. Soc. Lond. 8(2): 23-118.
- Wells, D.R., In prep. The Birds of the Thai-Malay Peninsula. 2.— London.
- Whistler, H. & N.B. Kinnear, 1933. The Vernay Scientific Survey of the Eastern Ghats. IV.— J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 36(2): 334-352.
- White, C.M.N. & M.D. Bruce, 1986. The birds of Wallacea.— BOU Check-list Ser. 7: 1-524. Tring, Herts.
- Wolters, H.E., 1977. Die Vogelarten der Erde. Eine systematische Liste mit Verbreitungsangaben sowie Deutschen und Englischen Namen. Pt. 3: 161-240.— Hamburg.

Received: 5.ix.2002 (final draft)

Accepted: 5.x.2002

Edited: C. van Achterberg