



# Bombay Natural History Society

HORNBILL HOUSE, APOLLO STREET,

Bombay 1 - B.P.

November 21, 1965

Mrs. Jamal Ara  
North Office Para  
Doranda, P.O. Hinoo  
Ranchi, Bihar

Madam,

## HAZARIBAGH NATIONAL PARK REVISITED

While preparing your above paper for the December Journal we find that your assistance in regard to some points, and clarification in regard to a few others is required. These points which need your attention are listed below.

1. Because to most people the scientific names of plants convey very little, the editors have decided to add the local names or accepted English names wherever these appear. In an attempt to do so, we have added:

MS. p. 3 -	Hindi name	<u>salga</u>	for	<u>Boswellia serrata</u>
MS. p. 4 -	"	<u>maljan</u>	"	<u>Bauhinia vahlii</u>
MS. p. 5 -	"	<u>katahi</u>	"	<u>Flacourtia ramontchi</u>
	"	<u>harsinghar</u>	"	<u>Nyctanthes arbortristis</u>
	"	<u>sakena</u>	"	<u>Indigofera pulchella</u>
	"	<u>bara-salpan</u>	"	<u>Flemingia chappar</u>
MS. p.12	"	<u>mahua</u>	"	<u>Madhuca latifolia</u> .

We want your confirmation by return that we have given the correct Hindi names in these instances, and that they are locally in use at your end. If not we shall thank you to let us have the correct ones in use, both for the above and whatever others we may have omitted to attend to.

: 2 :

November 21, 1965

2. In the table appearing on MS. p. 8, the editors have decided to give the actual numbers seen in the sample area, rather than the estimated number. We have arrived at these figures by reducing the present values in columns 2 and 3 of the table to a fifth of what they now are. Please confirm that we have not erred, and the resultant figures are in order.

3. In the birds listed by you we find that you have omitted to mention Phylloscopus trochiloides apparently due to an oversight. We have entered this bird as No. 84 in your list with the remarks: 'Not seen.' Please confirm that this is correct.

4. With the addition of Phylloscopus trochiloides the total number of birds recorded in the Hazaribagh National Park now becomes 98, and we have accordingly emended this on p. 16 of your MS., 8th line from the bottom of the page.

5. At p. 13 of the MS., under Hirundo rustica you mention "A large flock ~~near~~ with this year's young ones, near the Tourist Lodge." Could you please let us know by return how you could distinguish between the adults and the birds of the year?

We hope to receive an early reply from you <sup>to</sup> for the points.

Yours faithfully,

(J.C. Daniel)  
Curator

SJS

NORTH OFFICE PARA,  
Ranchi-2, November 27, 1965.

J.C. Daniel Esq.,  
Bombay Natural History Society,  
Hornbill House,  
BOMBAY. 1.

Dear Sir,

Please refer to your letter of the 21st. instant. My ideas on each point are:-

1. It is a very good idea that Hindi or accepted English names be used in addition to the Latin ones. I give the complete list below:-

MS - P3 -	Hindi name	<u>Salai</u>	for	<u>Boswellia serrata</u>
	" "	<u>Kher</u>	and English Spear Grass for	<u>Heteropogon contortus</u>
MS - P4 -	" "	<u>Sal</u>	for	<u>Shorea robusta</u>
	" "	<u>Mahul</u>	for	<u>Bauhinia vahlii</u>
MS - P5-	" "	<u>Harsinghar</u>	for	<u>Nyctanthes arbor-tristis</u>
	" "	<u>Jirul</u>	for	<u>Indigofera pulchella</u>
	" "	<u>Galphuli</u>	for	<u>Flemingia chappar</u>
MS - P6-	" "	<u>Ghechu</u>	for	<u>Aponogentum</u>
MS - P12-	" "	<u>Mahua</u>	for	<u>Madhuca latifolia</u>

2. The figures as arrived at by you are in order. I suggest that the legend above the table be re-written as:-

"A change has been made in the table. The numbers actually seen in the sampling area have been given in column 2, and alongside in column 3, the numbers seen in the same area in 1960, so that a ready comparison is possible".

3. The bird mentioned as Phylloscopus trochiloides markhami in 1960 has been re-named Phylloscopus nitidus by Dillon Ripley, and this bird appears in the list as No: 84 at page 15.
4. In view of para 3 above, the number will remain as 97, and no amendment is necessary,
5. Young swallows are dull in colour and do not have the steel-blue gloss of the adult birds. The face has a dull buff tint. They are slightly smaller as well, and the tail does not have such a long and deep fork. Seen together the young and the adults can be separated very easily in the field. This can be added as an explanatory note on page 13, just after the word "Nalla" in the last but one line.

I trust the above clarifies all the points raised by you.

Yours faithfully,

(Mrs. JAMAL ARA)



*Bombay Natural History Society*

HORNBILL HOUSE, APOLLO STREET,

*Bombay 1 - B.R.*

November 30, 1965

Mrs Jamal Ara  
North Office Para  
Doranda, P.O. Hinoo  
Ranchi 2, Bihar

Dear Mrs. Jamal Ara,

HAZARIBAGH NATIONAL PARK REVISITED

---

Many thanks for your letter of the 27th instant clarifying our queries.

Regarding point 3 I note that according to Ripley 1961 Phylloscopus trochiloides and Phylloscopus nitidus are two different species -- pp. 481 and 482 of the SYNOPSIS. Will you please let me know which is the species you saw during the present survey? If it is nitidus we should include in the list trochiloides also, as it has been recorded by you in your last report.

Yours sincerely,

(J.C. Daniel)  
Curator

JCD:SJS

NORTH OFFICE PARA, Doranda,  
Ranchi 2, December 4, 1965.

Dear Mr. Daniel,

Please refer to your letter dated November 30, 1965. The bird seen on both the occasions, i.e., 1960 and 1965, is the Green Willow Warbler, scientifically named Acanthopneuste nitidus nitidus at page 473, Volume II, of Stuart Baker's Fauna of British India - Birds, Volumes. Dr. Biswas replaced the Genus Acanthopneuste by Phylloscopus, and dropped the specific name nitidus, making the Green Willow Warbler Phylloscopus trochiloides nitidus. As my identifications are based on field identifications only, I usually do not use the sub-specific names, and therefore, in my 1960 report I mentioned this bird as Phylloscopus trochiloides. Now Dillon Ripley has separated Stuart Baker's A.n.nitidus (Vol. II, page 473) and A.n.viridanus (Vol. II, page 474) into two distinct species, viz., Phylloscopus nitidus and Phylloscopus trochiloides respectively. This is responsible for the confusion. In other words, the bird seen in 1960 too was Phylloscopus nitidus Blyth, but because of taxonomic changes, and also because I generally do not use trinomials, the name Phylloscopus trochiloides was used, since at the time my 1960 report was written Dillon Ripley's Synopsis had not appeared.

I trust this clarifies the situation, as also the reason why Phylloscopus trochiloides should not be added on to my 1965 list.

Yours sincerely,



(Mrs. JAMAL ARA)

J.C. Daniel, Esq.,  
B.N.H.S.,  
BOMBAY. 1.