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Abstract. Thirteen taxa thought by Jerdon to be new species were named in the first Supplement to Thomas Jerdon's *Catalogue of the birds of the peninsula of India*. The name of one of those thirteen, not now in synonymy, is usually dated as 1841. The others have virtually everywhere been dated 1844, at least since their listing by Baker in *The fauna of British India including Ceylon and Burma: Birds* (1930). The purpose of this paper is to explain how this has come about and to recommend that the earlier of the two dates (1841) be used consistently when any of these thirteen names is used. Our study has shown that, despite claims to the contrary, Jerdon did pre-print his Supplement; he did so in the form of a book, which appears to have been published in two parts.

The Madras Journal of Literature & Science

Jerdon's 'Catalogue' (Jerdon, 1839a, b, 1840a, b, c, d), his first major work on Indian birds, appeared in six successive issues of the *Madras Journal of Literature & Science* in 1839 and 1840: in issues 24 and 25 from the 1839 volume and in issues 26 to 29, these four issues making up the two 1840 volumes.

There were eventually two supplements to Jerdon's 'Catalogue'. Both appeared in the *Madras Journal of Literature & Science*, the first in 1844 (Jerdon, 1844) and the second (Jerdon, 1845) in a further issue of the same journal that is shown from the title page to Volume XIII to have been delayed until 1845. These two are respectively issues 30 and 31 of the journal.

The long delay between issue 29 and issue 30 is known to have been due to budget problems (see Anon., 1844). When the first supplement eventually appeared in 1844, the editors inserted a brief introductory note reading: 'In consequence of the
suspension of the Journal, this article was printed by the author and circulated among his friends but has never hitherto been published'. To make space for this insert the first species account was evidently reset in smaller type: from which we deduce that the type for the journal article must have been set earlier, no doubt prior to 18 August 1841, when the decision was taken to suspend publication (Anon., 1844).

It is on the basis of the recorded date of issue 30 of the journal that authors citing new names from there have generally used the date 1844, and presumably the above editorial note has caused people to reject the idea of prior publication.

Why not accept 1844? Did Jerdon pre-publish his Supplement?

Were it not for the fact that imposing the date 1844 on the one obvious case that is dated 1841 would invalidate the Jerdon name in question, this would be the obvious course to take. For, as we explain below, this name is then preoccupied by a different specific name put forward by Blyth (1842c, p. 602).

Early in our study the central question that emerged was whether and how the information ‘printed by the author and circulated among his friends’ might relate to the provisions of the Code. Was there a ‘preprint’? The Code validates names that are to be found in preprints, but it requires that such preprints be dated (Article 21.8). Or was it the advance distribution of a separate? Again, but only for names proposed in 1999 or earlier, the advance distribution of a separate can advance the date of publication (Article 21.8). Or is there some other answer?

Evidence of prior availability

To resolve our questions we needed evidence. The first clue was that Blyth (1842b) in a footnote to page 162 of the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal recorded that ‘Since the above was written, Mr. Jerdon has kindly favored me with a copy of the printed Supplement to his valuable Catalogue . . .’. This suggests a preprint, but Blyth gave no precise date and the date of his footnote is uncertain.

The numbered issues in this volume were Nos. 121–132. The paper by Blyth (1842b) is from the nominal February issue; Blyth’s footnote could have been written as early as ‘Feb. 26th. 1842’, a date which appears at the end of his article on p. 195, or it could have been added somewhat later but still before the final manuscript went to the printers. No. 129, which was that for September, contained on page 890 a Blyth footnote dated 20 January 1843. Here, at least, the evidence shows a four-month delay. One may conclude that the footnote to the February issue would have appeared no later than May or June 1842. Next, we noted that the date 1841 was routinely cited by Gray (1848a, b, c). And we found that Gray cited page numbers for the relevant Jerdon names that he listed (see Table 1); page numbers that did not accord with the 1844 Supplement.

The nature of the evidence: the through-paginated book

Enquiries about a pre-print were made of the librarians at The Natural History Museum, but these yielded no immediate evidence. The search was widened to Edinburgh, because we knew of links between Jerdon and Jardine, and to Cambridge, where at least some of Jardine’s library may be found. The librarians at the Balfour & Newton Library of the Department of Zoology, Cambridge University, rapidly found relevant material and were extremely helpful.
While we have seen no evidence of a dated pre-print and no evidence of the advance distribution of a separate, the evidence in Cambridge takes the form of a book that is through-paginated and includes the first, but not the second Supplement. Including the Supplement and the errata, this book contains 203 pages, and the pages cited by Gray (1848a, b, c) agree with this book. The book has its own title page. This shows that it was produced in ‘Madras’ by ‘J.B. Pharaoh’ ‘MDCCCXXXIX’. An unnumbered page or end paper says ‘From the Madras Journal of Literature & Science Nos. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 & 30’. This, of course, demonstrates that the 1839 date on the title page is wrong. It also leaves us without a valid date of publication, unless we draw on secondary sources. Despite the assertion in 1844 by the Editors of the Madras Journal of Literature & Science it is clear that Jerdon did publish his supplement in book form (we refer to this hereafter as the book). The title page shows the printers to have been the ‘Athenæum Press R. Hosie, Printer’ and one can but conclude that J.B. Pharaoh acted as Jerdon’s publisher. In these circumstances, the date 1839 (the date specified) is quite evidently wrong and Article 21.2 of the Code allows for ‘evidence to the contrary’.

Apart from through-pagination and a smaller type face, the book differs by including an opening section of 24 pages entitled ‘A synoptical table of contents’ which was evidently prepared specially for this work. On the evidence assembled we conclude that the editors of the Madras Journal deceived themselves and their readers in stating that Jerdon’s Supplement although distributed had not been published. Nonetheless, it may have been agreed between them and Jerdon that the Supplement in the journal should be considered to be the first publication and such an agreement may have led to the editorial note. Jerdon never contested the note; but Jerdon (1863) did not use Blyth’s name for what he had called Megalurus striatus. Most of Blyth’s related comments and actions are consistent with this understanding, but not all are: he immediately recognised that Dasyornis? locustelloides Blyth was simply Megalurus striatus Jerdon.

Therefore, in accordance with the Code and the need for a consistent date for all new names in this work, we consider that the editors’ comments must be discarded. Stability is best served by using the date 1841 and not 1844.

In evidence we put forward the date 1841 cited with appropriate pagination by Gray. Blyth’s footnote, quoted above, provides but limited extra support showing that in early 1842 what must have been the book was already in his hands.

It is curious that we have not located the copy that Gray must have used. However two copies have now been found in Cambridge and we here provide details.

Copies of the through-paginated book, in whole or in part

The first copy found (‘Newton’s copy’) was a bound volume with inserted interleaving on which some unidentified resident of Ceylon has made notes. By 1860 this copy was already in the hands of Alfred Newton (as evidenced by a notation in the copy), and may have already been cut down in dimensions to 133 mm. x 206 mm. and bound or perhaps rebound. This is the one copy we have found with continuous pagination right through to the end of the Supplement; however it begins with (pp. i-xxiv) a ‘Synoptical Table of Contents for the Birds of the Peninsula of India’ which never appeared in the journal.
The second copy ('Jardine's copy'), with page dimensions of 140 mm x 225 mm, is bound with other Jerdon papers and is incomplete. It contains pp. 1–140 through-paginated, then from the journal comes a title page for the 1840 issue, number 28, which began with the 15 page fifth part of Jerdon's catalogue originally paginated [1]-15 and a title page of issue 29 which held the sixth part originally paginated [193]-227, and finally a copy of the Synoptical Table mentioned above. This volume, which came from the Strickland library, shows Pharoah's title page which was inscribed for, and sent to, Sir William Jardine by Jerdon (but sadly Jerdon did not date this inscription). Jardine evidently passed on this copy to his son-in-law Hugh Strickland. Strickland died tragically in 1853, run over by a train while examining the geology of a railway cutting, and his bird collection was presented to the University of Cambridge in 1867 (Benson, 1999). His library seems to have reached Cambridge later, partly in 1875 and partly in 1881 (C. Castle, in litt.), both dates after Jardine's death. The fact that a distribution took place first of pp. 1 140 and later of the rest (including the Supplement) suggests to us that the book was not bound by J.B. Pharoah before its final distribution. We have found nothing in the literature before 1842 that might suggest when the first 140 pages were distributed but it seems likely this happened in late 1839 or in 1840. We have also scanned the Indian journals of the day for a notice of publication or a review, but we have traced neither. All these pages appeared in through-paginated form after they had appeared in the Madras Journal, in which the Synopsis did not appear.

We now know of a third copy, and of what may be a fourth. Mrs. F.E. Warr, alerted to our search, remembered an instance where a 'Jerdon MS' was offered to The Natural History Museum, London, from the library of J.G. van Marle, when this was put up for sale by A.L. van Gendt & Co. BV, in 1980, and she found museum notes about this. A reference in the Gendt sale catalogue mentioned a copy in the McGill Library, Montreal, listed by Casey Wood (1931).

Enquiries of the Librarian in Montreal, show that this copy, now in what is called the Blacker-Wood Library of Biology, is a mixed set lacking the supplement but beginning with the 1839 title page. The set comprises 140 pages continuously numbered plus separates or reprints from Madras Journal issues 28 and 29, with pagination as in the journal. This third copy, which essentially matches the 'Jardine' copy in Cambridge, once belonged to Thomas Horsfield. It can be seen from page numbers cited by Horsfield & Moore (1854) — see Table 1 — that they referred to it erratically and apparently without fully understanding how it differed from the original parts. As this copy did not include the Supplement one would expect all their citations to refer to the journal in 1844. This is true although there is one case where, possibly due to a typographic error, they cite a page number that would be right for the 1841 book.

The van Marle holding is probably a fourth copy. It was not sold at auction: The Natural History Museum rejected the proposed purchase from van Gendt & Co., seeing no special significance in the work offered. This, the book once in their hands, was possibly sold later by van Gendt's antiquarian bookshop, but no record of the sale can be traced (R. de Ruiter in litt.).

We believe a fifth copy was once in Gray's hands. Finally, Elliot (1873) listed Jerdon's major works as including a 'Catalogue of the Birds of the Peninsula of India, 8vo. Madras: J.B. Pharoah, 1839, pp. 203'. Sir Walter Elliot was a friend of Jerdon
of many years standing. He had been present at the meeting in Madras in August 1841 where the printing of issue 30 of the Madras Journal was postponed (Anon., 1844). It is more than likely that Elliot had his own copy. Blyth must have had a copy, which may have survived in Calcutta.

It seems clear that Baker never saw the book (see Table 1).

The printing and distribution of Jerdon's book

The McGill (Horsfield) and Jardine copies clearly suggest that printing of the through-paginated book was not a single exercise.

It began with the first 140 pages (or with a smaller part as hinted at by the retention of the date 1839 on the title page) and, as exemplified by the Newton copy, was completed through one or more additional printings of the pages from 141 to the end. We shall be interested to hear of any other copies that exist, and how they are made up, as we still have no idea of the size of the print run.

We note with interest that it appears that neither Jardine nor Horsfield received pages numbered 141 203. Elliot (1873) reported that Jerdon was 'deficient in habits of order and method' (p. 151) and that his regimental movements combined with 'habitual carelessness' led to the loss or destruction of specimens (p. 150). We thus assume that Jerdon kept no record of those to whom he had sent pages 141 and that he was indifferent to whether they received these pages or not, so that some of his correspondents received regular separates from the journal instead.

The specific case of Chaetornis striatus (Jerdon, 1841)

The case that causes us to recommend the uniform adoption of the date 1841 for Jerdon's first 'Supplement', in its book form, is that of Megalurus ? striatus Jerdon, 1841. In the 1844 Supplement this appeared on page 169. In the book it appears on p. 198. It is the latter page number, together with the date 1841 that Gray (1848a: 165) cited when erecting the genus Chaetornis with this as his type species.

Blyth (1842c, p. 602) described the same species, based not on Jerdon's material but on a specimen obtained 'in the bazaar', as Dasypornis ? locustelloides. Before letting this go to print Blyth added a footnote reading 'It is, I now find, the Megalurus ? striatus of Mr. Jerdon's Supplement, a single specimen having been procured by that naturalist in the Neilgherries'. Horsfield & Moore (1854: 330) called it Chaetornis striatus Jerdon, 1841; Jerdon (1863: 72) used Chaetornis striatus. However, Oates (1889: 388) called it Chaetornis locustelloides Blyth, 1842, and listed Jerdon’s name from its eventual 1844 publication in the Journal. So did Baker (1924: 438), but later (1930a: 179; 1930b: 640) he reverted to Chaetornis striatus (Jerdon, 1841), writing that this antedated locustelloides Blyth. But our search suggests that Baker made no attempt to correct to 1841 the dates of other names from the Supplement. And the present inconsistent state of affairs is due to later authors (e.g. Ripley, 1961, 1982) simply following Baker (1930).

Other names historically not always dated 1844

The names Buteo punctatus and Bulaca monticola appear in synonymy in Hodgson (1843) where they were introduced by Blyth with reference to Jerdon’s Supplement. As their placements in synonymy may be construed as providing 'indications' it could be argued that these two names should be credited to Blyth in Hodgson, 1843, as was
suggested for the second of these names by Baker (1930a: 379). Accepting that Jerdon’s Supplement was published within the 1841 book removes any need to account for these entries in synonymy by awarding them priority with Jerdon as the author.

No other names proposed by Jerdon (1841) for species pose problems. In no case does advancing their date from 1844 to 1841 affect stability (see right hand column Table 1).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerdon's generic name</th>
<th>Jerdon’s specific name</th>
<th>Page in 1844</th>
<th>Page in 1841</th>
<th>Gray (1848 a)</th>
<th>Page in 1848 b, c</th>
<th>Page in above, plus data there cited</th>
<th>Baker (1930a)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visacris ?? oivorus</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1844: 158</td>
<td>408 Suppl., privately circulated</td>
<td>Gray (1848b) also listed <em>Ictinactes malayensis</em> from Jerdon, 1844 p. 117, which is from the 2nd Supplement. Baker (1930a; 408) listed <em>Ictinactes oivorus</em> (not <em>Visacris</em>, citing Blyth (1843: 128 = 1842a: 128), which was taken from Jerdon’s Supplement ‘privately circulated’ (i.e. the book). The name <em>oivorus</em> Jerdon, 1841 is a junior synonym of <em>Ictinactes malayensis pertinax</em> (Hodgson, 1836).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spizaetus punctatus</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>no details given</td>
<td>406 1844: 164</td>
<td>The name <em>punctatus</em> Jerdon, 1841 is a junior synonym of <em>Aquila [pomarina] hastata</em> (Lesson, 1831). Peters (1931; 256) and subsequent authors, including Stresemann &amp; Amadon (1979: 379) have erred in dating Lesson’s name from 1834, see Browning &amp; Monroe (1991).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo rutiventer</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>Gray (1848b: 33) considered <em>rutiventer</em> Jerdon, 1841 a junior synonym of <em>Buteo rubinus</em> (Cretzschmar, 1829).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buteo melanotis</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>50 ND: 196</td>
<td>410 1844: 166</td>
<td>Baker (1930a: 410) wrongly cited the name as <em>melanotus not melanotis</em>. <em>Buteo melanotis</em> Jerdon, 1841 is a junior synonym of <em>Spilornis cheela</em> (Latham, 1790). For a comment on the generic name <em>Hematornis</em> employed by Baker see McAllan &amp; Bruce (2002: 167).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerdon’s generic name</td>
<td>Jerdon’s specific name</td>
<td>Page in 1844</td>
<td>Page in 1841</td>
<td>Gray 1848 a</td>
<td>Gray 1848 b, c</td>
<td>Horsfield &amp; Moore (1854) Page in above, plus data there cited</td>
<td>Baker (1930) Page in above, plus data there cited</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasciusa major</td>
<td></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>96 1844: 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See Brachypterus major major (Jerdon, 1844) as given by Ripley (1964: 15). Must now be dated 1841.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerdon's generic name</td>
<td>Jerdon's specific name</td>
<td>Page in 1844</td>
<td>Page in 1841</td>
<td>Gray 1848 a</td>
<td>Gray 1848 b, c</td>
<td>Horsfield &amp; Moore (1854)</td>
<td>Baker (1930)</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phanicura</td>
<td>supersiliaris [sic]</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1844: 170</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1844: 170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Page in above,</td>
<td>plus data there cited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plus data there cited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinnyris</td>
<td>longirostris</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td>not listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hirundo</td>
<td>inornata</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>95–201, 173</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1844: 173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spelling in the book corrected to superciliaris. Note the word ‘corrected’ (although superciliaris must be treated as the original spelling). It is believed that the type had already been set up for the Supplement and that it was not corrected. Phanicura superciliaris Jerdon, 1841 is considered a junior synonym of Erithacus brunneus brunneus (Hodgson, 1837).

Now Arachnothera longirostris (Latham 1790). Jerdon made no mention of Latham’s earlier use of the name Certhia longirostra, and may well have thought he was introducing a new name. Blyth (1852: 222) mistakenly associated Jerdon’s name with Arachnothera affinis (Horsfield, 1822) of south-east Asia.


As regards Horsfield & Moore (1854: 95) the context of p. 201 is Madras Journ. i.s. XII, and of p. 173 vol. XIII. The former is an error or is drawn from the book. Hirundo inornata Jerdon, 1841 is considered a junior synonym of Pygnaopragne rupestris rupestris (Scopoli, 1769).