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Cabanis (1851) erected the sunbird genera *Anthodiaeta* and *Hedydipna* for *Cinnyris collaris* Vieillot, 1819, and *Nectarinia metallica* M. H. C. Lichtenstein, 1823, respectively, and specified *C. platura* Vieillot, 1819, as the type species of *Hedydipna* whilst spelling it *platyura*. Several authors including Shelley (1877) and Roberts (1922, 1931, 1932, 1940) retained *collaris* within *Anthodiaeta*, but Sclater (1930) placed *collaris* within *Anthreptes* and maintained *platura* and *metallica* in *Hedydipna*. Delacour (1944) synonymised both *Anthodiaeta* and *Hedydipna* with *Anthreptes*. Wolters (1977) subsumed *Anthodiaeta* within *Hedydipna* in which he placed *platura, metallica* and *collaris*, but placed *A. pallidigaster* W. L. Sclater & Moreau, 1933, in *Lamprothreptes* Roberts, 1922, albeit with a question mark. Irwin (1999) followed Wolters but added *pallidigaster* to *Hedydipna*. Fry *et al.* (2000) and Cheke & Mann (2001) followed Irwin (1999) in using *Hedydipna* for *collaris, platura, metallica* and *pallidigaster*.

Mann & Cheke (2006), followed by Cheke & Mann (2008), proposed that *Anthodiaeta* should replace *Hedydipna* in the outdated belief that position priority applied to genera, since Cabanis had erected *Anthodiaeta* on the page preceding his erection of *Hedydipna*. However, arguments concerning position priority now usually only apply to the designation of type species (Recommendation 69A, ICZN 1999: 73). Furthermore, Mann & Cheke failed to recognise that Wolters (1977, 1979) may have acted as a first reviser. Art. 24.2.1. of the *International code of zoological nomenclature* states: ‘When the precedence between names or nomenclatural acts cannot be objectively determined, the precedence is fixed by the action of the first author citing in a published work those names or acts and selecting them [our italics]; this author is termed the ‘First Reviser.’ Although Wolters (1977: 86) did not explicitly select *Hedydipna* over *Anthodiaeta*, he did so implicitly, and the relevant section of Wolters (1979: 275) can be interpreted as an explicit selection, leaving little doubt that he was first reviser.

Given the above, *contra* Mann & Cheke (2006), *Hedydipna* should be used and not *Anthodiaeta* for *collaris, platura, metallica* and *pallidigaster* if they are considered congeneric. However, *platura* and *metallica* differ from *collaris* and *pallidigaster* in having (a) a non-breeding eclipse plumage in males; (b) no pectoral tufts; (c) no metallic plumage in females; (d) elongated rectrices in males, although the taxonomic value of this character is ignored in *Cinnyris* for example; (e) weaker bill serrations; (f) nests that are placed in bushes and not suspended and (g) DNA differences, as Bowie (2003), who lacked samples of *pallidigaster* or *metallica*, found that *platura* was well separated from *collaris* based on nuclear and mitochondrial data from 102 species of sunbirds. Therefore we propose that Cabanis’ original generic designations should be retained with *Hedydipna platura, H. metallica, Anthodiaeta collaris* and *A. pallidigaster* as valid species.
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On 19 November 1968, mammalogist Douglas M. Lay collected a juvenile female Indian Pitta *Pitta brachyura* that was deposited at the Museum of Natural Science, Louisiana State University (LSUMZ 85937; Fig. 1). The bird was “shot in thick *Populus euphratica* and *Tamarix* sp. “jungle”” along the Karkheh River, 17 km south-west of the city of Shush, Khuzestan province, in south-western Iran. The locality, 17 km south-west of Shush, is not precisely situated along the Karkheh River, and presumably reflects an inaccuracy on the behalf of the collector, who we unsuccessfully attempted to contact, meaning we are unable to present more data concerning the specimen’s collection. There are no records in Iran or anywhere else in the Middle East (Scott & Adhami 2006, Porter & Aspinall 2010).

*P. brachyura* breeds in tropical submontane forest and scrub from north-central (Sikkim) and perhaps north-east India (Assam, breeding unconfirmed) and central Nepal, through north-east Pakistan and south-west to the Indian states of Gujarat and Maharashtra (Grimmett *et al.* 1999, Birdlife International 2013). The species is a long-distance migrant and winters from central India south to Sri Lanka, mostly in the southern part of that range. Except records in south-east Pakistan and the Indian Thar desert (Kamal 1978, Singh 2004), long-distance vagrancy is unknown. A closely related (Irestedt *et al.* 2006) migratory species, Blue-winged Pitta *P. moluccensis* of South-East Asia, has strayed to Christmas Island and Australia, which are 500–3,000 km from the non-breeding range (Serventy 1968, Benson