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PREFACE

With this issue we begin volume two after a five month gap. This has been due to a lack of papers submitted for publication. Papers that fit our chosen niche arise only when serious bibliographic studies are undertaken and such studies are very often the outcome of years of patient pursuit of the evidence that is needed to justify fresh conclusions. Long gestation periods for such papers are normal. In addition Zoological Bibliography is still in its infancy and not widely known despite free access.

Those of our depositories who enquired about our “February issue” have been asked to change their records and list Zoological Bibliography not as a ‘quarterly’ but as an ‘occasional publication’. Our readers and subscribers should expect that a volume, and that is what they subscribe for, will contain 160 pages or more and that its four issues may be single issues or double issues.

The realisation that we could not count on a reasonably steady flow of papers allows us to reconsider our reaction to longer papers. To those offering these to us we have previously indicated that papers in excess of about 30 pages would need to be split into two or more parts. Now however we can look at the annual budget and much more easily envisage ‘double issues’ as a means of accommodating such papers, even accepting papers longer than 60 pp. This may also permit volumes, of 160 pages or more, to be completed more quickly than they might otherwise have been.

The original annual subscription thus becomes a volume subscription and current subscribers are asked to contact us when this issue reaches them, using the e-mail address info@avespress.com, to arrange to pay their subscriptions for volume two. The subscription for volume two is unchanged at £40 including postage. Due to the increasing cost of postage it is unlikely to be possible to hold it at this level for the next volume unless we triple the number of subscribers for the print edition.

In the last issue we provided details of the Sherborn Symposium which was held on October 28th at the Natural History Museum in London. This was highly successful. It was well attended and benefitted from internationally known speakers with a deep knowledge of their subjects. Plans are understood to be in hand for the publication of papers given at the meeting.

Edward Dickinson, Acting Editor
25 March 2012
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ABSTRACT: Based on a set of livraisons with wrappers indicating contents of plates for Pierre Hippolyte Lucas’s three volume *Animaux Articulés* in the *Exploration Scientifique de l’Algérie*, it is now possible to date the plates of all the invertebrates depicted on those plates, which were issued in advance of the text (the latter often dated as 1849). Dates of publication for the six plates of Diptera are given here and the earliest date of availability of each of the 71 names of Diptera depicted on the plates is presented, all of which predate their appearance in the 1849 text.
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INTRODUCTION

At the 19 June 1849 séance of the Société Entomologique de France, entomologist Pierre Hippolyte Lucas (1815–1899) announced to the society the completion of the three volume “Histoire Naturelle des Animaux Articulés” section of the multi-volume “Exploration Scientifique de l’Algérie pendant les années 1840, 1841, 1842 …”. The three volumes contained 1,495 pages of text and 122 hand-coloured plates depicting arthropods (crustaceans, arachnids, myriapods, “héxapodes” [smaller orders of insects and related arthropods], and the larger orders of insects) that were collected during the four-year expedition. A number of new species were described in the text and on the plates, so obtaining accurate dates of publication is critical to establishing priority of the many new taxonomic names proposed. However, since its publication, attempts to date the text and plates have proven difficult. According to the publisher (Arthus Bertrand, 1856: 20), the entire three volume set of the *Animaux Articulés* was part of a larger “Sciences Physiques.—Zoologie” containing text and plates of “Mammalogie, Ornithologie … Érpetologie, Ichthyologie” that were issued in 33 livraisons from 1846–1849, each livraison of which was comprised of a series of 6 plates and usually 5 feuilles (= gatherings; at 8 pages per feuille) of text. However, little evidence of receipts of the livraisons have been found and without the wrappers to them (which list the contents of plates and text on the front cover), associating text and plates with actual dates of publication has been severely limited.

Recent acquisition by me of an uncut copy of this work, which was accompanied by 23 of the 33 wrappers with contents listed on the cover of each, gives a much clearer picture of the dates of publication of this three volume work and the sequence of issuance of plates and text. A much more detailed study on the history of this work and the results of dating research of all of the parts of the *Zoologie* volumes will be presented elsewhere. However, in order to allow proper dating of the names of the Diptera in this work that were proposed by Pierre-Justin-Marie-Macquart in an upcoming study of his new genus-group and species-
group names, I herewith present the dates of publication for the livraison that contained the Diptera plates and present the earliest date of availability for all the names of Diptera proposed by Macquart that are depicted on the plates.

**SOURCES USED FOR DATING**

The wrappers of 23 of the 33 livraisons (livraisons 4–26) from the three volume set obtained by me during this study were the primary source for the contents of each issue. Additional evidence of contents and dating were obtained from receipt records in the *Bibliographie de la France* (BF), detailed and annotated bibliographies listing a breakdown of contents, and contemporary published reviews of livraisons. The results obtained from these sources in this study were compared with previous research conducted by Sherborn & Woodward (1901), Baker (1994), Evenhuis (1997), and Chandler (1999).

**DATING OF THE LIVRAISONS CONTAINING PLATES AND TEXT OF THE DIPTERA**

Printing of the *Animaux Articulés* was done by the Impprimerie Royale (the plates were contracted out to the well-known intaglio printer N. Rémond) and published by the Paris bookseller Claude Arthus Bertrand. Arthus Bertrand issued to subscribers the work in livraisons, each of which was comprised of 6 plates in folio and often 5 feuilles (= 40 pages) of text in large quarto. The plates were not issued in any pattern and evidence from the contents on the wrappers researched in this study shows that some livraisons containing arthropods for the *Animaux Articulés* volumes also contained the plates of *Reptiles, Poissons, Oiseaux*, and *Mammifères* for their respective vertebrate volumes, the text of which appeared later. The vertebrate plates being issued far in advance of the text (in some cases by as much as twenty years!) is apparently not well known (there are a few contemporary citations by workers of the plate and figure numbers for animals but none knew the exact date of publication). More detailed analysis of the vertebrate plates and their dating is being published by me elsewhere.

Initially, advertisements in journals mention that the livraisons for the Exploration *Scientifique de l’Algérie* were to be issued monthly. However, there is little evidence of this actually having been implemented in the *Animaux Articulés*, even for the first few livraisons that were recorded in the *Bibliographie de la France*. There are no doubt many possible explanations for delays in publication but one delay a few years after publication of the *Animaux Articulés* began, which appeared to have a significant impact on the production output, was the workers’ revolution in France that began in February 1848 and ceased in December 1848.

Based on the set of the *Animaux Articulés* at hand, the six Diptera plates are all contained within one livraison (livraison 18; see Figure 1 for the contents). The text of the Diptera was on pp. 414–503 of the third of the three volumes, which was completed by the 13 June meeting of the Société Entomologique de France. Livraisons were issued in chronological order and few accurate dates beyond the year have yet been found for livraisons 23–33. The Diptera pages 414–503 fall within these livraisons, so the text of the Diptera must date from before 13 June 1849.

A date for livraison 20 was found in this study based on a review of that livraison by Guérin-Méneville (1847) in the November issue of his *Revue et Magazin Zoologique de la Société Cuvierienne*. A date for livraison 17 was obtained in this study based on one of the plates
contained in that livraison (plate 22 of the Arachnida), which was cited in a work by Walckenaer & Gervais (1847). The Bibliographie de la France recorded the Walckenaer & Gervais work on 15 May 1847. No date has yet been found for livraison 18 so it must date from between 15 May and November 1847. A date for livraison 27 was found through citation by Walker (1849: 275) of a species (Silvius algerius) and its page 427 in the Macquart work in the Animaux Articulés. Walker’s work has a publication date of 21 April 1849 (see Evenhuis, 1997: 800). Hence, the pages of livraison 27 (pp. 361–440) date from at least before 21 April 1849. The remainder of volume 3 of the Animaux Articulés (pages 441–527) therefore dates from between 21 April and 13 June 1849.

![DIX-HUITIÈME LIVRAISON.](image)

**Figure 1.** Bottom portion of the front cover of the wrapper for livraison 18 of the Animaux Articulés showing contents of the livraison.

**DIPTERA DEPICTED ON THE PLATES**

The Diptera in the Animaux Articulés are on six plates (Figures 2–7), all contained within livraison 18, which dates from between 15 May and November 1847 and are here referred to as in Macquart (1847). Some 71 species are illustrated, most names of which are proposed by Macquart, either previous to this work or as new in this work. Since previous to this study, the dates of the plates were unknown, workers have conservatively dated the new Diptera proposed in this work as “1849” based on their appearance in the text. However, because the plates came out before the text and bear the names of these new species, all the names proposed as new on these plates therefore take their date of availability from the plates and not the text.
Pierre-Justin-Marie Macquart (1778–1855) was responsible for the names on the plates (his name abbreviated as “Macq” appears after every Diptera name on the plates except one, which is attributed to Meigen) as well as the text of the Diptera, so research was conducted by me to determine if any of the names on the plates had appeared previously in Macquart’s publications. Although Macquart did not treat any of the new Algerian species in the text to his 1846 Diptères exotiques, he did illustrate a number of them and since their names are in the figure legends, those names take their date of availability from Macquart (1846) rather than from the plates in Macquart (1847) or the text in Macquart (1849). Table 1 gives the earliest dates of availability found for each of the Diptera names depicted on the plates. Notes clarifying spelling and dates of availability for a number of species on the plates follows the table.

Table 1. Names of Diptera Depicted on the Plates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species*</th>
<th>Macquart 1846 page/plate</th>
<th>Macquart 1847 plate</th>
<th>Macquart 1849 page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platyptalmus algirus Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 5</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physogaster maculatus Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 6</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemestrina fasciata Olivier, 1810</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 7</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthrax variipennis Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 8</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthrax fasciventeris Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 9</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthrax minuta Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 10</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthrax argentifrons Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 11</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomatia appendiculata Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 3</td>
<td>pl. 3, fig. 12</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius maculipennis Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 4</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 1</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius leucopyga Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 5</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 2</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius numida Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 6</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 3</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius albicans Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 7</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 4</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius singularis Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 8</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 5</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombylius argyropyga Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 9</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 6</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usia vestita Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 13</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 7</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amictus pulchellus Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>349, pl. 10, fig. 11</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 8</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toxophora maculata Meigen, 1820</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 9</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eristalis quivevittatus Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 10</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrphus algirus Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 11</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragus algirus Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>350, pl. 11, figs. 14, 15</td>
<td>pl. 4, fig. 12</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psilopus algirus Macquart, 1846</td>
<td>350, pl. 11, fig. 15</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 1</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conops fascipennis Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 2</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conops algira Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 3</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conops rufoventris Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 4</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinomyia algira Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 5</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinomyia prompta Meigen, 1824</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 6</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinomyia canariensis Macquart, 1839</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 7</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurinia angustiventris Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 8</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemorea vicina Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 9</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species*</td>
<td>Macquart 1846 page/plate</td>
<td>Macquart 1847 plate</td>
<td>Macquart 1849 page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Exorista nigripalpis</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 10</td>
<td>478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Miltogramma nitidomaculata</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 11</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paragus numida</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 5, fig. 12</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ptilocera lateralis</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 1</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sericocera fusicipennis</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 2</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sericocera algira</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 3</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lucilia hirsutoculata</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 4</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dexia lata</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 5</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dinera nigripes</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 6</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hydrophoria limbinervis</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 7</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sapromyza suillorum</em> (Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 8</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tetanocera algira</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 9</td>
<td>493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tetanocera unipunctata</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 10</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urophora radiata</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 11</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Borborus oeneus</em> Macquart, 1847</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>pl. 6, fig. 12</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* correct orthography is used for genus-group and species-group names in the table; any differences in spelling on the plates are explained below under “Notes”; names in **boldface** in the table are treated as new in the *Animaux Articulés* text.

**NOTES ON SOME OF THE DIPTERA DEPICTED ON THE PLATES**

Some but not all spelling errors on the 1847 Diptera plates were corrected by Macquart in footnotes in the 1849 text. These orthographic anomalies and some clarifications on dating of the names found in the plates are explained below.

**Plate 1** (Figure 2).

*Odontomyia limbata* Macquart, 1847 — The genus-group name is spelled as “*Odontomya*” on the plate. The spelling on the plate was explicitly corrected to “*Odontomyia*” in a footnote in the text (1849: 428).

*Rhopalia vittata* (Wiedemann, 1828) — The name on the plate was listed as “*Rhophalia vittata*, Macq”. The spelling of the genus-group name on the plate was not explicitly corrected but was correctly spelled and the author was cited correctly as “*Wied. Aus. Zweifl.* tom. I, p. 559, n° 37” in the text (1849: 431).

**Plate 2** (Figure 3).

*Dasypogon pygmaeus* Macquart, 1847 — A close examination of the text on the plate shows that the spelling is “*pygmaeus*”. There is no correction of the spelling on the plate in the text, but the species-group name is spelled as “*pygmaeus*” in the text (1849: 437). Because the names on the plates were hand-written and not type set with font, it is here concluded that the “*oe*” was intentional and not printed as such because of a limited dye set for a particular font, which is sometimes used as an excuse for the use of an “*oe*” when an “*ae*” may have been intended in typeset documents. Other names with an “*oe*” exist in on plates this work (e.g., see *Borborus oeneus* below).
Asilus castanipes (Meigen, 1820) — The name is listed as “Asilus castanipes, Macq” on the plate, but the authorship is correctly listed as “Meig. Dipt. d’Europe, tom. II, p. 312, no 9” in the text (1849: 440).

Plate 3 (Figure 4).

Empis geniculata Macquart, 1847 — The species-group name is spelled as “geniculatus” on the plate but explicitly corrected to “geniculata” in a footnote in the text (1849: 444).

Physegaster maculatus Macquart, 1847 — The plate depicting the new genus and new species has two figures labelled “6a”. The plate lettering is corrected in two footnotes in the text (1849: 445) so that the illustration labelled as 6a for the antenna is changed to 6b and the figure of the lateral view of the thorax labelled as 6b is changed to 6c.

Lomatia appendiculata Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 3 of Macquart (1846: 349).

Plate 4 (Figure 5).

Bombylius maculipennis Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 4 of Macquart (1846: 349).

Bombylius leucopyga Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 5 of Macquart (1846: 349).

Bombylius numidus Macquart, 1846 — The species-group name is spelled as “numida” on the plate; the spelling on the plate is not explicitly corrected in the text but the name is spelled in the text as “numidus” (1849: 450). Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 6 of Macquart (1846: 349; as “numidus”). Thus, the spelling on the plate here is not an original spelling of the name.

Bombylius albicans Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 7 of Macquart (1846: 349).

Bombylius singularis Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 8 of Macquart (1846: 349).

Bombylius argyropyga Macquart, 1846 — The species-group name is spelled on the plate as “argyropega”; the spelling on the plate is explicitly corrected in a footnote in the text (1849: 451) to “argyropega”. Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 9 of Macquart (1846: 349). Thus, the spelling on the plate here is not an original spelling of the name.

Usia vestita Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 13 of Macquart (1846: 349).
**Amictus pulchellus** Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 10, fig. 11 of Macquart (1846: 349).

**Toxophora maculata** Meigen, 1820 — The name is listed on the plate as “Toxophora maculata, Macq’’’, but the authorship is correctly listed as “Meig. Dipt. d’Europe, tom. II, p. 237, n° 1, pl. 19, fig. 12 à 16” in the text (1849: 456).

**Eristalis quinquevittatus** Macquart, 1847 — The species-group name is spelled as “quinque-vittatus” on the plate, but spelled as “quinquevittatus” in the text (1849: 465).

**Syrphus algirus** Macquart, 1847 — The genus-group name is spelled as “Sirphus” on the plate. The spelling on the plate is not explicitly corrected in the text but the genus-group name is spelled correctly as “Syrphus” in the text (1849: 469).

**Paragus algirus** Macquart, 1847 — The name *Paragus algirus* appears for the first time on the plate legend to plate 11, fig. 14 of Macquart (1846: 350), but because the plate depicts two species (“algirus et notata”) the name is not made available there. Its earliest date of its availability derives from its depiction on the plate in this work.

**Plate 5** (Figure 6).

**Psilopus algirus** Macquart, 1846 — Although intended to be described as new in this work, the earliest date of availability of the name is its appearance in the plate legend to plate 11, fig. 15 of Macquart (1846: 349).

**Echinomya algira** Macquart, 1847 — The spelling of the genus-group name on the plate is unnecessarily corrected in a footnote in the text (1849: 475) to “Echinomyia”.

**Echinomya prompta** Meigen, 1824 — The name is listed in the plate as “Echinomya prompta, Macq’’ and the authorship is treated in the text (1849: 476) as “Macq. Dipt. Exot. tom. II, p. 74, n° 13”. The spelling of the genus-group name on the plate is unnecessarily corrected in a footnote in the text (1849: 476) from “Echinomya prompta, Meig.” to “Echinomyia prompta, Meig.” Although Macquart listed his own work as the reference for this species, it is evident he knew that Meigen was the author from the footnote correction. I thus treat the citation of Macquart’s “Dipt. Exot. tom. II” as reference to his concept of the species and not his authorship of the species.

**Echinomya canariensis** Macquart, 1839 — The spelling of the genus-group name on the plate is unnecessarily corrected in a footnote in the text (1849: 475) to “Echinomyia”.

**Nemoraea vicina** Macquart, 1847 — The genus-group name is spelled as “Nemorea” on the plate. The spelling on the plate is not explicitly corrected in the text, but the genus-group name is spelled correctly as “Nemoreae” in the text (1849: 477).

**Miltogramma nitidomaculata** Macquart, 1847 — The species-group name is spelled as “nitido maculata” in the text (1849: 479).

**Plate 6** (Figure 7).

**Sapromyza suillorum** (Robineau-Desvoidy, 1830) — The name is listed on the plate as “Sapromyza suillorum, Macq’” and treated in the text (1849: 495) similarly with authorship
cited as “Macq. Hist. nat. des ins. Dipt. tom. II, p. 399, no 14.” That Robineau-Desvoidy is not mentioned by Macquart is not surprising as Macquart, due to strong differences of opinion, intentionally ignored Robineau-Desvoidy’s names in many of his works from the mid-1840s to the 1850s (see Evenhuis et al., 2010).

**Urophora radiata** Macquart, 1847 — The genus-group name was spelled as “**Uroptera**” on the plate; the spelling on the plate was explicitly corrected to “**Urophora**” in the text in a footnote (1849: 496).

**Borborus oeneus** Macquart, 1847 — A close examination of the text on the plate shows that the spelling is “**oeneus**”. There is no correction of the spelling on the plate in the text, but the species-group name is spelled as “**aeneus**” in the text (1849: 500). Because the names on the plates were hand-written and not type set with font, it is here concluded that the “oe” was intentional and not printed as such because of a limited dye set for a particular font, which is an excuse for the use of an “oe” when an “ae” may have been intended in typeset documents.

**CONCLUSIONS ON DATING FOR MACQUART’S SPECIES ON THE PLATES**

The following are the works in which the Macquart species dating from 1846 and 1847 that are found on the Diptera plates in Lucas have their earliest date of availability. The respective species are listed under each citation.


[Culex maculiventris, Tipula modesta, Limnobia longicollis, Bibio pusillus, Pangonia funebris, Tabanus tibialis, Tabanus tomentosus, Silvius appendiculatus, Lomatia appendiculata, Bombylius maculipennis, Bombylius leucropyga, Bombylius numidus, Bombylius albicans, Bombylius singularis, Bombylius argyropyga, Ustia vestita, Amictus pulchellus, Psilopus algirus]


Figure 2. Diptera plate 1 of the *Animaux Articulés.*
Figure 3. Diptera plate 2 of the *Animaux Articulés*.
Figure 4. Diptera plate 3 of the Animaux Articulés.
Figure 5. Diptera plate 4 of the *Animaux Articulés*.
Figure 6. Diptera plate 5 of the *Animaux Articulés*. 
Figure 7. Diptera plate 6 of the *Animaux Articulés*.
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ABSTRACT: Jean Cabanis’s Museum Heineanum: Singvögel includes gathering dates that evidence type-setting in 1850-1851 which is the date range given on the title page. However, other evidence presented here shows that publication occurred in 1853, and April 1853 is recommended on that basis. At least the first nine gatherings, all typeset in 1850, have been reported, and must have been proofed, and seen by other ornithologists but these are considered proof sheets which, as indicated in Article 9 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999), do not constitute publication.

KEYWORDS: Cabanis, Heine, Museum Heineanum, publication date, proofs, bibliographic sources (Germany).

INTRODUCTION

Ferdinand Heine¹ (1809-1894), landowner and public official, established a large collection of birds in c.1830 at his homestead St. Burchard near Halberstadt, Saxony-Anhalt, Germany (Nicolai et al., 1994, Quaisser & Nicolai, 2006). In the second half of the 1840s, Heine invited Jean Cabanis (1816-1906), bird curator at the Zoologisches Museum (now Museum für Naturkunde) in Berlin, to identify specimens in his collection and to publish a catalogue of the collection (Quaisser & Nicolai, 2006). The first volume of the Catalogue, covering Singvögel (true songbirds) was published some years later. It is usually dated from 1850-1851 (e.g. Schalow, 1906: 343, Zimmer, 1926: 122) or from 1851 (e.g. Quaisser & Nicolai, 2006: 20), but various uncertainties led Quaisser & Dickinson (2011: 81) to consider the dating of this work unresolved. This prompted me to review the available evidence.

Cabanis’s Singvögel appeared in 29 consecutively numbered gatherings (plus introduction plus two additional pages), of which gatherings 14–29 bear gathering dates ranging from January 1851 (gathering 14; day not given) to 23 October 1851 (gathering 29). The cover bears the date range ”1850–1851” and the preface was signed by Cabanis in October 1851. This indicates that at least some gatherings (presumably 1–13) were set in 1850 and that the remaining gatherings were set in January – October 1851. However, gathering dates are not the same as publication dates.

THE BOOK AS A WHOLE

Hartlaub (1851) did not list Cabanis’s Singvögel in his report on the advances in ornithology achieved during 1850 (although he cited a species from the work; see below). In

¹ This Ferdinand Heine was the father of Ferdinand Heine Jr. (1840-1920) who co-authored further parts of the catalogue with Cabanis (Cabanis & Heine Jr., 1859-1860, 1860, 1863a,b) and a final catalogue with Reichenow (Heine Jr. & Reichenow, 1890). For bibliographies of the Heines see Gebhardt (1964) and Quaisser & Nicolai (2006).
his subsequent report for 1851, presumably written in the first half of 1852, Hartlaub (1852: 4) wrote (my translation): “Dr. J. Cabanis is busy writing a [...] catalogue of the excellent ornithological collection of [...] F. Heine [...]. Some 150 pages of this [...] significant work have been already printed and [...] we can thus briefly mention this work here even before [my italics] it is published [...].” Hartlaub (1852: 4) thus explicitly said that the book was not published in 1851 and, indeed, I was not able to find Cabanis’s Singvögel listed in any other “recent literature” reviews for 1851. Moreover, I was not able to discover any other indication in the contemporary literature that the work was published before 1853. Cabanis (1853b) reviewed and praised Hartlaub’s (1852) report and did not object to Hartlaub’s statement that his (Cabanis’s) Singvögel was not yet published. He called the work (p. 45; my translation) “an aptly written annual report of our esteemed friend Hartlaub” and further evaluated this and previous reports from the same series as follows: “The great usefulness of these reports is acknowledged. They are not only of great importance for the history of ornithology, but they offer a brief but thorough overview for everybody who is interested in the ornithological literature of the past decades. We cannot recommend these annual reports warmly enough and we sincerely hope they will long continue to be published.” Cabanis’s review appeared in the January 1853 issue of the Journal für Ornithologie; the preface to this issue was signed by Cabanis (1853a: 4) and dated 12 November 1852.

One year later, Hartlaub (1853: 27–28) included Singvögel among the works published in 1852, albeit without giving a date of publication for the work (he gave no publication dates for most works he listed). It is known that Hartlaub sometimes included in his annual reports on ornithology works published after the given year, but received by him before he finished his report on that year (Mathews, 1922; Mlíkovský unpub. obs.). Hence, an inclusion of a work in one of Hartlaub’s annual reports does not mean that the work indeed was published in the target year. I found no explicit statement in any contemporary work that Cabanis’s Singvögel was published in 1852.

First reviews of Cabanis’s Singvögel were published in 1853 (Agassiz, 1853: 287, Anonymous, 1853a: 69 (Figure 1A), Anonymous, 1853b: 226, Anonymous, 1853c: 20 (Figure 1B), Anonymous, 1853e: 50 (Figure 1C), Gersdorf, 1853b: 57 (Figure 1D); see also Graevell, 1854: 32). The earliest of these appeared on 15 May (Anonymous, 1853a: 69). Gersdorf (1853b: 57) listed the book in the issue of the (almost) weekly Leipziger Repertorium2. Obituaries listed in this periodical indicate that Gersdorf (or his staff) received the book during the period 6–18 April 18533. Hartlaub (1853: 28) mentioned that Singvögel will be of use to the participants of the “diesjährige Versammlung in Halberstadt” (“this year’s meeting in Halberstadt”), i.e. of the 7th Annual Meeting of the Deutsche Ornithologen–Gesellschaft (“German Society of Ornithologists”), which was held on 11–14 July 1853.

---

2 Somewhat fewer than 52 issues were published per year and the exact dates of individual issues is so far unclear.

3 In the period of interest, Gersdorf (1853a) listed obituaries of persons deceased from 4 March – 5 April 1853, Gersdorf (1853c) listed those deceased from 4–14 April 1853, and Gersdorf (1853d) listed those deceased from 19–26 April 1853. The apparent gap between the latter two lists apparently reflects the fact that no persons of interest died during 15–18 April 1853, because Gersdorf’s 1853c and 1853d reports were published in consecutive issues of the Leipziger Repertorium (see references). Gersdorf reported on Cabanis’s Singvögel in the sheet with the obituaries for 4–14 April. Obituaries included in the preceding and the subsequent issues of the Leipziger Repertorium thus indicate that he (or his staff) received Cabanis’s book after 5 April and before 19 April 1853.
(Cabanis 1854). Pucheran (1853: 550) referred to p. 233 of Cabanis’s Singvögel in the December 1853 issue of the Revue et Magasin de Zoologie Pure et Appliquée, showing that he had access to the book before that date. Anonymous (1854: lxiv) mentioned that the Library of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia received a copy of Cabanis’s Singvögel on 6 December 1853. Pucheran (December 1853) appears to have been the first naturalist to refer to the Singvögel in a scientific paper. All previous reports from 1853 were from “recent literature” reviews.

**Figure 1A.** Anonymous (1853a) – page 69 from Intelligenz-Blatt zum Serapeum, 1853(9): 69-72.

**Figure 1B.** Anonymous (1853c) – page 20 from Bibliotheca Historico-Naturalis Physico-Chemica et Mathematica oder Systematisch Geordnete Uebersicht der in Deutschland und im Auslande auf dem Gebiete der Gesammten Naturwissenschaften und der Mathematik neu Erschieneen Bücher, 3(1).

**Figure 1C.** Anonymous (1853e) – page 50 from Messkatalog. Neue Folge 6: Michaelis 1853.

**Figure 1D.** Gersdorf (1853b) – page 57 from Leipziger Repertorium der Deutschen und Ausländischen Literatur, 19.
Further evidence comes from the book catalogues published on the occasion on the semi-annual Leipzig Book Fair, one of the largest book fairs in Europe, which started after Easter Day (March to April, depending on the year) and after St. Michael’s Day (29 August) each year (Wittmann, 1999), but the dates varied from year to year\(^4\). Although R. Frantz of Halberstadt, the publisher of the Singvögel always had advertisements or notices in these catalogues, Cabanis’s Singvögel was not mentioned in those in the 1851, 1852 and 1853 spring fair catalogues (Anonymous, 1851a, b, 1852a, b, 1853d) and first appeared in the catalogue for the St. Michael’s Day Book Fair in 1853 (Anonymous, 1853e: 50). This indicates that Cabanis’s Singvögel was not published early enough to be included in the catalogue for the 1853 Easter Day Book Fair, which presumably started on 17 April (Jubilate in 1853), but early enough to be included in the catalogue for the 1853 St. Michael’s Day Book Fair (Figure 2), which started on 4 September (Sayre, 1959).

In summary, the reports by Hartlaub (1852) and Cabanis (1853b) show that Cabanis’s Singvögel was not published before 1852, and there is no reliable evidence that the work was published in 1852; Hartlaub’s (1853) report being unsubstantiated in this respect. Subsequent reports show that the work was published in 1853 before 11 July (Hartlaub, 1853), before 16 June (Anonymous, 1853b; first record outside Germany), before 15 May (Anonymous, 1853a), probably between 6-18 April (Gersdorf, 1853a, b, c, d), and probably after March 1853 (Anonymous, 1853e). I conclude that Cabanis’s work Singvögel was quite probably published in April 1853. On this evidence the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999, Art. 21.3) leads me to recommend a date of publication of 30 April 1853 until better data are available.

**ADVANCE SHEETS**

Zimmer (1926: 122) observed that Sclater (1857: viii) said “I am informed that the sheets of his [= Cabanis’s] work containing the Tanagers [= pp. 21-30] — though not in England — were in circulation in Germany in the latter part of the year 1850 [...]” and suggested that part(s) of the Singvögel might thus have been published in 1850. Iredale (in Sherborn, 1922: xxxiv) reported that “there is no evidence that any part was issued before Oct. 1851”. Charles Davies Sherborn’s unpublished note in a BMNH (Natural History Museum at Tring) copy of the Singvögel says “I do not know of any evidence to show that pp. 1–106 were issued before 1851” (Quaissner & Dickinson, 2011: 81).

Better data were provided by Hartlaub (1852), who said that Cabanis’s work was not published by 1851, but that some 150 pages were already printed, presumably at the time he wrote the report, i.e. in 1852 (presumably in the first half of that year). Note that gathering dates show that the whole work was proofed before November 1851, but this information had apparently not reached Hartlaub. Hartlaub (1852: 4) mentioned some details from Cabanis’s work, so he must have seen a part of it. In the taxonomic part of his annual report

\(^4\) The Easter Day Book Fair started on “Misericordias Domini” (second Sunday after Easter Day) in the early 19th century (Sayre, 1959: 4-5), on “Jubilate” (third Sunday after Easter Day) in mid 19th century (Bohn, 1850: 86) and on “Cantate” (third Sunday after Easter Day) in the 1860s (Anonymous 1869). I adopt here “Jubilate” as the starting date of the Easter Day Book Fair in 1853. The St. Michael’s Day Book Fair started on the first Sunday after the St. Michael’s Day in mid 19th century (Bohn, 1850: 86). The catalogues had to be printed before the start of each Book Fair, hence the deadline for acceptance of entries for the catalogue had to be a few weeks earlier.
for 1851, Hartlaub (1852: 17-38) listed new species of birds described by Cabanis in his *Singvögel* but without providing descriptions for them. A comparison of Hartlaub’s list with Cabanis’s book shows that Hartlaub (1852) examined only the first nine gatherings of the *Singvögel*, i.e. pp. 1–72 of this work, while excerpts from subsequent gatherings appeared in Hartlaub (1853), when he had the whole of Cabanis’s book at his disposal.

*Figure 2. The cover of the Michaelmas 1853 Leipzig Book Fair (Neue Folge 6)*
Other references to Cabanis’s Singvögel prior to April 1853 are limited to Hartlaub (1851: 57) who referred to p. 66 of the Singvögel (re: Falcunculus gouldi) (as previously noted by Mathews, 1922: 17) and to Cabanis (1853d: 93–94), who referred to p. 33 of his own Singvögel (re: Phyllobasileus) in the March 1853 issue of the Journal für Ornithologie.

In summary, only the following authors referred to the Singvögel before April 1853 (the postulated publication date of the whole book): Hartlaub (1851) to gathering 9, Hartlaub (1852) to gatherings 1–9, and Cabanis (January 1853) to gathering 5. In addition, Sclater (1857) reported that gatherings 3–4 were allegedly “circulated” in Germany in 1850, and Hartlaub (1852) said that some 150 pages (i.e. some 19 gatherings) were printed at the time he finished his report (presumably in the first half of 1852), but there is no evidence that he saw more than the first nine gatherings.

Thus, the only published evidence for a “circulation” of advance sheets of the Singvögel is of the first nine gatherings which were available to Hartlaub in the first half of 1851 (Hartlaub, 1851) and one year later (Hartlaub, 1852). The only person other than the author (Cabanis) to use data from these sheets, appears to be Hartlaub (1852) and he, himself, considered these sheets as not published. I therefore conclude that any gatherings made available before April 1853 were proof sheets, which do not constitute a publication according to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN, 1999, Article 9.3).

I also conclude that no separates or preprints of Cabanis’s Singvögel existed, that the work was not published in parts (although it was proofed by gatherings over several months), and that it was published in a single volume by the date given above.

A PUBLICATION SCENARIO

The Heine Collection was among the largest and most important ornithological collections in Central Europe, when Cabanis started to write its catalogue. Good for the collection, but unfortunately for the forthcoming catalogue, the Heine Collection rapidly grew in the same period (Quaisser & Nicolai, 2006: 9-11), and thus the draft catalogue presumably was outdated by the time of its completion. This may have been the reason why the first nine gatherings (all presumably proofed in 1850) were made available to Hartlaub, while gatherings proofed subsequently (presumably in late 1850 to October 1851) were not advertised and not made available even to Hartlaub. The gathering dates show that Cabanis finished his work in October 1851 and signed and dated the preface to the book. It is possible that the discrepancy between the Catalogue and the current state of the Collection was by now so large that initially Heine decided not to publish the Catalogue.

Heine was an active member of the Deutsche Ornithologen–Gesellschaft (German Society of Ornithologists) in those years, and a decision was taken at the 6th Annual Meeting of this society, held on 5–10 July 1852 at Altenburg, that the 7th Annual Meeting would be held on 11–14 July 1853 at Halberstadt, the home of Ferdinand Heine (Cabanis 1853c: 66, 1854). A visit to the Heine’s famous bird collection was an obvious highlight of the Meeting. This, two-and-half years after Cabanis’s draft was completed, might have been the impetus finally causing Heine to decide to publish the first volume of the Catalogue, some nine months after it had been decided that this ornithological meeting would be held at Halberstadt, and just in time for the Meeting. That the Catalogue was not then updated could have been due to the very limited lead time.
NOMENCLATUREL ISSUES

Cabanis (1853e) described numerous new genera and species of birds in his Singvögel (Schalow, 1906: 343-344, Quaisser & Nicolai, 2006), all of which have generally been believed to date from 1851 or even from 1850. Showing that they were published much later, in April 1853, may affect precedence, because many ornithologists, including H.G.L. Reichenbach, C.L. Bonaparte and G.R. Gray were all busily publishing during this period. Extensive comparisons of literature will be necessary to expose such issues and I will publish these in a second part of this paper. In the meantime, new names of birds created by Cabanis in his Singvögel should be dated from 1853, but no nomenclatural changes should be made on the basis of this fact alone.
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ABSTRACT: Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800–1894) introduced a new species of hornbill to science naming it *Buceros Nipalensis*. Since it was published this taxon has been cited from two different sources, but, as shown below, it first appeared in the eighteenth volume of *Asiatic Researches* where it was validly introduced.


INTRODUCTION

A succession of authors has cited Hodgson, 1829 or Hodgson, 1831, as the source of the hornbill name *Buceros Nipalensis* and while citations to *Gleanings in Science* have consistently referred to 1829 (Horsfield & Moore, 1856–1858; Carus & Englemann, 1861; Cocker & Inskipp, 1988; Blanford, 1895, Waterhouse, 2004), or lacked a date (Oates, 1883), citations to *Asiatic Researches* have varied, some authors citing 1829 (Bose, 1885; Sharpe & Ogilvie-Grant, 1892; Blanford, 1895; Baker, 1923, 1927, 1930; Peters, 1945; Chaudhuri, 1956; Ripley, 1961, 1982; Ali & Ripley, 1970; Ripley, 1982) and others 1832 (Sherborn, 1928: 4290) and yet others omitting a date (Prinsep, 1835; Blyth, 1852; Jerdon, 1862; Mitra, 1885). Both these journals are Indian.

It is desirable to determine the source of this confusion and to firmly establish the correct citation for this name.

ASIATIC RESEARCHES

The journal *Asiatick Researches* later *Asiatic Researches* was published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal from 1788 to 1839, during which period twenty volumes were published. The first fourteen volumes were entitled *Asiatick Researches*, after which the ‘k’ was dropped (Nair 1996). Volumes XVIII–XX comprised two parts each.

The publication of *Asiatic Researches* suffered from the difficult financial situation of the Society and these difficulties extended beyond its life. As a consequence some issues were printed as much as three years after their due date (Nair 2000). Here I examine only volumes XVII and XVIII, as these are volumes that my investigations led to because 1829 is the date associated with volume XVII and the fact that this date was cited so often made it essential to check it out.

---

1 See Nair (2000: 399, 494), who presents in a table, printing dates for *Asiatic Researches* vols. 6–17 (1799–1833), along with costs, including in the end, “1st Part Physical Class,” printed in 1829.
ASIATIC RESEARCHES VOLUME XVII

Volume XVII of the *Asiatic Researches* has a title page dated 1832, and is through-paginated: pp. i–xii, 1–636. It contains ten papers numbered I to X, but does not contain Hodgson’s paper describing *Buceros Nipalensis*.

The gatherings that make up this volume [A–Z (pp. 1–87), A1–Z1 (pp. 91–181), A1–Z1 (pp. 185–277), A2–Z2 (pp. 281–373), A3–Z3 (pp. 377–469), A4–Z4 (pp. 473–557), A5–T5 (pp. 561–633)] do not hint at the volume having appeared in parts. The minutes of the Society’s meeting held on 7 November 1832, chaired by The Hon’ble Sir E. Ryan, President, record, “The Secretary reported the completion of the 17(th) volume: …” (Nair 1996a: 762). To that some additional material was added for preliminary page number ‘v’ reports on a “Resolution passed at a meeting of The Asiatic Society,” which is dated, “Wednesday, the 9th January, 1833,” [emphasis mine]. It is likely that the Appendix (pp. 631–636) which contains a list of members of the Society for calendar year 1832 was printed at the same time. At this period it is almost certain that the volume would have been issued unbound and these later pages could have been issued separately. If they were, publication of the main contents occurred not before 7 November 1832 and if they were not, then the whole volume did not appear until after 9 January 1833.

The volume number would seem to imply that production of this volume was intended to come earlier and that the volume was delayed for some reason. It would be desirable if the reason could be determined.

ASIATIC RESEARCHES VOLUME XVIII PART I

Volume XVIII of *Asiatic Researches* was divided into two parts, with separate title pages (Figure 1), pagination, gathering signatures, and different printing presses.

Part I was “Printed at the Government Gazette Press | By G. H. Huttmann. | 1829.” It had a title page dated 1829. Inside, p. i of Appendix No. I (pp. i–ii), which follows the main text (pp. 1–267) the date “20th May, 1829” appears. Publication must have been later than that but following the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (I.C.Z.N., 1999) it is reasonable to date this from June 1829 with the implied date of 30 June.

ASIATIC RESEARCHES VOLUME XVIII PART II

Part II was “Printed at the Bengal Military Orphan Press | By G. H. Huttmann. | 1833.” It had a title page dated 1833. Inside this, after the main text, is an Appendix entitled, “Members of the Asiatic Society,—1833”. This would appear to list the membership for the year 1833. Thus this part will have been published in early 1834, or later. This does not concern us, however, because Hodgson’s paper (Hodgson, 1829a) is to be found in Part I.

---

2 Asiatic Researches; | or, | Transactions of the Society, | Instituted in Bengal, | For enquiring into | The history, the antiquities, the arts and | Sciences, and literature | of | Asia. | Volume XVII | Calcutta: | Printed at the Bengal Military Orphan Press, | By G. H. Huttmann. | 1832.
Figure 1. Title pages of *Asiatic Researches*.
Bottom – the overall title page for volume XVIII.
CONCLUSIONS AS REGARDS THE ASIATIC RESEARCHES

At least the first part of Vol. XVIII appeared before Vol. XVII, i.e. the former in 1829 and the latter in 1832 or 1833. Those citing 1832 will have taken that date from the title page date in volume XVIII and will have failed to realise that the first part appeared much earlier.

GLEANINGS IN SCIENCE

Gleanings in Science, a very short-lived (1829–1831) monthly publication, was published by Captain J. D. Herbert and his intent “... was to confine it to extracts and abstracts from European scientific publications, but original contributions poured in so rapidly that he had to abstain from extracts,” (Mitra 1885, p. 51). When its publisher “was appointed Astronomer to His Majesty the King of Oudh [Awadh] in 1830 ... Mr. James Prinsep [the Secretary of the Asiatic Society of Bengal] ... proposed to change its name and call it ‘The Journal of the Asiatic Society.’ The sanction was given in March 1832. The ‘Journal,’ however, as it appeared in that month, bore the name of the ‘Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,’” (Mitra 1885).

It should be noted that Gleanings in Science was an independent publication when Captain Herbert started it. When he was appointed Astronomer, and could not continue editing the monthly, his friend and collaborator, James Prinsep, not wanting to abandon his friend’s already established publication, persuaded the Society to continue it, after renaming it (Nair, 1996: 230–233).

The first volume of Gleanings in Science, published in 1829, comprised twelve issues numbered 1–12, for the calendar months of that year. In its seventh issue, in July 1829 (pp. 211–230), is published an “Analyses of books,” which reviews the contents of “Asiatic Researches XVII [sic], Part 1.” In the introductory paragraphs of this the editor wrote, “Sixteen volumes of the Transactions of the Asiatic Society, have been given to the public, but this work has continued to be essentially literary in its character ...” (p. 211) (Figure 2).

This section of “analyses” is perfectly consistent with the publisher’s stated intent. The publisher was perfectly correct that sixteen volumes had appeared and either misread the evidence that what he had to hand was volume XVIII or presumed that that was a mistake. And it is perfectly conceivable that it was a mistake, and that it led to the succeeding volume being numbered to fill the gap.

Volume XVII was cited again two months later in the September 1829 issue of Gleanings in Science where Hodgson’s (1829b) actual paper was reprinted in its entirety, beginning on p. 249 (Figure 3), and the caption stated: “[From the 17th vol. As. Res. Pt. 1.],” thereby apparently corroborating the July information.

It is conceivable that in July 1829 Herbert had seen evidence of what was coming rather than what was already published but the most straightforward explanation is that he was indeed reporting on what had appeared.

From the use of “Volume XVII” in these two issues of the Gleanings comes all the subsequent confusion.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore recommended that that unless and until it is proved that the Asiatic Researches was published after July 1829, the citation for Buceros Nipalensis Hodgson be to the Asiatic Researches, XVIII (1): 178-186.
IX. Analyses of Books.

1.—Asiatic Researches; or, Transactions of the Society instituted in Bengal for inquiring into the History and Antiquities, the Arts, Sciences, and Literature of Asia, Vol. xvii. Part 1. [Physical Science.]

Considering the large field of inquiry presented to us by India in particular, and Asia generally, it must be confessed, that little has been done by us for the cultivation of natural history or physical science. With the exception of one department of the former (which we allow has had justice done it,) and the few papers of Col. Lamb MANUAL OF NATURAL HISTORY, AND LITERATURE OF ASIA, vol. xvi. little, if any thing, has been published in India on these subjects. Nor has this been for want of an appropriate vehicle of publication. Sixteen volumes of the Transactions of the Asiatic Society have been given to the public, but this work has continued to be essentially literary in its character; the scientific communications being too few in number, and too slender in pretension (with one or two exceptions) to require much consideration.

This leaning of the Society towards literature, to the almost exclusion of science, has been the effect of various causes into which we do not feel ourselves called upon here to inquire. The founder’s views, deeply imbued as he was with an enthusiastic love of eastern lore, necessarily had their influence, and this was increased by our position in the country. The views of a government situated as ours has been naturally led to the encouragement of the study of the languages of the country, which thence became the road to preferment, so that the strong stimulus of fame and profit were made to increase the tendency originally given to the inquiries of the Society by the genius of the founder.

But though the circumstances in which the Society originated, and for some time grew and prospered, were, if not adverse, yet far from favourable to the cultivation of science, the subject has not altogether lost sight of; a very early history of the Society having provided for the meeting of a class or committee especially applying itself to the cultivation of science. This provision had not, it is true, produced much fruit; for, though repeatedly revived, these meetings have always after a time fallen off, from what reason it is difficult to say. The last attempt made to revive them about this time last year promises to be more successful. They have had regularly meetings monthly since February last year, and many papers of interest have been promised and read at them. From these and some papers which had been previously in the possession of the Society a selection has been made, and the result, forming the first part of the seventeenth volume, is now before the public. We shall endeavour to give our readers an idea of the contents of the volume on these subjects.

The papers are sixteen in number, of which all except three are more or less connected with geology. This department of natural history has latterly engrossed a large share of the public attention in Europe. It is still in its infancy, yet teeming every day with discoveries of the greatest interest. In India the subject has been altogether untouched, and the first breaking up therefore of so rich a field promises an abundant harvest. It is not then to be wondered at, that the number of geological papers should greatly exceed the others. For a long time this subject must continue to afford the most promising field to the Indian observer; and we may therefore expect that the transactions of this branch of the Society will continue to have a leaning towards geology.


Mr. Calder begins his paper by paying a just tribute to the memory of the late W. H. Vossel, Esq., to whose unpublished notes he acknowledges himself indebted for much of the materials of his essay, and whom he justly describes as having fallen a victim to that uncarried zeal and ardour in the pursuit of science, which no toil or even danger could daunt. There is little doubt, that had the life of this indefatigable observer been spared, his labours alone would have served to raise the standard of Indian research, and to wipe out the reproach of indolence and indifference sometimes preferred against us by our enemies.

After noticing Mr. Vossel’s great merits, and deploring his untimely fate, Mr. Calder proceeds to take a general but rapid survey of the great mountain tracts, extending from Cashmere to Assam, the highest ridges of which are covered with per-

• We should be glad to see some of the friends of this gentleman give some account of his life and labours. We think they owe it to his memory.

Figure 2. First page of ‘Analyses,’ from Gleanings in Science No. 7 for July 1829, p. 211. Note the mistaken use of “vol. xvii” which is best explained by a presumption that this was the as yet unpublished vol. xvii when in fact it was not. See also lines 6–8 in the first paragraph. Image downloaded from www.books.google.com.
GLEANINGS
IN
SCIENCE.

No. 9.—September, 1829.

I.—On a New Species of Bucerós.—By H. Hodgson, Esq. B. C. S.
[From the 17th vol. As. Res. Pt. 1.]

Order Pinnipedia; Tribe Conipenos; Family Buceridæ; Genus Bucerós, Species new; Bucerós Nipponensis, Dhanás, Ind.

This remarkable and very large species, which I have the advantage of contemplating at leisure in a live specimen, measures, from the point of one wing to that of the other, four feet five inches; and from the tip of the beak to the extremity of the tail, three feet six inches, whereof the beak is eight inches, and the tail, one foot five inches. Its body, in size, exceeds that of the largest raven, and is lank and uncompact, having a rather long and very flexible neck slightly ruffled, a bill and tail of extreme length; high-shouldered powerful wings, and short strong legs. The colour may in general terms be said to be black, with a white-pointed tail, and white patch on the wings: the figure, upon the whole, and in the bird’s most accustomed attitudes, is clumsy and heavy.

Let me now attempt a more particular description, beginning with the specific dimensions, which are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ft.</th>
<th>in.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wing to wing</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beak to tail</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tail</td>
<td>1 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill, length of</td>
<td>0 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ditto, depth or height of</td>
<td>0 3½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>0 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whereof, thighs to the knee</td>
<td>0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsi, to ball of foot</td>
<td>0 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central toe and claw</td>
<td>0 2½</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The skinned carcase measures, from first to last joint of neck, eight inches; from last joint of the neck to end of rump, nine inches.

The bill, which is large even for this genus, is nearly straight from the gape to the tip, but still having, upon the whole, a slight incurvation which is most sensibly along the ridge of the upper mandible, and especially towards the base of it, where the arch is conspicuous, but without any abruptness. The substance of the bill is perfectly hard and apparently solid, not "cellular," or "hollow," unless in a manner traceable only by dissection, which I do not pretend to affirm or deny. The latter compression is great, so great as to render the edges above and below somewhat sharp, to destroy almost the convexity of the sides, and to leave hardly any breadth to the bill, except at the base, where it is a little thickened, but still much less broad than high. The upper mandible is strengthened by six large prominent ribs, running obliquely down nearly the whole breadth of it, and extending lengthwise from the base beyond the centre. These ribs present their prominence edgewise to the surface of the bill, giving it there an undulatory form: elsewhere, the surface is perfectly smooth. The inner margins of the bill are, by nature, united and entire, but with their edges cut out, and interlocked towards the base, and so they continue to be in the oldest birds. Towards the tip, the inner margins are, in old birds, much and irregularly broken, and separated by hard use; and the ridge also is broken by similar means.

* The words thus indicated as quotations, refer to the generic character.

Figure 3. First page of re-production in Gleanings in Science No. 9 for September 1829, p. 249, of Hodgson’s paper. Please note sixth line from the top. Image downloaded from www.books.google.com.
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The first twenty livraisons of “Les Planches Coloriées d’Oiseaux” of Temminck & Laugier (1820–1839):
IV. Discovery of the remaining wrappers.
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ABSTRACT: The first 20 livraisons (parts) of the “Nouveaux recueil des planches coloriées d’oiseaux, pour servir de suite et de complément aux planches enluminées de Buffon” issued between August 1820 and March 1822 included no texts – the texts did not follow any earlier than August 1822. The 120 plates in these livraisons carried just French vernacular names, only the wrappers exhibit the associated scientific names, some of which were new. In 2011 the number of livraison wrappers known grew from two to ten. The remaining ten wrappers have now been found and are here illustrated. Short notes on spelling issues are added. There is now no longer any reason to date the names Temminck introduced with these plates from the date of his later texts or to use spellings from those texts now shown to be incorrect subsequent spellings.

KEYWORDS: Temminck, Planches Coloriées, wrappers, original spellings, discovery, authorship.

INTRODUCTION

Lebossé & Bour (2011) reported on the remarkable discovery of eight of the missing eighteen wrappers. This meant that images of the lists of plates included in Livraisons 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19 and 20 were made available to all those interested. In an associated paper (Dickinson, 2011) I supplemented their report with notes on some issues of authorship and nomenclature, and dealt with one or two matters of taxonomy.

Now Alain Lebossé has followed the success he reported in 2011 with the discovery of other sources allowing the assembly of images of the lists of plates included in Livraisons 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 15 and 17. Two of these, livraisons 1 and 2, were located on the website of the library of the University of Göttingen, but hopes that a complete set might be held there were dashed when Francisco Welter-Schultes kindly investigated and reported that only those two were held. Meanwhile, Alain had met a private collector who was able to provide images of the remaining eight and allowed them to be published here.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THESE WRAPPERS

Before depicting the ten images it may be useful to remind readers why these lists are so important. Each of the first twenty livraisons came with a wrapper that gave the scientific name of the species depicted in the six enclosed plates, reported the French vernacular names, which were on such plates, and mentioned the authorship of the name and the terra typica (which was the relatively inexact geographical source or range of the taxon). Because, the wrappers containing these lists were ephemeral – usually being discarded after binding –
there have been periodic objections to citing spellings from them. The main one, originally applying to names in the 18 lists for which no wrappers were known to be in existence, was that only second-hand information as to the names and their spellings in those lists was available, and, worse, that there were in some cases inconsistencies between the reported spellings given by the reviewers of the day. A second argument put to me was that it could not be argued, because of their impermanence, that these published wrappers met the condition imposed by Art. 8.1.1 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, hereafter ‘the Code’ (I.C.Z.N., 1999: 6). A clear understanding of the origination of the work largely refutes that view. Temminck originally had no intention of providing texts. That he later did so followed his discovery that his plates, if they continued to be provided in the fashion that they were being issued, would be taxed at national borders as works of art; and that by adding texts they were immediately transformed into scientific works and became free of tax (Dickinson, 2001). And yet it can reasonably be argued that he would still have anticipated their discard when his planned volumes were originally bound. However, Art. 8.1.1 was almost certainly not worded to exclude part works that were common during the late 18th and much of the 19th century, thus this argument was really raised only by those who felt that the complete set of wrappers would never be available, and that the original spellings of all the new names in these livraisons would never be able to be verified.

Well now they are, and the mixed methodologies of the past century or more can be set aside. “Mixed methodologies”? Indeed; Sherborn (1898) provided a carefully constructed set of dates with limited supporting evidence and many authors have followed those. However, I (Dickinson, 2011: 153) pointed out the uncharacteristic haphazard date choices later made by Sherborn in his Index Animalium and many will have tried to follow those without realising the inconsistencies. Consequently it has not been unusual to find serious works of reference, like the volumes of Peters Check-list of Birds of the World (Peters, 1931 and successors), associate dates applicable to the issue of the livraisons and their plates with spellings applicable to the later texts for those plates.

Now we have the opportunity, far better as a basis for stability, to use the original spellings – with such emendations as are required by the Code. And these can be used together with a set of dates derived from Sherborn (1898), but updated based on later work.

Stresemann (1922) first suggested changes based on dates of receipt in Berlin. Later Dickinson (2001), whose list took account of Stresemann’s findings, modified some dates based on evidence of page substitution but mainly made changes required by his resolution of the puzzle of the uncertainty attached to Sherborn’s original information. That uncertainty flowed from the fact that 600 plates required not 100 livraisons as intended, but 101, i.e. there had not been a consistent issue of six plates per part. The solution to the puzzle proved to be Temminck’s notion that a plate that, due to its size (for example to accommodate long tail feathers), had required two printing plates meant that it counted as two of the six plates per part that his subscribers had been promised. The identity of these exceptional plates, and evidence of the livraison within which each had appeared, revealed exactly how many plates made up each individual livraison and thus led to small adjustments in the interpretation of Sherborn’s original schedule.

Following the depictions of the lists from these ten livraisons those original spellings that are now validated and have an effect on spellings in use, often where two are in parallel use (or two different dates are in use), are discussed here livraison by livraison.
Figure 1. The list of contents of livraison 1 (pll. 1-6: August, 1820) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: State and University Library of Göttingen.]

Figure 2. The list of contents of livraison 2 (pll. 7-12; September, 1820) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: State and University Library of Göttingen.]
Figure 3. The list of contents of livraison 3 (pll. 13-18; October, 1820) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck's texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]

Figure 4. The list of contents of livraison 4 (pll. 19-24; November, 1820) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck's texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]
Figure 5. The list of contents of livraison 5 (pll. 25-30; December, 1820) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck's texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]

Figure 6. The list of contents of livraison 6 (pll. 31-36; January 1821) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck's texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]
Figure 7. The list of contents of livraison 8 (pll. 43-48; March, 1821) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]

Figure 8. The list of contents of livraison 9 (pll. 49-54; 18 April 1821) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about June, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]
Figure 9. The list of contents of livraison 15 (plls. 85-90; October, 1821) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about December, 1823 (Dickinson, 2001: 22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]

Figure 10. The list of contents of livraison 17 (plls. 97-102; December, 1821) as depicted on the back of the wrapper. Temminck’s texts date from about August, 1822 (Dickinson, 2001:22). [Source: Collection privée: Phil Galice.]
ORIGINAL SPELLINGS

Comments here derive from comparison between the evidence of the wrapper and the names that Temminck used in his later texts. Mention is also made of spellings reported by Froriep (1821, 1822) in the context of errors made by him in transcription or by his printers or publishers in type setting. Temminck’s emendations, whether in his original text or in his index, the “Tableau Méthodique” of 1839, will also be mentioned. In reporting the spellings original capitalisations are here retained although today they would not be permitted when used in species accounts or other non-bibliographic text.

Livraison 1 (pll. 1–6) (Temminck, 1820b):

Here there is complete consistency between the spellings that Temminck (1823a) used in his text and those evident on the wrapper (1820b). Froriep’s report (1821) is completely accurate. Later, Temminck (1839) emended the name Vultur ponticerianus (plate 1) to Vultur pondicerianus. The subject of plate 5 Procnias ventralis Temminck (1839) renamed Procnias tersa adding ‘Ampelis’ thus indicating that he identified this with Ampelis tersa Linnaeus, 1766.

Livraison 2 (pll. 7–12) (Temminck, 1820c):

Here again there is complete consistency between the spellings that Temminck (1823a) used in his text and those evident on the wrapper (1820c). Froriep’s report is again completely accurate in spelling the species group names and no emendations were made to these by Temminck (1839).

Livraison 3 (pll. 13–18) (Temminck, 1820d):

Here, all names except one were retained in their original texts (Temminck, 1823a). The exception is Trochilus Delalandi (plate 18, figs 1 and 2), which Froriep (1821) reported accurately but for which, in the text, Temminck (1823a) used Lalandei and later (Temminck, 1839) used Delalandei. The spellings used by Temminck (1823, 1839) reflect more appropriately the derivation from P. A. Delalande, an early French naturalist who visited Brazil. Vultur monachus (plate 13) also requires comment. Two versions of Temminck’s text are known: what must be the first – present in Newton’s copy in the library in Cambridge – retains the name on the wrapper; however, a later text – present in a copy in the library of the National Museum of Natural History, Leiden – names it Vultur occipitalis. This name comes from Burchell, 1824, and its use reflects a re-identification of the subject.

Livraison 4 (pll. 19–24) (Temminck, 1820e):

Four names out of eight herein go through changes. Strix Leschenaulti (plate 20) was accurately reported by Froriep (1821) but became Leschenault in the text (Temminck, 1823a) only to change again to Leschenaldi in Temminck (1839). Strix Sonnerati (plate 21) was given accurately by Froriep (1821), and in Temminck’s text but then emended to Sonneratii in Temminck (1839). Falco gularis (plate 22), attributed to Cuvier, reported accurately by Froriep, became Falco palustris of Prince Maximilian zu Wied in Temminck’s text (1823a) and index (1839). Sylvia Nattereri (plate 24) was again reported accurately by Froriep (1821), but became Nattereri in Temminck (1823a, 1839).
Livraison 5 (pll. 25–30) (Temminck, 1820f):

No species group name changes here. The only observed difference is the spelling of the generic name *Meliphaga*, spelled thus in the context of plate 29 (1820), by Froriep (1821) and in the text Temminck (1823a), but Temminck (1839) used *Melliphaga*.

Livraison 6 (pll. 31–36) (Temminck, 1821b):

*Cathartes vulturinus* (plate 31) (1820) was reported as *vulturinus* by Froriep (1821) and Temminck (1823a, 1839) used that spelling. *Tanagra speculifera* (plate 36, figs 1 and 2) is as reported by Froriep and is the name to be found in the text in the copy in the Rothschild Library, the Natural History Museum, Tring. However, the text was later reissued with the generic name changed and the species spelled as *Hylophilus speculiferus* to match the gender of the generic name. The date of the reissue is unknown.

Livraison 8 (pll. 43–48) (Temminck, 1821c):

*Falco torquatus* (plate 43), a name Temminck attributed to Cuvier, but actually introduced by Brünnich (1764), is accurately reported from the wrapper by Froriep (1821) and retained for Temminck’s text (1823a), but by Temminck (1839) the subject was named *Falco arquatus* Cuvier. *Falco ptilorhynchus* (plate 44) was also accurately reported by Froriep, but was spelled *ptilorhyncus* in Temminck’s text and then *ptilonorhynchus* in the *Tableau Méthodique* (Temminck, 1839). The spellings *ptilorhyncus* and *ptilonorhynchus* have both been widely used.

Livraison 9 (pll. 49–54) (Temminck, 1821d):

*Casmarhinchos variegata* (plate 51), described by Temminck (1820) as *Casmarhinchos variegatus*, used an incorrect feminine suffix. Froriep (1822) accurately reported this and in his text Temminck (1823a) modified the generic name to use *Casmarhynchos variegata*, finally correcting the suffix to the specific epithet in the *Tableau Méthodique* (Temminck, 1839) and using *Casmarhynchos variegatus*.

Livraison 15 (pll. 85–90) (Temminck, 1821f):

*Falco riocourii* (plate 85) was reported as *Falco Riocurii* by Froriep (1822); in his text Temminck (1823) used *Falco Riocour*, repeating this in Temminck (1839). *Falco striolatus* Temminck (plate 87) was accurately reported by Froriep (1822); however Temminck soon recognised that this was a synonym of *Falco nitidus* Latham, 1790, and used that name for this bird in his 1823 text and in the *Tableau Méthodique* (Temminck, 1839). *Criniger barbatus* (plate 88), accurately recorded by Froriep and originally introduced by Temminck (1820a), became *Trichophorus barbatius* in Temminck’s 1823 text and in the *Tableau Méthodique* (Temminck, 1839). In plate 89 there are two barbets of the genus *Bucco*. Figure 1 depicts *armillaris* and figure 2 depicts *Gularis*. For the latter the generic name was omitted in the wrapper text. Froriep (1822) reported this, understandably, as *Bucco gularis*.

Livraison 17 (pll. 97–102) (Temminck, 1821g):

*Strix spadicea* (plate 98) reported accurately by Froriep (1822) was another name Temminck quickly realised was a synonym. In his text (1822) it became *Strix castanoptera*
Horsfield, 1821. *Columba amboinensis* (plate 100) was spelled *Amboinensis* by Froriep, and in this instance Temminck (1823b) concluded that this specimen was not the bird described by Linnaeus (1766) but more like birds he had himself named *Columba phasianella* (Temminck, 1821a). Temminck’s name was based on Australian material. The depiction in the *Planches Coloriées* is not of the Australian bird but a Philippine specimen still held in the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Paris. For an unresolved disagreement over the relevance of that specimen to the determination of the type species of the genus *Macropygia* see Gregory et al. (2007) and Schodde (2009).

**FRORIEP AS AN OBSERVER**

Robert Froriep (1804-1861) was a brilliant young German scientist, and a relatively accurate reporter. In the wrappers of the twenty livraisons that he (1821, 1822) reported on there are, if we discount names repeated on the same wrapper, 144 names. Froriep reported 141 correctly although occasionally using an initial capital or spelling out the two letters of a diphthong. One of his three different spellings (*Turdus phoenicopterus* [sic] in place of *Turdus phanicurus*) – from livraison 12 (Temminck, 1821e) – suggests that the homonymy must have been discovered and a correction signalled because Temminck (1823b) used *phoenicopterus* [sic]. The other two cases (*Cathartes vulturinus* for *C. vulturnus*, and *Falco riocurii* for *F. riocurii*) are both dealt with above: the originals in these cases may also have been signalled as errors as later usage by Temminck of the former was *vulturinus* and at least the name Riocour was reflected in later usage by Temminck.

**SOME GENERAL COMMENTS**

Because the names used in the wrappers have date priority over the names used in Temminck’s texts any changed names used in the texts, which are not deliberate uses of different names, are incorrect subsequent spellings.

As admitted above, the view that the criterion set out in Art. 8.1.1 is sufficiently met may be challenged. However, the most logical approach is to accept that Temminck certainly published the plates as a permanent record and that he deliberately provided the scientific names needed. He must have seen his use of wrappers as the place to include his names as the most convenient storage solution until binding eventually followed when he would provide a binding plan and an index; thus he was providing a permanent record from the outset, but anticipated that the completed work world require something else. Thus his method was far–sighted and he should not be penalised, nor we confused, by a rigid interpretation of Art. 8.1.1.

It should be noted that where two cases of pages being cancelled and replaced have been found (as are reported here) others may also exist, and in a work this large, which took twenty years to complete, they almost certainly will.

Dickinson (2001) provided a set of dates that took into account those given by Zimmer (1926) which had, in turn made use of those of Mathews (1919), who had drawn on the volumes of the *Bibliographie de la France*. That source has now been rechecked and the findings are provided in Table I. Fourteen minor revisions emerge, but there is nothing helpful regarding the first issue of livraisons 1 to 20. The most interesting finding concerns what has to be the distribution of the texts for those livraisons (see comments in Table 1).
Table 1. Further information on the dates of the livraisons, with fourteen changes in bold type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Vol.</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Entry No.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reported in the BDF</th>
<th>Dates (Livr. 35–92) from Dickinson (2001)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1820</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>3506</td>
<td>7 Oct. 1820</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>No text issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>26 Jul. 1823</td>
<td>7–10 and 23–35</td>
<td>[35] [June 20, 1823]</td>
<td>7–10 = inc. text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>3590</td>
<td>30 Aug. 1823</td>
<td>11 and 37</td>
<td>[37] August 30, 1823</td>
<td>11 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>4024</td>
<td>27 Sep. 1823</td>
<td>12 and 38</td>
<td>[38] September 27, 1823</td>
<td>12 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>5408</td>
<td>6 Dec. 1823</td>
<td>14 and 40</td>
<td>[40] [November 1823]</td>
<td>14 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>5862</td>
<td>27 Dec. 1823</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>[41] [December 25, 1823]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[42] Jan. 1824</td>
<td>Probably correct but perhaps reissued later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>27 Mar. 1824</td>
<td>16 and 44</td>
<td>[44] March 27, 1824</td>
<td>15 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>1 May 1824</td>
<td>17 and 45</td>
<td>[45] [April 1824]</td>
<td>17 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>321*</td>
<td>2737</td>
<td>22 May 1824</td>
<td>18 and 46</td>
<td>[46] May 22, 1824</td>
<td>* “221” = 321 18 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>3383</td>
<td>26 Jun. 1824</td>
<td>19, 20 and 47</td>
<td>[47] [June 15, 1824]</td>
<td>19 &amp; 20 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>3929</td>
<td>31 Jul. 1824</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>[48] July 31, 1824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>4499</td>
<td>28 Aug. 1824</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>[49] [August 18, 1824]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>4921</td>
<td>2 Oct. 1824</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>[50] [September 1824]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>5366</td>
<td>23 Oct. 1824</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>[51] October 23, 1824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>6250</td>
<td>27 Nov. 1824</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>[52] November 27, 1824</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>6949</td>
<td>25 Dec. 1824</td>
<td>1–6 and 53</td>
<td>[53] December 25, 1824</td>
<td>1–6 = inc. text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>12 Feb. 1825</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>[54] [January 1825]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>26 Feb. 1825</td>
<td>42 and 55</td>
<td>[55] [February 1825]</td>
<td>Note 42 mentioned here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>16 Apr. 1825</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>[56] [March 1825]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>23 Apr. 1825</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>[57] April 23, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>2925</td>
<td>28 May 1825</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>[58] May 28, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>4170</td>
<td>23 Jul. 1825</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>[60] July 23, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>27 Aug. 1825</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>[61] August 27, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Vol.</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Entry No.</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Reported in the BdF</td>
<td>Dates (Livr. 35–92) from Dickinson (2001)</td>
<td>Dates in [–] should be corrected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>6266</td>
<td>12 Nov. 1825</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>[63] October 9, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>7239</td>
<td>21 Dec. 1825</td>
<td>“63” = 64</td>
<td>[64] December 21, 1825</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1826</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3421</td>
<td>27 May 1826</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>[65] May 27, 1826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>3758</td>
<td>10 Jun. 1826</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>[66] June 10, 1826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55 *</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>4577</td>
<td>12 Jul. 1826</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>[67] July 12, 1826</td>
<td>In 1826 and 1827 the BdF appeared on Wednesdays and Saturdays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>5840</td>
<td>16 Sep. 1826</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>[68] September 16, 1826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>6739</td>
<td>28 Oct. 1826</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>[69] October 28, 1826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>8217</td>
<td>30 Dec. 1826</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>[70] December 27, 1826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>28 Feb. 1827</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>[71] February 28, 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>25 Apr. 1827</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>[72] April 25, 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>4308</td>
<td>30 Jun. 1827</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>[73] June 30, 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>5986</td>
<td>22 Sep. 1827</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>[74] September 22, 1827</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5 Jan. 1828</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>[75] January 5, 1828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1 Mar. 1828</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>[76] March 1, 1828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2496</td>
<td>23 Apr. 1828</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>[77] April 23, 1828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>4091</td>
<td>5 Jul. 1828</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>[78] [June 1828]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1829</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1 Aug. 1829</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>[79] August 1, 1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>5354</td>
<td>5 Sep. 1829</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>[80] September 5, 1829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>6117</td>
<td>17 Oct. 1829</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>[81] [October 1829]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2 Jan. 1830</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>[82] January 2, 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>20 Feb. 1830</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>[83] February 20, 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>2503</td>
<td>8 May 1830</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>[84] May 8, 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>3682</td>
<td>3 Jul. 1830</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>[85] July 3, 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>4817</td>
<td>4 Sep. 1830</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>[86] September 4, 1830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22 Jan. 1831</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>[87] January 22, 1831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>2243</td>
<td>14 May 1831</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>[88] May 14, 1831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11 Feb. 1832</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>[89] February 11, 1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>3629</td>
<td>28 Jul. 1832</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>[90] July 28, 1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>6426</td>
<td>29 Dec. 1832</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>[91] December 20, 1832</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1833</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>26 Jul. 1834</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>[92] July 26, 1834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None located</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the information in here on the distribution of the text of the first twenty livraisons it is apparent that previous information from Stresemann (1922) can be bettered (See Table 2).
Table 2. Comparative information on dates of availability of the text of the first twenty livraisons, the earliest date shown in bold type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livraison</th>
<th>Date text reportedly received in Berlin</th>
<th>Date text delivered to the Bibliothèque Nationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source: Stresemann (1922)</td>
<td>Source: see Table 1 (above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–6</td>
<td>June 25, 1823</td>
<td>December 25, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7–10</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 26, 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>August 30, 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>December 25, 1823</td>
<td>September 27, 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>October 25, 1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>December 25, 1823</td>
<td>February 28, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 27, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 1, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 22, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>August 22, 1822</td>
<td>June 26, 1824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Priority! The Dating of Scientific Names in Ornithology. A Directory to the Literature and its Reviewers.


As an amateur ornithologist and bibliophile regularly benumbed by the incomprehensible molecular jargon of modern ornithology, it was a pleasure to take up this handsome volume. Edward Dickinson and his dedicated team of experts have successfully shattered the apparent dichotomy of producing a well-designed, well written, fully researched and informative reference on the bibliography of scientific bird names.

The understanding and proper designation of scientific bird names form a basic pillar to their study. The correct dating of such names is vital. “Zoologists often raced to be first to describe a new animal. To some extent they still do, but rules are there to determine winners” are the first two sentences in a volume that highlights the problems thrust upon nomenclature in ornithology, and provides a comprehensive reference to many books and periodicals whose dates are considered problematic. Priority! more than achieves its aims, with carefully annotated and reasoned bibliographies of 155 books and 122 periodicals. It also highlights the work still to be done, and reveals that the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is still far from perfect. From my own research, for example, the genus *Bolemoreus* Nyári & Joseph (in Meliphagidae) was diagnosed twice in 2011. Apparently first in a PhD thesis (University of Kansas) by Árpád Nyári defended on 22 April 2011 (where in Chapter 2, p. 49, the name is given as *Bolemoreus* Nyári & Joseph), the second time in a paper by Árpád Nyári and Leo Joseph, in Emu, 111 (3), published on 17 August 2011. The International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, 3rd edition, 1985, Art. 9 (11), specifically excluded a thesis as an acceptable method of publication, but the 4th edition, 1999, Arts.8-9, is strangely silent on the subject.

A short introduction provides the raison d’être for this valuable synthesis of an important, but neglected, branch of ornithology. Many zoologists are unconsciously indebted to the Code, even though it provides a valuable framework underpinning communication and all levels of research. Despite the frenetic pace of our technological age the valuable works of Sherborn, Richmond, Zimmer and Mathews, much acknowledged here, have yet to be superseded, and, throughout the text, the editors provide copious suggestions for further study.

In Chapter 1 six articles of the current Code are quoted or commented on. Of importance to this book is Article 21 Determination of date, which is quoted in full. The six relevant Recommendations are referred to and commented on, although the distinction between separates, offprints and preprints will require dedicated scrutiny!

Chapter 2 begins with a short but interesting overview on the history of printing and publishing, which should be read in conjunction with the comprehensive Glossary, and concludes with a section on resources available to the researcher. This highlights the necessity of consulting the original work (printed “facsimiles” are not always reliable or accurate) or trawling the works of such as Sherborn and Richmond, the latter’s card index now happily made available by Alan Peterson on www.zoonomen.net.
The third and fourth chapters contain the meat of the volume, consisting of entries on books and periodicals whose dates of publication have been or could be treated as problematical. By their very nature the dating of the individual numbers of periodicals can be fraught. Each entry is treated in a uniform way, with thorough references, and concludes with a recommendation. I checked the entries for Bonaparte’s *Conspectus Generum Avium* and Cabanis & Heine’s *Museum Heineanum*, and found the bibliographic information to be accurate and the recommendations reasoned. Amongst other interesting nuggets, we read that the Belgian struggle for independence seriously interrupted the timetable of publication of Temminck and Laugier’s *Nouveau recueil de planches coloriées d’oiseaux*. Here, also, the cataclysm of conflict enabled the dating of *Cholornis Verreaux* “1870” in the *Nouvelles Archives* to be corrected, since it dates from after the Prussian bombardment of Paris in January 1871.

The Appendices supply notes on the French Revolutionary Calendar, the months of the year in Russian, watermarks, the derivation of hypothetical dates from certain years of the *Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia*, and periodicals the editors were unable to review thoroughly.

The comprehensive list of References is complemented by separate indices of books and periodicals referred to in the text. Spanning the void between old and modern technology and providing a vital resource, a CD-ROM contains 65 files with detailed bibliographies of titles. These are printable in landscape format. Table 66 is an annotated review of date changes, linking dates in Peters Checklist, Howard & Moore, ed. 3, and Howard & Moore, ed. 4 (in press).

I can thoroughly recommend this original and well produced work which deserves a wide audience.

James A. Jobling
Priority!
The Dating of Scientific Names in Ornithology
A Directory to the Literature and its Reviewers

This is the first book to explain the importance of priority in relation to names in ornithology and in the context of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature. Backgrounds are first provided on the Code and on printing and publishing over the last 250 years. The compilers then bring together reports on 148 books and 121 periodicals in zoology which, between them, present almost all the challenges that can make date determination problematic. The reports provide links to the published authorities and are supported by tables containing extensive detail about the subsidiary parts or issues with their pagination and dates. This book and the included CD ROM are a searchable treasure trove.
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Notes

We are happy to acknowledge a special ‘feed’ from Thompson-Reuters which suggests papers for inclusion in this section of our journal. This feed flows to Connie Rinaldo, of our board, who watches our Notes. We should also like to thank various board members for comments on articles in the ‘feed’ as well as Roger Bour, Bill Eschmeyer, Colin Jones, Martyn Low and Francisco Welter-Schultes for comments, suggestions and offers of help.


Reliable compilations of dates of publication of pages and plates of 45 selected multivolume works on molluscs, mostly published in the 1800s and with primary relevance to North American malacology. Many works are of global importance. [FW-S]


The extensive research involved in this colossal work where every name was checked to the primary literature revealed a need to conserve many family-group names. Within the References (pp. 641 et seq.) dates in square brackets at the reference end reflect the authors’ findings (see for example ’Lacordaire (1865)’ p. 746). [ECD]


“This note attempts at providing a complete bibliography, with precise publication dates, and corrects several errors usually reproduced in biographies of Daudin.”


The authors draw attention to the fact that the reprint of Vieillot’s Analyse by the Willughby Society is not the facsimile reprint that is usually believed. Errors are noted [ECD].


The authors refer to the dates of two 1830 publications citing a researched date of June for one and accepting December 31 for Wagler’s Natürliches System der Amphibien.


This work provides background chapters on the ICZN Code (8 pp) and on methodology (43 pp) before two long chapters relating to books (96 pp) and to periodicals (89 pp). The entries in the chapters come from many hands all of whom are identified and credited. An extensive
list of references (28 pp) and a glossary (14 pp) are also included. See review in this issue of *Zoological Bibliography*.


Includes the correction of the date from 1932 to 1931 of an article in the Annals of the Transvaal Museum which affects 18 birds named by Austin Roberts.


The anuran familial name Ranidae has been credited with several authorships and dates in the recent decades. Some of these changes were due to the rediscovery of older works and some to modifications in the Rules of the Code. The rediscovery of the work of Batsch (1796) brings a new change in this respect as this name was indeed created in this book.


This updates the 1st edition (2008). Numerous additions have been made. Inevitably the book remains, as its author says, a work in progress. Just so, but a hugely valuable one. Pp. 7-202 ‘Dating sources for books’; 203-234 ‘dating sources for periodicals’. [ECD]


The validity and date attaching to decapod taxa named in this work (Anomura by Henderson and Brachyura by Miers) have been widely ignored. This paper puts the record straight. [ECD]


Not examined, but it is hoped that this may add to our understanding of the work discussed by Sherborn (1897: 285-288) in the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London*.


The author refers to the claimed and apparent priority of the date of a name for an echinoderm introduced by Verrill in the *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* (of which a relevant page carried the printed date of March 1867). Its apparent junior synonym was published by Ljungman in the *Öfversigt af Kongliga Vetenskaps-Akademien Förhandlingar*, 1866, Årgang 23 and in relation to the latter it is revealed that an invoice from the printers bound into an accounting ledger at the Swedish Academy of Sciences permits the accurate dating of this to late May 1867. [ECD]

Saussure’s contribution dealing with Othoptera has often been dated 1874 but printed covers dated 1870 suggest printing at least in part in 1870. The authors recommend the dates 1870, 1872 and 1874 for different parts of this work relying on the Zoological Record, although the 1870 section was not reviewed until 1872. Whether evidence was found in the *Bibliographie de la France* is not mentioned. [ECD]


In establishing correct dates for Bleeker’s publications (which modify the dates of many taxon names) very useful information is provided on various journals. In particular our knowledge of the dates of issues of *Natuurkundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië* is greatly advanced. [ECD]


“Discrepancies between dates given in Kury (2003) and Neave’s Nomenclator and the Zoological Record are discussed. Accurate issue dates for relevant publications are used to define priorities.”


This work made good use of dates provided by Husson & Holthuis (1955) regarding the contains useful information relating to “the various volumes and parts of *Verhandelingen over de Natuurlijke Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Overzeesche Bezittingen*, edited by C.J. Temminck”. It also includes some background on the classic *Histoire Naturelle des Mammifères* of E. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire and F. Cuvier.


Convincing evidence is supplied that copies of the Philadelphia edition were available with one bookseller on 31 December 1822, and on this basis 1822 must be accepted as the date of publication; the London edition was later as had always been supposed. 43 new animals and 11 fossils are described by Thomas Say in this work. [ECD]
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