



<http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3609.2.12>

<http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:2749193C-44A6-407D-A044-42D4F161D3C4>

The type series of *Chloris sinica tschiliensis* Jacobi, 1923 (Aves, Fringillidae)

TILL TÖPFER

Senckenberg Naturhistorische Sammlungen Dresden, Museum für Tierkunde, Königsbrücker Landstrasse 159, 01109 Dresden, Germany

Present address:

Zoologisches Forschungsmuseum Alexander Koenig, Adenauerallee 160, 53113 Bonn, Germany, E-mail: T.Toepfer@zfmk.de

The Oriental Greenfinch *Carduelis sinica* (Linnaeus, 1766) is currently regarded as consisting of five to six subspecies (Dickinson 2003: 749; Clement 2010: 543–544; Clements *et al.* 2012; Gill & Donsker 2012; treated as *Chloris sinica* by the latter two authors). In 1923, Arnold Jacobi, then working at the Zoological Museum in Dresden, described the subspecies *Chloris sinica tschiliensis*, but it was recognized for just a few years before being synonymised by Howell *et al.* (1968: 236) under *Carduelis s. sinica* (Linnaeus, 1766). The description is based on twelve specimens (six males, five adult females, one juvenile female) obtained by Hugo Weigold during his participation in Walt(h)er Stötzner's 1914–1916 Sichuan expedition (Jacobi 1923). Although most of the birds have ever since been present in different collections, the whereabouts of the type series remained unclear for several years (e.g., van den Elzen 2010). Thus, in the following I present a comprehensive overview of the identity and contemporary availability of the original specimens that Jacobi had at hand.

Because Jacobi did not name a particular specimen as holotype, nor has any lectotype been subsequently designated, all twelve birds must be considered syntypes. Due to this fact, the annotations “Typus”, “Paratypus” and “Cotypus” occur on different labels. As was the common custom in those days, it appears likely that Jacobi described *tschiliensis* when the birds were still the property of the collector Stötzner, who later sold the birds to different collections. Consequently, individual specimens of the type series reside in four different collections today. Jacobi (1923) presented unique wing length measurements for every bird, so it is possible to assign individual specimens with their current collection number on the grounds of the respective label annotations (Table 1).

Of the seven syntypes of *C. sinica tschiliensis* acquired by the Zoological Museum at Dresden, only six specimens (four males and two females) are known to exist today. The seventh bird, a juvenile female, was apparently lost during World War II (Table 1). This is indicated by the fact that its museum catalogue entry lacks yellow underlining, which was used for those specimens that still existed after the war. All existing birds still bear original Stötzner expedition labels. From the catalogue inventory dates, I conclude that the specimens SNSD C 24008 to SNSD C 24012 were catalogued in 1924–1925, whereas the specimens SNSD C 27034 and SNSD C 27035 were catalogued in 1930–1931. There is a remark referring to the latter two birds as belonging to the museum's “old property”. Thus, it appears likely that all the Dresden specimens were acquired as a single installment but that two birds were inventoried later. Also, the label annotations “Typus” for the former five specimens and “Paratypus” and “Cotypus” for the latter two birds indicate that these might have been (wrongly) used to distinguish the two sets of specimens. However, none of the Dresden specimens is listed in the recent type catalogues of the museum (Eck & Quaisser 2004; Quaisser & Eck 2006).

There is one specimen in the current bird collection of the Zoological Research Museum Alexander Koenig at Bonn that was incorporated as a part of the collection of Otto Kleinschmidt in 1935 (ZFMK Kl. 506). The bird is an adult female (not a juvenile as stated in van den Elzen 2010) but does not have an original Stötzner expedition label. This specimen is mentioned in Kleinschmidt's catalogue (1936: 14) but without any reference to its syntype status. However, it is listed as such in the museum's recent type catalogues (Rheinwald & van den Elzen 1984; van den Elzen 2010) which is justified because all information given on the label is consistent with the data of the other specimens, including the (crossed-out) annotation “Typus” and remarks referring to the collector Weigold and to its wing length.