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A list is presented of 126 names applied to Asian forms of nuthatch and wallcreeper species (family Sittidae) and of treecreeper and spotted creeper species (family Certhiidae). 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. A lectotype is designated for Sitta frontalis Swainson, 1820.

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. The geographic scope of our series (see map in the Editor’s Foreword to this issue) has the juncture of Russia with China for the bulk of its northern border. However, when we list a taxon that occurs within our limits, such as Sitta europaea asiatica Gould, 1835, we list all its synonyms although we may not provide details of where a type is to be found when a synonym has a type locality that is extralimital.
Methodology

Our table shows the names applied to the taxa, with author(s) and date (the relevant original descriptions being reported in the ‘References’). Where a type or types have been located the acronym of a museum holding a type is given. A list of these acronyms appears before the References. The final column gives the number of a comment. The numbered comments follow the table. The arrangement of the list is by species and within that by subspecies. The sequence of species is nearly that of Greenway (1967a, b) in Peters’s Check-list, but we have amended it down to subspecies level in some cases. Our treatment of all the Sittinae as being within the genus *Sitta* should not be taken to imply that we will retain this broad genus in the planned ‘Synopsis’. In keeping with previous papers in this series we use bold type for the names of accepted species and subspecies and plain types for synonyms.

The subspecies recognized here differ from those recognized in Peters’s Check-list in two particulars. First, we include the subsequent names of which we are aware: *Sitta frontalis isarog* Rand & Rabor, 1967 and *Certhia familiaris tianquanensis* Li, 1995. Second, we apply the decisions made in the accompanying papers on these families (Dickinson, 2006; Martens & Tietze, 2006), even though the views in these papers remain 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 the Eurylaimidae (Dekker et al., 2000), Pittidae (Dickinson et al., 2000), Alaudidae (Dickinson et al., 2001) and subsequent papers in this series, we investigated all the names that we found in synonymy. All names have been checked to the original citation and original spellings are used; and in the case of unusual spellings we add the adjunction ‘sic’. We then list each name in our type table and for every such name we have explored what is known about the types.

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 re-examined any given type. We have examined types where we had a particular reason to do so.

This paper, like that on the parids (Dickinson et al., 2006; this issue), demonstrates how much type material was destroyed in World War II. The holotype, or set of syntypes, of 6 names of the families treated here is shown to have been lost in Europe, Japan or the Philippines. In our paper on the parid types (op. cit. supra) we have given some background on the effects of war on Japanese holdings, and have particularly drawn on Morioka et al. (2005). When Morioka et al. were working on this they also gave some attention to the search for types described by Japanese authors, but from outside Japan. We have also applied our growing, but incomplete, understanding of the habits of Hodgson and Blyth and how these affect the discovery and identification of types of their names.
Recent bibliographical history of the family

Understanding of Northern Palaearctic species benefited from the work of Stepanyan (1983, 1990). Eck (1976) examined Chinese populations of *Sitta europaea* and Martens (1981) used acoustic evidence to examine the relationships of the treecreepers of the Himalayas. Since Greenway (1967a, b), however, only the guide of Harrap (1996) has provided a comprehensive treatment of these two families. Scientific papers relating to the systematics of the Asian nuthatches and treecreepers since 1996 have been rather few. Pasquet (1998) offered a molecular study of one group of nuthatches and, based on morphology and voice, Martens et al. (2002) elevated *Certhia tianquanensis* Li, 1995, from its proposed subspecific rank.

### The types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Mus.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. asiatica</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta bifasciata</em></td>
<td>von Madarász</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Lost 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta biedermannii</em></td>
<td>Reichenow</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>ZMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. baicalensis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta baicalensis</em></td>
<td>Taczanowski</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>MPHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta</em> [euro<em>opaea</em>] partia*aria</td>
<td>Portenko</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>ZISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. clara</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta amurensis clara</em></td>
<td>Stejneger</td>
<td>1887 3</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea bergmani</em></td>
<td>Momiyama</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Lost 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. sakhalinensis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea sakhalinensis</em></td>
<td>Buturlin</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>ZISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. takatsukasai</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea takatsukasai</em></td>
<td>Momiyama</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Lost 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. seorsa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea seorsa</em></td>
<td>Portenko</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>ZISP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. amurensis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta amurensis</em></td>
<td>Swinhoe</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea buturlini</em></td>
<td>Momiyama</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Lost 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea kleinschmidtiti</em></td>
<td>Hartert &amp; Steinbacher</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>ZMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>S. e. hondoensis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea hondoensis</em></td>
<td>Buturlin</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>ZMMU 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sitta europaea kumagaii</em></td>
<td>Momiyama</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>YIO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Greenway (1967: 127) dated this 1837, but see Dickinson (2006; this issue).
2 This, in some cases, is used as shorthand for ‘destroyed’. Unless used with a ? it implies permanent loss.
3 Greenway (1967: 127) dated this 1886, but see Editorial Division (1947: 63). He also cited p. 392 for the description of *clara*, but this name also appears in a key on p. 390.
4 Greenway (1967: 127) erred in spelling this *takatsukasae*.
5 Placed here following Eck (1976).
Sitta europaea nakaokae
S. e. roseilia
S[itta], roseilia
Sitta europaea harterti
S. e. bedfordi
Sitta bedfordi
S. e. sinensis
Sitta europaea kiukiangensis
Sitta europaea itschangensis
S. e. formosana
Sitta formosana
Sitta europaea tavihana nom. emend.
Sitta [europaea] nagaensis
S. n. grisiventris
Sitta europaea grisiventris
S. n. nagaensis
Sitta nagaensis
S[itta], montium
Sitta europaea obscura
Sitta europaea nebulosa
nom. nov.
Sitta (europaea) tibetosinensis
Sitta europaea delacouri
Sitta europaea kongboensis
Sitta cashmirensis
Sitta hariabica ‘Wardlaw Ramsay MS’

---

6 Greenway (1967: 131) thought that Verreaux’s article appeared in 1871 but the volume title page is dated 1870 and Verreaux (1871: 28) referred to his description as having been in 1870.

7 Not kiukiangenensis as given by Greenway (1967: 131). Proposed as a replacement name for sinensis Verreaux, 1871, which Buturlin (1915) thought preoccupied by Sitta chinensis ‘Latham’; he may however have meant that the preoccupation was by Sitta chinensis Vieillot (1819: 332). Despite Recommendation 58A in the Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999) suggesting that no second name with the same root be created, Verreaux’s name sinensis, although unfortunate, is not a homonym of chinensis and is not retrospectively banned by Art. 58. Vieillot’s name was listed in the synonymy of Sitta caesia Wolf, 1810, by Gadow (1883: 347) but is here considered a nomen oblitum.

8 A new name for formosana Buturlin, 1911, thought to be too easily confused with formosa Blyth, 1843, but formosa of Blyth’s usage meant ‘beautiful’. There is anyway no homonymy and the original name must stand (Recommendation 58A in The Code comes closest to matching this case but this is purely recommendatory).

9 Preoccupied by Sitta tephrnota obscura Zarudny & Loudon, 1905.

10 New name for Sitta europaea obscura La Touche, 1921.

11 Recognized by Eck & Quaisser (2004: 299) but reasons behind this not given.

12 Original spelling konyboensis but corrected to kongboensis later in the same volume (Kinnear, 1940b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sitta castanea</td>
<td>S. c. almorae</td>
<td>Kinnear &amp; Whistler</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. cinnamoventris</td>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>ZSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. koelzi</td>
<td>Vaurie</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>AMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. neglecta</td>
<td>Walden</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. koelzi</td>
<td>Kleinschmidt</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>ZMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. castanea</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>MNHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. castanoeventris</td>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. prateri</td>
<td>Whistler &amp; Kinnear</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. c. tonkinensis</td>
<td>Kinnear</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta himalayensis</td>
<td>Jardine &amp; Selby</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta himalayensis</td>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta himalayensis</td>
<td>Delacour</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta himalayensis</td>
<td>Koelz</td>
<td>1951</td>
<td>UMMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta himalayensis</td>
<td>Koelz</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>UMMZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta victoriae</td>
<td>Rippon</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sitta villosa</td>
<td>Stresemann</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>ZMB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. v. bangsi</td>
<td>Verreaux</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>MNHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. v. villosa</td>
<td>Ogilvie-Grant</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. v. corea</td>
<td>Ogilvie-Grant</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. v. yunnanensis</td>
<td>Ogilvie-Grant</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 Spelled *cinnamoventris* by Gadow (1883: 351).
14 Has also been spelled *castaneiventris* (see Gadow, 1883: 351).
15 Greenway (1967: 133) erroneously dated this 1936.
16 The original name is all in capital letters in the text page, but on the plate a capital H is used.
17 Momiyama (1931: 24) apparently provided an indication to Ingram (1909: 433) but on the page cited there is no reference to *Sitta villosa* (ne Verreaux); instead there is a list of specimens of *Sitta amurensis* from Manchuria, but these are not described. Momiyama’s name is thus a *nomen nudum.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Catalogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. l. przewalskii</td>
<td>Berezowski &amp; Bianchi</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>ZMMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta tephronota</td>
<td>Sharpe</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>MMUM 20.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. t. tephronota</td>
<td>Buturlin</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>ZMMU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupisitta tephronota iranica</td>
<td>Meinertzhagen</td>
<td>1938</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta neumayer subcaeruleus</td>
<td>Deignan</td>
<td>1938b</td>
<td>USNM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta magna</td>
<td>Wardlaw Ramsay</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. m. ligea</td>
<td>Blyth</td>
<td>1843</td>
<td>ZSI ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. a. expectata</td>
<td>Hartert</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>AMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. a. nigriventer</td>
<td>Swainson</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td>UMZC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poliositta azurea nigriventer</td>
<td>Robinson &amp; Kloss</td>
<td>1919a</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. a. azurea</td>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>1830</td>
<td>MNHN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta frontalis</td>
<td>Swainson</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sittta corallina</td>
<td>Hodgson</td>
<td>1837</td>
<td>BMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta frontalis saturatior</td>
<td>Hartert</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>AMNH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta frontalis hageni</td>
<td>Parrot</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>ZSM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitta frontalis simplex</td>
<td>Koelz</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>FMNH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 The name was proposed spelled in capital letters.
19 This, under the name flavipes, is the type species of genus Dendrophila Swainson (1837) and is a very distinct species.
20 Benson (1999: 136) reported that the holotype did not match nominate azurea but matched nigriventer and remarked that Swainson’s name had probably not been used since 1838, implying that he considered it a nomen oblitum.
21 In Swainson, 1820-21.
22 Greenway (1967: 142) dated this 1836, however the issue was delayed until 1837. That can be seen from p. 828 of this volume (same issue) where the minutes appear of a meeting of the Society held on 4th January 1837.
23 Wells (in press) is expected to accept this name for the population of the south part of the Malay peninsula, but we are not clear whether Sumatran birds will be discussed there or in a later separate paper.
24 Dated 1908 by Greenway (1967: 142), but at the back of the article is “Angegeben am 6 November 1907” and a date stamp shows this issue was received in the library of the Natural History Museum, London on 26 November, 1907.
**S. f. velata**

[Sitta frontalis] 25  
Horsfield 1821  -  23.

**S. velata** 26  
Temminck 1821  NMW

**S. f. corallipes**  
Dendrophila corallipes

**S. f. palawana**  
Sitta frontalis palawana

**S. f. corallipes** 26  
Sharpe 1888  AMNH

**S. f. palawana** 26  
Hartert 1905a  AMNH

**S. f. oenochlamys**  
Dendrophila oenochlamys

**S. f. mesoleuca**  
Ogilvie-Grant 1894  BMNH

**S. f. isarog**  
Rand & Rabor 1967 27  FMNH

**S. f. oenochlamys**  
Dendrophila oenochlamys

**S. f. mesoleuca** 26  
Sharpe 1877  UMMZ

**S. f. isarog**  
Hachisuka 1930  Lost 25.

**S. f. oenochlamys**  
Hachisuka 1930  Lost 26.

**S. f. lilacea**  
Dendrophila lilacea

**S. f. lilacea** 26  
Whitehead 1897  AMNH

**S. f. apo**  
Callisitta frontalis apo

**S. f. apo** 26  
Hachisuka 1930  DMNH

**S. f. zamboanga**  
Sitta frontalis zamboanga

**S. f. zamboanga** 26  
Rand & Rabor 1957  FMNH

**S. solangiae**  
S. s. solangiae

**S. solangiae** 26  
Calositta [sic] solangiae
Delacour & Jabouille 1930  MNHN

**S. s. fortior**  
Sitta solangiae fortior
Delacour & Greenway 1939  MCZ 27

**S. s. chienfengensis**  
Sitta frontalis chienfengensis 28  
Cheng, Ting & Wang 1964  IZAS

**Tichodroma muraria**  
T. m. muraria

**T. m. muraria** 26  

**Metacilla [sic] longirostra**  
S. G. Gmelin 1774  ?  E.

**T. m. nepalesis**  
T[ichodroma]. nepalesis
Bonaparte 1850  RMNH

**T. m. nepalesis** 26  
T[ichodroma]. m[uraria]. ognewi  
Portenko 1954  ZISP

**Certhia [familiaris] familiaris**  
C. f. tianshanica

**C. f. tianshanica** 26  
Hartert 1905b  AMNH

---

25 A primary homonym. See Comment.
26 Greenway (1967) omitted this name from his synonymy. It was revived by Mees (1986) and applied to Javan birds. See Quaiser & Dekker (2006, this issue).
27 The registered number of the holotype was mistakenly cited as 866,562 in the original publication; it should have been 266562 (Dickinson et al., 1991: 301).
28 Greenway (1967: 142) placed this in the synonymy of nominate Sitta frontalis despite its yellow bill.
**C. f. daurica**  
*Certhia familiaris daurica*  
Domaniewski  1922  MPHN  
*Certhia familiaris orientalis*  
Domaniewski  1922  MPHN  
*Certhia familiaris ernsti*  
Kuroda  1924  Lost  29.  
*Certhia familiaris canescens*  
Sushkin  1925  ZISP  
*Certhia familiaris altaica*  
Sushkin  1925  ZISP  
*Certhia familiaris kurilensis*  
Momiyama  1927  YIO  
*Certhia familiaris kawamurai*  
Momiyama  1927  YIO

**C. f. japonica**  
*Certhia japonica*  
Hartert  1897  AMNH  
*Certhia familiaris shikokiana*  
Mishima  1955  TPM  

**C. f. bianchii**  
*Certhia familiaris bianchii*  
Hartert  1905b  ZISP

**Certhia hodgsoni**  
**C. h. hodgsoni**  
*Certhia Hodgsoni*  
Brooks  1871  29  BMNH  
**C. h. mandellii**  
*Certhia Mandellii*  
Brooks  1874  BMNH  
**C. h. khamensis**  
*Certhia khamensis*  
Bianchi in Sharpe  1903  ZISP  
*Distinc but still to be assigned:*  
*Certhia familiaris kwanhsienensis*  
Kleinschmidt & Weigold 1922  AMNH  30.

**Certhia himalayana**  
**C. h. taeniura**  
*Certhia taeniura*  
Severtzov  1873  30  ZISP  32.  
**C. h. himalayana**  
*Certhia Himalayana*  
Vigors  1832  33.  
*Certhia himalayana limes*  
Meinertzhagen  1922  BMNH  
*Certhia himalayana cedricola*  
Koelz  1939  AMNH  
*Certhia himalayana infima*  
Ripley  1950  USNM  
**C. h. yunnanensis**  
*Certhia yunnanensis*  
Sharpe  1902  BMNH  
**C. h. ripponi**  
*Certhia himalayana intermedia*  
Kinnear  1921  BMNH  
*Certhia familiaris [lapsus for himalayana] ripponi nom. nov.*  
Kinnear  1929  BMNH

---

29 Greenway (1967: 152) dated this from volume 41 of the Journal of the Asiatic Soc. Bengal but a description first appeared a year or so earlier in the *Proceedings* of this society.  
30 Greenway (1967: 157) mentioned two dates for Severtzov's publication. The title page is dated 1873. Severtzov sometimes claimed that this appeared in December 1872 but may have ignored the difference between the Gregorian and Julian calendars; late December 1872 in Russia would have been early January 1873 in most of the western world!  
31 Preoccupied by *Certhia intermedia* Status Müller, 1776 (not identified).  
32 This was Kinnear’s replacement name for *Certhia himalayana intermedia* Kinnear, 1921.
Certhia tianquanensis
Certhia familiaris tianquanensis 33 Li Gui-yuan 1995 SAU 34.

Certhia nipalensis
Certhia Stoliczkae Brooks 1874 BMNH 36.

Certhia discolor

Certhia manipurensis
C. m. manipurensis Hume 1881 BMNH
Certhia victoriae Rippon 1906 BMNH

C. m. shanensis
Certhia discolor fuliginosa 34 Baker 1922 BMNH
Certhia discolor shanensis nom. nov. 35 Baker 1930 BMNH

C. m. laotiana
Certhia discolor laotiana Delacour 1951 MCZ

C. m. meridionalis
Certhia discolor meridionalis Robinson & Kloss 1919b BMNH

Salpornis spilonotus
S. s. spilonotus Franklin 1831 BMNH 38.
Certhia spilonota
Salpornis spilonotus rajputana R. Meinertzhagen & A. Meinertzhagen 36 1926 BMNH

Comments

1. The specimen Gould depicted was ‘forwarded’ to him by Temminck with a note stating that “it was from Russia, and would form a portion of the supplement to the third part of his Manuel”. It is possible that this specimen was returned to Temminck, but if so it apparently is no longer in the RMNH, Leiden (C. Quaisser in litt., 4 May 2006).

33 Three different spellings of this name appeared in the original description; for a First Reviser see Martens & Tietze (2006; this issue).
34 Preoccupied by Certhia fuliginosa Shaw, 1811, in use for a nectariniid (see Dickinson, 2003: 706). Greenway (1967: 159) referred to Certhia fuliginosa Bechstein, 1811. Baker (1930: 90) listed Bechstein’s name as well as Shaw’s (now Nectarinia fuliginosa Shaw, ‘1811-12’) as employed by Rand, 1967: 232). Both authors, each actually dating from 1811, based this name on an earlier work of Vieillot in which there is only a French vernacular name. For the purposes of this list it is enough to know that fuliginosa Baker, 1922, is preoccupied by the sunbird given the name Certhia fuliginosa (it will be either Bechstein or Shaw, but the priority needs to be clarified).
35 For Certhia discolor fuliginosa Baker, 1922.
36 Greenway (1967: 160) erred in citing this from “Meinertzhagen”; it was jointly described by Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen and his wife.
2. Type destroyed when the museum in Budapest burned down in 1956 (Horváth, 1970).

3. Almost certainly destroyed in World War II (see Morioka et al., 2005: 26).

4. Almost certainly destroyed in World War II (see Morioka et al., 2005: 123).

5. Momiyama provided a small drawing that has to suffice as a description. If the type survives it should be in the YIO with other nuthatches from Momiyama’s collection, but it has not been located.

6. Lectotypification was discussed by Rossolimo et al. (2001: 152).

7. Stejneger (1887: 391) suggested that Bonaparte had probably named *roseilia* from the drawing that was mentioned by Temminck & Schlegel (1844-1850: 138). This drawing may be in the collections of the RMNH. Should it be found, the image, the subject of which may be considered to be Bonaparte’s type, should be compared with the forms of *Sitta europaea* known to occur in Japan. If it is evident which Japanese population was depicted, the type locality of *roseilia* may need to be reconsidered.

8. For the designation of a lectotype, which is necessary because the type series includes two distinct taxa, see Voisin et al. (2002).

9. Voisin et al. (2002) designated MCZ 128308 from Kuatun as the lectotype of *sinensis* because the series included specimens of *montium* from Moupin (in Sichuan). Although this action is correct it does not alter the anomaly mapped by Cheng (1987: 908) suggesting that the type locality represents an isolated population while a second, separated by hundreds of miles, occurs in the mountains through which the Mekong and the Yangtse flow from Tibet to Yunnan (Vaurie, 1957, judged these two populations inseparable; but see Dickinson, 2006: this issue).


11. Warren & Harrison (1971: 230) listed a syntype from ‘Bian Khel’. The original description of *hariabica* ‘Wardlaw Ramsay’ by Whistler (1944: 517) appeared in an account of *Sitta cashmirensis* and relates to two females from Otipore and the male from ‘Bian Khel’ collected by Griffith. Later in this discussion two of Venning’s male specimens from Zhob (‘over the Afghan border’) are mentioned, but these should not be considered syntypes as they did not accord with the description.

12. Blyth (1842) dealt with a collection from Chyebassa (or Chaibasa) made by Lieutenant Tickell. To an account of *Sitta castaneoventris*, of which one might suppose Tickell had provided a specimen although no such specimen was in the Calcutta Museum when that collection was catalogued (Blyth, 1852), he appended a description of another nuthatch already in the Calcutta collection which he named *Sitta cinnamoventris* but gave no collecting locality. Blyth (1852: 189) listed a female in the Society’s ‘Old
collection’ which could have been Blyth’s type, and several specimens from Darjeeling that Blyth received later than his description. Baker (1930: 24) listed Darjeeling as the type locality, perhaps misled by Blyth (1852). If, some time between 1842 and 1930, the description was indeed connected with Darjeeling no citation of this type locality designation has been traced.

13. Franklin’s collection was presented to the Zoological Society of London, whose museum collection was later disposed of as discussed by Wheeler (1997). Most of the types of Franklin’s names do not seem to have been transferred to the BMNH and must be considered lost.

14. The specimen considered to be a syntype by Warren & Harrison (1966) was purchased from Gerrard as a part of the Jardine collection, but no mention of its status appears in the BMNH accessions register. That it is or might be a type seems to have been recognised later. A specimen that belonged to Selby was deposited in Cambridge University zoology museum (UMZC) by his trustees and is considered a syntype (Benson, 1999). Warren & Harrison (op. cit.) referred to W. Murray as the collector; but this is not mentioned in the original description. Described from the Himalayas, Baker (1921: 472) restricted its type locality to Kashmir. Meinertzhagen (1927: 410) questioned this, suggesting Simla would have been a better choice, but offered no evidence of where Jardine’s specimens may actually have come from, hence Kashmir should stand.

15. There are three Hodgson specimens in the BMNH collection, but none is demonstrably one that was collected before Hodgson’s description was published.

16. The types were not mentioned by Warren & Harrison (1971). Subsequently, they have been added to the types drawers and database at the BMNH and written into the working copy of the BMNH type catalogue. For details see Hennache & Dickinson (2000: 621).

17. The syntypes are likely to be the pair accessioned in 1863, of which the female could not be found at the MNHN in Paris in 1999 or in 2006. Two other specimens accessioned in 1868 do not seem to qualify.

18. There appears to be no description given with this name. As a nomen nudum it cannot have a type.

19. Gould (1850) referred to examples from the collection of Captain Hay (Lord Arthur Hay, who eventually became Viscount Walden and later the Marquess of Tweeddale) that were by then in Gould’s own collection. Gould presented a specimen to the East India Company Museum in 1853 (Horsfield & Moore, 1858: 721), a date which, according to Warren & Harrison (1966), seems to depend on the note in Horsfield & Moore (1854: v). Horsfield & Moore (1858) did not suggest that this was a type but it seems certain to have been one.
20. The description by Sharpe (1872) implied that the specimen had been examined when Sharpe & Dresser were working on the early parts of Dresser’s History of the Birds of Europe, and the specimen has indeed been located with Dresser’s collection in Manchester.

21. Blyth (1843), in his report to the December 1842 meeting of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, described a specimen apparently from Darjeeling. In Blyth (1852: 189) the only specimen held by the Museum was one presented by a Mrs. Oakes in 1843. Perhaps Blyth described this before it was presented; if so then this was no doubt his type as Sclater (1892) seems to have thought, although it is not possible to be sure (because it was Blyth’s practice to replace poor quality skins with better specimens when he could).

22. There were two syntypes, with original numbers 2226A and 2316, collected in February 1916. Warren & Harrison (1971: 390) listed this taxon as nivriventer not nigroventer, thus their entry is easily missed.

23. Swainson’s original specimen, of which an engraving was made, had been sent to Banks from Ceylon. This specimen, now probably lost, is presumed to have been the basis for the description as well as the plate; and for it Swainson adopted Horsfield’s Javan name, thinking that the latter had been published. Warren & Harrison (1971: 193) stated that “the specimen from Java listed by Gadow (1883: 359) has no type status”. In fact Gadow listed two ‘types’, under Art. 72.4 of The Code (I.C.Z.N., 1999) they would be wrong; a specimen can be included in the type series by bibliographic reference to it. It is recommended that the BMNH examine the possibility that the specimens Gadow discussed are types of Swainson’s name. Whether those specimens do or do not qualify, it is apparent that the type series must be held to have included specimens from both Ceylon and Java, and, as these are considered distinct, the designation of a lectotype is necessary. Soon after Horsfield (1821), Javan birds were named velata by Temminck (1821). This seems not to have been interpreted as a restriction of the type locality, probably because that was considered to be Ceylon. However, such a restriction does not resolve the problem of a composite series and so we hereby designate the Ceylon specimen depicted in Plate 2 of Swainson’s Zoological illustrations as the lectotype of Sitta frontalis. Horsfield specimen from Java, if it qualifies, would then be a paralectotype. Meanwhile, Horsfield’s name, a primary homonym the moment it was published, is “permanently invalid” and has no right to a type. Whilst validly proposed, the name would have lost validity by the accident of dual usage, by one author for Ceylon birds and by the other for Javan birds. It is not clear whether Article 57.2 of the Code, which treats primary homonyms, was drafted with an awareness of cases such as this. Surely, permanently ‘unavailable’ would have been sufficient, and better than ‘invalid’ because types employed in such situa-

37 The 1961 Code was less clear.
38 See also Dickinson et al. (2006; this issue) for a discussion on new parid names used by both Gould and Moore where, on present evidence, we cannot be 100% certain which author has priority.
tions have great historical value, even if their names may not be retained in use. For other examples of such dual usage see *Pitta gigas* Blyth nec Temminck, discussed by Dickinson et al. (2000: 107), and *Pericrocotus speciosus fohkiensis* Baker nec Buturlin, discussed by Dickinson et al. (2002: 44) – listed as valid by Warren & Harrison (1966: 186) but which must be treated as permanently invalid in the same way as *Sitta frontalis* Horsfield, 1821. It is to be hoped that the I.C.Z.N. will revisit the wording of this Article. Gadow (*op. cit. supra*) mentioned two females received at the BMNH from the East India Company and derived from Java. These must be two of the three specimens listed as ‘types’ by Horsfield & Moore (1858: 723). The population of Java is distinct from that of Ceylon. If the I.C.Z.N. were to clarify that the “types” of names rendered permanently invalid were of historical importance then Horsfield’s “types” should attract special attention for preservation in their own right.

24. The ‘syntype’ of *Sitta corallina* Hodgson listed by Warren & Harrison (1971: 130) may be a syntype, but there is nothing to show whether it was collected before or after the publication of the description.

25. The holotype was a No. 12774 in the Bureau of Science, Manila, but this was destroyed in World War II. Manuel (1957) proposed a neotype, but Parkes (1958) wrote that loss alone was insufficient cause for this action.

26. The holotype of this, No. 5790 in the Bureau of Science, Manila, was also destroyed in World War II.

27. Peters (1943: 89) gave the number of the type as MCZ No. 267097. A recent review of the type material from Delacour’s expeditions to Indochina (Hennache & Dickinson, 2000) corrected that to 265097.

28. Linnaeus (1766: 184) employed the same name as Brisson (1760), from which author, in accordance with Opinion 37 (I.C.Z.N., 1910) no specific name is available.

29. Destroyed in World War II, see Morioka et al. (2005: 37).

30. The other syntypes in Dresden were destroyed in World War II, see Eck & Quaisser (2004: 300).


32. Three syntypes were collected by Fedchenko in the upper Zeravshan River valley near Samarkand in winter 1868-69. These are in ZISP; the fourth, a female collected in November near Chimkent, is not.

33. The birds described by Vigors in conjunction with Gould’s *A Century of birds from the Himalayan mountains* were presented by Gould to the Zoological Society of London. Immediately after Vigors (1832) described the last of the birds from Gould’s collection that were intended for that work he dealt with four new birds collected some
years earlier by Dr [John?] Struthers and sent to him by Dr John Scouler of Glasgow University. It seemed possible that the types of these four taxa, of which this treecreeper was one, had been returned to Scouler, rather than being included in Gould’s donation but, if so, they are not now in this Glasgow collection (M. Reilly, pers. comm., 04 May 2006).

34. The holotype is preserved in Sichuan Agricultural University (J. Martens pers. comm.). The number given in the original description appears to be a field number and it is not known what museum registration number has been given to the specimen.

35. Blyth (1845: 581) began by describing Certhia discolor and mentioned that he also had five specimens (by implication from Darjeeling and probably Nepal) with the underparts “uniform dingy brown” whereas “in three Nepal specimens of the other the white is alike pure”. The brown birds Blyth considered to be “C. nipalensis, Hodgson” and by “of the other” he meant C. himalayana Vigors 40. Blyth (1852: 188) listed two specimens in bad order received from Hodgson in 1843, early enough to have been two of his three types. It is to be hoped that these may have survived in Calcutta, and now be at the ZSI. However, despite their condition they were not mentioned by Sclater (1892) either in his list of types present or in that of those missing. As Blyth’s third type was not in Calcutta in 1852 there is some potential for this to have reached the BMNH. Warren & Harrison (1971: 386) listed a syntype (BMNH 1843.1.13.247) with a query, but offered no specifics on when this transfer had occurred nor why such a specimen could have been accessioned two years before the taxon was described. Gadow (1883: 329) listed six specimens from Nepal of which two came from Gould’s collection. The first three of these came from Hodgson and, presumably, were accessioned in 1843-45. The last came from the East India Museum, and such a specimen was listed by Horsfield & Moore (1858: 718) as having been donated by Hodgson, not by the Asiatic Society of Bengal (which one would expect to see credited if the specimen had come from Blyth in Calcutta). Thus there is no clear trail for these although one may be demonstrable for another of the BMNH specimens associated with Hodgson. Gadow’s list of specimens hides a further problem. Kinnear (1935) observed that birds to which Hodgson assigned his MS name Certhia nipalensis were not what Blyth actually named nipalensis. However, judging by his descriptions, Gadow (1883) probably did group the correct specimens under the name discolor, although the name stoliczkae was wrongly listed as a synonym. Brooks’s specimens of the latter, now in the Hume collection, had not yet reached London, so that no specimen before Gadow could have been certainly identified as stoliczkae. The same caution is needed as regards Gadow’s placement of mandelli in the synonymy of nipalensis as, again, Brooks’s specimens had not reached London.

---

39 Blyth (1852: 188) listed two specimens both from Darjeeling and presented in 1845.
40 Blyth (1852: 188) listed no early specimens of C. himalayana.
41 Which was once mounted and has not been relaxed.
36. It was Kinnear (1935) who placed *stolickzae* in the synonymy of *C. nipalensis* Blyth, referring to Blyth’s rather confusing description of the latter, mentioned in Comment 35, and also to the notation by Blyth “on a skin sent to him by Gould” (i.e., a skin that Blyth had marked as *nipalensis* which was thought to be *stolickzae*).

37. Blyth (1852: 188) listed two specimens from Darjeeling presented by Webb; however his description seems to suggest that he actually had Hodgson specimens from Nepal in hand at the time. Whether he had received Webb’s specimens by then is unclear but it can be reasonably assumed that he had. Both were noted by Sclater (1892) and are presumably still in Calcutta, at the ZSI.

38. This was one of the few types acquired by the British Museum when the collection of the Zoological Society was dispersed (Wheeler, 1997).

**Other names**

Two names once suggested for treecreepers have been found to be preoccupied, one by *Certhia intermedia* Statius Müller, 1776, and the other by *Certhia fuliginosa* Shaw, 1811 42. We have made efforts to discover to what Statius Muller’s name relates, i.e., where it now lies in synonymy, but have failed to find an answer in time for this paper. Of the name *Dendrophila* [*Sitta*] *gymnophrys* ‘Kuhl’ listed by Bonaparte (1850: 226) no description was found by Reichenbach (1853) and so, rightly, the name did not appear in the *Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum* (Gadow, 1883).

Attention is also drawn to the name *Sitta longirostris* Latham, 1790. Greenway (1967: 142) considered this unidentified. Fisher & Warr (2003: 159) showed reason to believe that Latham described this from one or two paintings from the collection of Lady Impey. They reproduced two paintings, one of which was labelled ‘Syam Chakar’, and suggested that the origin of the specimen depicted (either a syntype of a holotype of Latham’s name) was Thailand. However, the coloration of the underparts is much more like that of Iranian birds than it is any form known from Thailand. This is further discussed by Dickinson (2006) in the preliminary review that is associated with this paper.

**Summary of types of unknown whereabouts**

*Sitta asiatica* Gould, 1837; *Sitta castaneoventris* Franklin, 1831; *Sitta frontalis* Swainson, 1820; *Certhia muraria* Linnaeus, 1766; *Metacilla* [sic] *longirostra* S.G. Gmelin, 1774; *Certhia Himalayana* Vigors, 1832.

The above list presumes that the specimens thought to be at the ZSI in Calcutta are indeed there. It excludes all names for which the types are believed definitely lost, but includes those whose types we consider may yet be rediscovered.

---

42 This name is in use in the genus *Cinnyris* (see Dickinson, 2003: 706). See also the footnote to the name *fuliginosa* in our table.
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