

AMERICAN MUSEUM NOVITATES

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY
CITY OF NEW YORK JANUARY 19, 1953 NUMBER 1605

NOTES ON TYRANT FLYCATCHERS (TYRANNIDAE)

BY JOHN T. ZIMMER

During the review of various members of the family Tyrannidae in connection with the preparation of volume 8 of the "Check-list of birds of the world," several cases have come to light that require more extended treatment than can be given them in the final volume. Those that have been studied in sufficient detail to date to justify a formal report are discussed below.

I am grateful to Dr. Herbert Friedmann of the United States National Museum, Washington, D. C., Mr. Thomas R. Howell of the Los Angeles Museum, California, the late Mr. James L. Peters of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and Dr. William H. Phelps of Caracas, Venezuela, for the loan of critical material that has been of the greatest value in the present study.

In the descriptions that follow, names of colors are capitalized when direct comparison has been made with Ridgway's "Color standards and color nomenclature."

***Myiarchus tuberculifer littoralis*, new subspecies**

TYPE: From El Zapotal, Guanacaste, Costa Rica. No. 391023, American Museum of Natural History. Adult female collected January 11, 1892, by Austin Paul Smith.

DIAGNOSIS: Compared with the adjacent subspecies *lawrenceii*, *platyrhynchus*, *connectens*, and *nigricapillus*. Dorsum paler than in these others; throat more whitish, less grayish, than in *lawrenceii*; top of head paler than in *nigricapillus*, a little darker than in *platyrhynchus*, matched by some *lawrenceii* and *connectens* but averaging a little lighter.

RANGE: Pacific littoral of extreme southeastern Honduras, Nicaragua, and northwestern Costa Rica.

DESCRIPTION OF TYPE: Top of head near Chaetura Drab; back near Grayish Olive, a little darker and grayer anteriorly and with a slight tinge of rufous on the lower rump; upper tail-coverts dusky, with brighter rufescent margins. Loes dark gray, invading the nasal feathering and the anterior edge of the forehead; malar region gray, passing into brown on the auriculars; chin and throat Pallid Neutral Gray, with whiter flammulations; breast a little deeper grayish, passing into dark olive on the sides and into Barium Yellow on the belly and flanks; under tail-coverts yellow, with a tinge of buff; thighs light brown. Remiges blackish brown edged exteriorly with Sayal Brown on the primaries, more broadly with Cinnamon \times Orange-Cinnamon on the secondaries, and with Pinkish Buff on the tertials; primary-coverts unmarked blackish brown; upper greater and median coverts dusky, with Avellaneous margins and tips making two moderately marked wing-bars; lesser coverts about like the back; under wing-coverts a little paler yellow than the belly; inner margins of most of the remiges Pale Pinkish Buff. Rectrices sooty brown, with outer margins broadly Cinnamon \times Orange-Cinnamon except on outermost feathers which have the outer webs inconspicuously lighter than the inner webs; inner margins Light Pinkish Cinnamon. Bill (in dried skin) dark brown; feet black. Wing, 78.25 mm.; tail, 75.5; exposed culmen, 16; culmen from base, 21; tarsus, 18.

REMARKS: Sexes apparently alike in coloration, although the males may be a little larger, with the wing over 80 mm. in length. Assurance on this point is lacking, and the exact limits of measurement of the sexes cannot be given here. A number of specimens in the series appear to be wrongly sexed on any such criterion of size.

One young bird has the pattern of the adults, but the top of the head is lighter brown, the markings on wing and tail are more strongly rufous, and the belly is whitish, with a slight tinge of pinkish on the under tail-coverts and the belly, but no yellow; the under wing-coverts also are whitish; bill black.

The distinctions of this form were noted some years ago (1938, Amer. Mus. Novitates, no. 994, pp. 19-25), but no name was given to the population. Recent reëxamination of the series together with some additional material has renewed my belief in the validity of the suggested subspecies which is described and named herewith.

The material examined in this connection is that listed in the

1938 paper with additions as noted below. For clarity I have repeated the catalogue of the specimens of the new form.

M. t. platyrhynchus.—

MEXICO:

Quintana Roo, Xcopán, 1 ♂¹;
Camp Menzel, 2 ♂¹.

M. t. connectens.—

HONDURAS:

El Boquerón, 1 ♂;
Tegucigalpa, 1 ♂, 1 ♀;
Comayagua, 1 ♂;
Hatillo, 1 ♂;
Sabana Grande, 1 ♀,
El Caliche, 1 ♂, 1 ♀.

EL SALVADOR:

San Salvador, 2 ♂¹, 1 ♀¹;
Volcán de San Rafael, 1 ♂¹.

M. t. littoralis.—

HONDURAS:

San Lorenzo, Valle, 1 ♂.

NICARAGUA:

Tipitapa, 1 ♂;
Chinandega, 2 “♂” [?= ♀], 1 (?) [?= ♂];
Volcán de Chinandega, 1 ♀;
Volcán Viejo, 2 ♂, 1 ♀;
Corinto, 2 ♂, 3 ♀.

COSTA RICA:

Miravalles, 2 ♀;
Bebedero, 1 ♀;
El Zapotal, 2 ♀ (including type).

Empidonax difficilis* and *Empidonax flavescens

A study of the Mexican and Central American forms of *Empidonax difficilis* and *E. flavescens* has shown that considerable confusion has existed in these two species. It has proved impossible to reconcile the various accounts with one another or with the material at hand, particularly as regards the series from Guatemala and Honduras.

Through the kindness of the late James L. Peters of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Dr. Herbert Friedmann of the United States National Museum, and Thomas R. Howell of the Los Angeles Museum, I have been able to enlarge the available material for study and reach more satisfactory conclusions, especially since this material includes a number of specimens

¹ Specimens in Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge.

examined by previous workers which demonstrate the basis for some of the conflicting accounts.

Although *difficilis* and *flavescens* are quite closely allied, they appear to be justifiably separated specifically, but I can find no good evidence that they occur together, especially as breeding birds. Furthermore, I have seen no indications of the occurrence of any form of *difficilis* anywhere in Guatemala or Honduras where it has been reported to exist. All specimens I have seen, including some identified as members of the *difficilis* group, are certainly one form or another of *flavescens*.

Much of the trouble has arisen through inability to allocate the type of *Empidonax salvini* Ridgway (1886 [Oct.], *Ibis*, ser. 5, vol. 4, p. 459—Calderas, Volcán de Fuego, Guatemala). It has been considered as unidentifiable, as representing a monotypic species, and as a subspecies of *difficilis*, with all of which conclusions I disagree. Admittedly the specimen is old and faded, but I place it unquestionably in the *flavescens* group. Furthermore, various fresher specimens from near-by localities in Guatemala show the true characters of *salvini* to better advantage and differ from the type only in those particulars that can be ascribed without hesitation to differences in post-mortem changes (if any) in the specimens. There is no reason to refuse to accept the evidence of these fresher specimens. They show *salvini* to be a relatively dull bird, with the cap and back relatively uniform (with the cap not so brownish as in most *dwrighti* and the back less yellowish or golden green) and the pectoral area duller and less strongly brownish or less well defined as a marked pectoral band.

Van Rossem, in describing his *Empidonax flavescens dwrighti* (1928, *Auk*, vol. 45, p. 359—Los Esesmiles, El Salvador) claimed that it was obvious that Ridgway had based his redescription of *salvini* (1907, *Bull. U. S. Natl. Mus.*, vol. 50, pt. 4, p. 582) on a specimen of *dwrighti*, not on the type, but I fail to find the proof of such assertion. The redescription differs from the original in only minor particulars that are matters of individual variation, such as the completeness or incompleteness of the eye ring, the color of the wing bars, and the exact depth of yellow on the under parts. Furthermore, at the time of the second description, Ridgway appears to have had only the type and a specimen from Tumbalá, Chiapas, México, and, although van Rossem identified this Chiapas specimen as *dwrighti*, several Chiapas birds now at hand are not distinguishable from the series of *salvini*. Ridgway's

description in 1907 gives no character that is not found in *salvini*.

On the other hand, Moore (1940, Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, vol. 53, pp. 26-29) assigned some specimens from Chiapas to *flavescens dwighti* and others (from the same locality) to "*difficilis seclusus*"; the same disposition was made of certain examples from Honduras, some of which I have examined without finding the specific segregation implied thereby.

It must be confessed that two extremes of coloration are exhibited by the Chiapas and Honduras specimens now before me as well as by the Guatemalan series, and there is complete intergradation between these extremes, but the brighter extreme here is still not quite in full agreement with *dwighti*. Nevertheless, the series from Chiapas and the mountainous part of southwestern Guatemala show a preponderance of characters in favor of *salvini*, while the longer series from Honduras contains a majority of specimens inseparable from El Salvador examples of *dwighti*. Two specimens from northeastern Guatemala (Finca Sepur) and one labeled simply "Guatemala," can be assigned to *dwighti*; the other Guatemalan birds at hand are *salvini*. Griscom (1935, Ibis, ser. 13, vol. 5, p. 813) identified a male from the Sierra de las Minas, eastern Guatemala, as *salvini* and a female from the same mountain range as *dwighti* (thereby necessarily considering the two as specifically distinct), but I believe the case is parallel to that demonstrated by the birds from other regions now before me and indicative of individual variation but not of specific distinction. Some of the Honduras birds are fully as dull as *salvini*, but others are just as bright as *dwighti*, while still others are intermediate.

The question remains, therefore, as to just where the dividing line must be drawn between the two subspecies. From the evidence at hand, it appears justifiable to recognize *dwighti* from the whole of Honduras, spreading northward into eastern Guatemala (and southward into Nicaragua and, of course, westward into El Salvador). *Salvini*, then, inhabits western Guatemala, spreading northward into Chiapas, México, and, it also appears, across into Veracruz, México. The proposed form *Empidonax flavescens imperturbatus* Wetmore (1942, Auk, vol. 59, p. 267—Volcán San Martín, Veracruz) was described in comparison with *dwighti* but without consideration of *salvini* which the most recent discussions had hidden under the guise of a subspecies of *difficilis*. Comparison of topotypes of "*imperturbatus*" with the series of *salvini* shows such

close similarity that these topotypes cannot well be distinguished from the others. Separation from *dwighti* is obvious, but not from *salvini* to which I believe "*imperturbatus*" belongs. The range of *salvini* thus crosses the Isthmus of Tehuantepec into southern Veracruz as suggested above.

We have, then, a dull-colored *salvini*, the bright extremes of which approach *dwighti* which, in turn, shows an approach to *salvini* in some individuals from southern Honduras. Extremes of the two conspecies are easily distinguished, but the intermediates are not. Identification of single examples can be problematical. My present conclusions are based on the preponderance of well-marked examples from the various areas involved.

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

E. f. salvini.—

MEXICO:

- Veracruz, Volcán San Martín, 1 ♂¹, 1 ♀¹;
- Chiapas, Monte Ovando, 1 ♂², 1 ♀²;
- Chiapas, Sillepec, 3 ♂².

GUATEMALA:

- Calderas, Volcán de Fuego, 1 ♂ (type)¹;
- Volcán de Agua, 1 ♀;
- Volcán San Lucas, 1 ♂, 2 ♀, 1 ♂ 2, 2 ♀ 2;
- Tecpam, 1 ♀;
- Panajachel, 1 ♂²;
- Dueñas, 1 (?)².

E. f. dwighti.—

GUATEMALA:

- Finca Sepur, 1 ♂, 1 ♀.

EL SALVADOR:

- Los Esesmiles, 1 ♂³, 1 ♀³;
- Mt. Cacaguatique, 3 ♂³, 1 ♀³.

HONDURAS:

- Cerro Nieve, Santa Barbara, 1 ♂;
- Santa Barbara, 1 ♂;
- Portillo Grande, Yoro, 1 ♂², 1 ♀²;
- Las Peñitas, Cortes, 1 ♂², 1 ♀²;
- Rancho Quemado, Yoro, 1 ♀²;
- Merendón, Copán, 1 ♂²;
- Mt. Pucca, Gracias, 4 ♂²;
- Muye, La Paz, 3 ♂, 2 ♀;
- Cerro Santa Maria, La Paz, 1 ♀²;

¹ Specimens in United States National Museum.

² Specimens in Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge.

³ Specimens in Dickey Collection, Los Angeles Museum.

Cerro Cantoral, Tegucigalpa, 1 ♂, 6 ♂¹, 1 ♀¹;
 Alto Cantoral, 4 ♂, 2 ♀, 2 (?);
 Cantoral, 6 ♂, 3 ♀;
 El Derrumbo, Tegucigalpa, 1 ♂, 2 ♂¹, 2 ♀¹;
 "Guatemala," 1 (?).

NICARAGUA:

Ocotal, 1 ♂, 2 ♀;
 San Rafael del Norte, 6 ♂, 6 ♀, 1 (?).

"Euscarthmus nattereri" Hellmayr

Euscarthmus nattereri HELLMAYR, 1903, Verhandl. Zool. Bot. Gesellsch. Wien, vol. 53, p. 204—[Rio] Paraná, [northern São Paulo, Brazil]; ♂; Vienna Mus.

Repeated attempts to link Hellmayr's species *nattereri* with one or other of the better-known members of the genus *Idioptilon* [= *Euscarthmornis*]² or its close relative, *Todirostrum*, have led me invariably to the conclusion that it is identical with *Todirostrum latirostre ochropterum* (Allen).

In the original description, comparison was made with "*Euscarthmus gularis*" [= *Todirostrum p. plumbeiceps* Lafresnaye] and *Todirostrum latirostre*. With the latter form, Hellmayr mistakenly synonymized *ochropterum* (cf. 1940, Amer. Mus. Novitates, no. 1066, p. 8), although he had two of Lawrence's original specimens of that form to compare with Pelzeln's type of *latirostre*. Judging by a later account, he had no other true *latirostre*. *Gularis* was found to differ from *nattereri* by its dusky gray cap, stronger rusty sides of the head and throat, and olive green, instead of ochraceous yellow, lesser wing-coverts. *Latirostre* was said to differ from *nattereri* by its darker and browner cap (presumably darker brown, since *nattereri* was said to have a brownish tone on the top of the head) and by a differently shaped bill—broader and less narrowed terminally, being of the characteristic shape of that member in *Todirostrum*.

These features, as well as all those in the full description of *nattereri*, agree precisely with those of *latirostre ochropterum*. In *ochropterum* the bill is quite variable in shape, and some individuals have this member so narrow in contrast to the broader extreme shown by birds from the same region, or even locality, that the supposed distinction ascribed to *nattereri* is easily ap-

¹ Specimens in Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge.

² *Idioptilon* (Berlepsch, 1907) has many years' priority over *Euscarthmornis* (Oberholser, 1923), a point I overlooked (1940, Amer. Mus. Novitates, no. 1066, p. 13) in reporting the identity of *Idioptilon rothschildi* Berlepsch (the type of the genus) with *Euscarthmus Zosterops* Pelzeln.

preciated, although it is entirely overcome by intergradation throughout the series.

In addition to the type of *nattereri*, Hellmayr had two examples from Mato Grosso that he referred to the new form, but all other comparable material since recorded from Mato Grosso and São Paulo has been assigned to *latirostre* or, more recently, to *ochropterum*, strengthening my belief that *nattereri* is no more than the narrow-billed extreme of *ochropterum*.

(For the list of material examined, see Zimmer, 1940, Amer. Mus. Novitates, no. 1066, p. 9).

Idioptilon mirandae kaempferi, new subspecies

TYPE: From Salto Pirahy (Joinville), Santa Catarina, Brazil; altitude 450 feet. No. 315108, American Museum of Natural History. Adult female collected June 3, 1929, by Emil Kaempfer; original no. 10283.

DIAGNOSIS: Much like *I. m. mirandae* (as exemplified by two specimens from Pernambuco), but upper parts strongly brownish, especially on the head, buff of breast with a yellowish tinge, belly strongly yellow, broad inner margins of the tertials lighter and more yellowish, not buffy, and light margins of greater and median upper wing-coverts brighter and pronouncedly buffy, forming two obvious wing bars.

RANGE: Known only from the type locality.

DESCRIPTION OF TYPE: Top of head a little warmer than dark Dresden Brown; forehead, lores, and a narrow eye ring more buffy; remainder of sides of the head a little lighter than the crown; mantle near Saccardo's Olive; uropygium a little lighter olive. Chin and throat Chamois × Cinnamon-Buff; breast similar but slightly tinged with yellow and with the color extended a little posteriad on the sides; belly and under tail-coverts deep Barium Yellow; thighs brownish. Remiges blackish brown; primaries and secondaries narrowly margined exteriorly with the color of the back, becoming paler (near Marguerite Yellow) near the tips of the inner secondaries; tertials with the outer margins still broader and longer and clear Marguerite Yellow, occupying almost the entire outer web on the innermost feather; this innermost feather also with a small buffy spot next to the shaft at the base of the inner web; this spot wider and longer on the second tertial and even more extended distad on the third, being duplicated as

a light inner margin on the secondaries and, narrowly, on the primaries, becoming obsolete on the outermost; under wing-coverts Primrose Yellow. Tail dark brown, edged externally with brownish olive. Maxilla (in dried skin) blackish; mandible flesh-colored; feet light brown. Wing, 46 mm.; tail, 38; exposed culmen, 11; culmen from base, 14; tarsus, 18.

REMARKS: The two examples of *mirandae* agree in detail with the original description and with Hellmayr's later diagnosis including the narrowed outline of the bill that indicates *Idioptilon*. The only prominent feature that is not mentioned by either Sneath or Hellmayr is the exceptionally broad stripe on the outer margins of the tertials, which is buff in *mirandae* and light yellow, almost white, in *kaempferi*. This pattern is extremely similar to that in females of *Todirostrum capitale* to which *mirandae* and the present new form bear no obvious relationship. It also appears in *Idioptilon orbitatum* and *I. zosterops*, the bills of which are like the bill in *mirandae*—so much so that generic distinction is impossible to justify.

The general style of coloration in *mirandae* is paralleled somewhat, except for the striking wing pattern, in *I. rufigulare*. The absence of the pronounced pale yellow stripes on the tertials in *rufigulare* is not the only distinction, however, although the most obvious one. There is a considerable hiatus in distribution and taxonomic characters to be overcome before relationship to *mirandae* is more than faintly suggested.

It has been suggested by Pinto (1940, Rev. Mus. Paulista, vol. 24, pp. 261–262) that *mirandae* might prove to be only a subspecies of *Todirostrum fumifrons*, but unless I am completely misled as to the identity of the two birds from Pernambuco, now before me, such relationship is insupportable. *Fumifrons* is smaller, and the shape of the wing is quite different from that of *mirandae*. The outer primary is notably short (as in *sylvia*), and the tertials and inner secondaries also are short, making the outline of the wing tip more evenly arcuate than in *mirandae*. Its bill is more obviously that of *Todirostrum* and is completely black (except at the very tip, as in most of the species), while the culmen is less flattened than in *mirandae*. The wing bars are strong and sharply outlined, exceeding even those of *mirandae kaempferi*, and the pattern of the tertials is different, having only a narrow, pale outer margin. When the two species are compared, there is little resemblance to be seen. In form and proportions, as well as

in wing and facial pattern but not in general coloration or size, *mirandae* shows the most resemblance to *I. orbitatum*.

It may seem presumptuous to describe *kaempferi* from a single specimen, but it is sufficiently distinct from *mirandae*, as that form is known at present, to make its separation justifiable. The differences from *mirandae* are, in fact, pronounced enough to make it possible that it is specifically, rather than subspecifically, distinct, but it possesses enough of the features that characterize *mirandae* in comparison with its congeners to lead me to propose it as a conspecies. The males of both forms have yet to be discovered but, judging by the rule in *Idioptilon* (and almost the rule in *Todirostrum*), it would be surprising to find any great difference in general appearance.

The assignment to *mirandae* of a previous (? sight) record by W. A. Forbes of "*Euscarthmus gularis*" from Pernambuco was suggested by Hellmayr (1927, Field Mus. Nat. Hist., zool. ser., vol. 13, pt. 5, p. 307) and is now substantiated by the two Pernambuco birds at hand.

I wish to express my thanks to Mrs. W. W. Naumburg for permission to describe the new form from the material in the Kaempfer Collection which was obtained through her generous sponsorship.

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

I. m. mirandae.—

BRAZIL:

Brejão, Pernambuco, 1 ♀, 1 (?).

I. m. kaempferi.—

BRAZIL:

Salto Pirahy (Joinville), Santa Catarina, 1 ♀ (type).

***Hemitriccus obsoletus naumburgae*, new subspecies**

TYPE: From Sinimbu, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil; altitude 500 feet. No. 315128, American Museum of Natural History. Adult male collected September 30, 1928, by E. Kaempfer; original no. 7987.

DIAGNOSIS: Differs from *H. o. obsoletus* of Mt. Itatiaia, Brazil, by more greenish upper parts, slightly more ochraceous, less vinaceous-tinged, breast and sides, and more strongly ochraceous belly and under wing-coverts.

Differs from *H. diops* of southeastern Brazil and adjacent areas by darker and browner olive upper parts, decidedly more

ochraceous under parts (gray and white in *diops*), paler tarsi and toes, and complete buff eye ring and buffy lores (in *diops* whitish lores and pale yellowish white eye ring incomplete posteriorly and interrupted in front by a prominent blackish patch).

RANGE: Elevated central area of Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil.

DESCRIPTION OF TYPE: Upper parts largely Dull Citrine × Dark Citrine, becoming somewhat brownish on the forehead; inconspicuous eye ring dull buff; lores a little paler; sides of head darker, a little more brownish than the back. Broad malar region, breast, and sides buffy Drab; chin and upper throat a little paler; lower throat with an indistinct central patch of lighter color poorly defined; belly pale Pinkish Buff × Cartridge Buff; anal region with concealed white; flanks like upper throat; under tail-coverts brighter, tinged with Colonial Buff. Remiges dull grayish brown; outer margins of primaries finely margined exteriorly with the color of the back, obsolete on the outermost and basal on the next, increasing in extent on the inner ones; outer margins of secondaries a little broader and brighter and those of tertials widest and with a more golden tinge; upper primary-coverts dusky; greater series dusky, margined with the dorsal color; remainder of upper coverts a little darker than the back; under wing-coverts Cream Buff, becoming Chamois on carpal margin; inner margins of remiges narrowly dull whitish. Rectrices light brown, exteriorly margined with a little lighter green than the color of the back. Maxilla (in dried skin) dusky brown; mandible pale; feet light brown. Wing, 57 mm.; tail, 50; exposed culmen, 10; culmen from base, 13.8; tarsus, 20.

REMARKS: Females resemble the males in coloration but have somewhat shorter wing and tail: wing, 52–53 mm.; tail, 40–45 as against 54.5–57 and 45–50 (as the material at hand is sexed).

Although *obsoletus* has sometimes been considered as a conspecific of *diops*, there are certain factors of appearance and distribution that make it desirable to reconsider the situation. The general appearance of the two is much the same except that *diops* is greener above, grayer on the breast, and clearer whitish on the belly, being less brownish and buffy in these particulars. The pattern of marking about the eye is perceptibly different in the two forms. In *diops*, the upper and lower eyelids are occupied by separated patches of pale yellow, making an interrupted eye ring; the anterior part of the lores is still paler, with the posterior

part dusky or even blackish, effectively interrupting the eye ring; above the lores and upper eyelid there usually is a narrow blackish border which in most cases is met by the upward extension of the dark anteorbital patch; this patch, in turn, sometimes extends farther downward, tending to form a narrow stripe beneath the anterior border of the lower eyelid. These dusky markings are absent from nearly all examples of *obsoletus* I have seen. In that form, the eye ring is complete, dull, and not sharply defined, uninterruptedly continuous with the lores and, like them, deep buff, not yellowish. One or two examples show traces of a dark line bordering the entire anterior portion of the orbital ring, but its appearance is not quite like that shown in *diops*.

The distributional patterns of the two groups do not fit well together, although I have no record of the occurrence of both at the same locality. *Diops* ranges from southern Baía southward to northern São Paulo, thence extending westward across western Paraná to southeastern Paraguay. It occurs, however, at Hansa, in the lowland coastal area of northeastern Santa Catarina, although whether the range is continued from São Paulo or is interrupted I am unable to say.

Obsoletus, however, occurs in the interior of Rio de Janeiro and neighboring São Paulo (Itatiaia, Bocaina, and Bananal ranges) at elevations, according to my material, of 5800 to 7500 feet, while *diops* (again according to my material) ranges from 250 to 3500 feet and probably lower. The new form, of which the affinity to *obsoletus* rather than to *diops* is marked, inhabits central Paraná and Rio Grande do Sul, at elevations of 300 to 3000 feet (about as in *diops*), reaching a point (Corvo, Paraná) between the Santa Catarina (Hansa) locality of *diops* and the São Paulo localities of the same form. Interdigitation rather than actual coexistence may be found to explain the apparent irregularities of distribution, but until sufficient material is at hand to clarify the situation, I prefer to keep *diops* and *obsoletus* (with the new subspecies added) specifically distinct.

Two Paraguayan specimens of *diops* are possibly a little lighter and more ochraceous on the breast than the Brazilian specimens but without suggesting *obsoletus*. Perhaps they may be found to represent a Paraguayan form to which the name *salvadorianus* (*Hemitriscus Salvadorianus* Bertoni, 1901, Aves nuevas del Paraguay, p. 123—Alto Paraná, latitude 26° S., Paraguay) may be

found applicable. The present material is insufficient to justify a proposal for its recognition.

I take pleasure in naming this new bird for Mrs. W. W. Naumburg who generously gave permission for its description from the material in the Kaempfer Collection.

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

H. diops.—

BRAZIL:

- Baía (Itirussú), 1 “♂”;
- Minas Gerais (Fazenda Emmerinck, Rio Caparaó, and Fazendinha), 5 ♂, 2 ♀;
- Espirito Santo (Santa Barbara de Caparaó), 2 ♀, 1 (?);
- Rio de Janeiro (Therezopolis), 4 ♂;
- São Paulo (Victoria and Alambary), 3 ♂, 1 ♀;
- Paraná (Porto Britania), 1 ♂;
- Santa Catarina (Hansa), 1 ♀.

PARAGUAY:

- East of Yhú, 2 ♀.

H. o. obsoletus.—

BRAZIL:

- Rio de Janeiro (Maceiras and Alto Itatiaia), 4 ♂, 2 ♀.

H. o. naumburgae.—

BRAZIL:

- Rio Grande do Sul, Sinimbú, 1 ♂ (type);
- São Francisco de Paula, 1 ♂, 1 ♀;
- Erebango, 2 ♀;
- Santa Cruz, 1 (?);
- Paraná, Corvo, 1 ♂, 3 (?);
- Porto Almeida, 1 (?).

THE GENERIC NAMES *MYIOBIUS* AND *TYRANNULA*

It has been a recognized fact, briefly mentioned by various authors, that the name *Myiobius* was not strictly tenable, but strict application of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature would have been attended by unfortunate complications, and the settlement of the problem has been avoided. One of the decisions taken by the International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the Commission, at Paris in 1948, although acceptable in itself, in this case resulted in the introduction of a further complication with respect to *Myiobius* with even more far-reaching disturbance to existing usage. This decision was that under which a generic name published before January 1, 1931, is to be accepted as published with an “indication” if the names of

previously established species are cited, even if no description of the genus is given (cf. 1950, Bull. Zool. Nomencl., vol. 4, p. 80).

Briefly, a strict application of the "Règles" would submerge the name *Myiobius* under a genus *Tyrannula* whose name would have to be used for one or another of five well-known but more recent genera (according to some future designation of a type species), and *Tyrannula* would coexist in the same family with *Tyrannulus*. The present genus *Myiobius* would then be left without a name.

With these facts in mind, it has seemed highly desirable to obtain an official ruling that would maintain the existing nomenclature, and a petition is now in the hands of the International Commission to that effect. Details of the case have been published in the Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature [October, 1952, vol. 9, pp. 98-100; Commission's reference Z. N. (S.) 676]. Until a formal ruling is given, no changes are in order, and the name *Myiobius* Darwin, with type *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, is meanwhile the acceptable name for the genus to which it has been applied for many years. At the same time, *Tyrannula* will remain unavailable for purposes of the Law of Priority but on record for purposes of the Law of Homonymy.

Taeniotriccus andrei andrei Berlepsch and Hartert

Taeniotriccus andrei BERLEPSCH AND HARTERT, 1902 (April), Novitates Zool., vol. 9, p. 38—La Prición [= La Prisión], Caura River, Venezuela; ♂ juv.; Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.

Until quite recently, this form was known only from the type specimen, an immature male, not far enough advanced in its molt to give assurance of the adult characteristics. Todd (1925 [July 15], Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, vol. 38, p. 94) described as *Taeniotriccus klagesi* a female from Itaituba, Río Tapajoz, Brazil, that appeared to be certainly congeneric with *andrei*, but any closer relationship was problematical in the absence of specimens of the same sex of *andrei*, then unknown.

Phelps and Phelps (1950 [March], Lista de las aves de Venezuela, pt. 2, p. 187) recorded additional specimens of *andrei* from other localities in Venezuela and in northwestern Brazil, and since that time have obtained still others, all of which have been kindly lent to me for study.

The series includes examples of both sexes, enabling descriptions to be published of the adult plumages. Although I have not seen the unique type of *klagesi*, I judge from Todd's description

that it is indistinguishable from that sex of *andrei*; at least the description closely agrees. There is no doubt, therefore, that *andrei* and *klagesi* are conspecific, and it seems probable that they are identical, but in the absence of an adult male of *klagesi* it is not certain that some distinctions of note may not exist in the male sex of the two populations. There is enough geographical separation of the known ranges to permit subspecific segregation. For the present, therefore, a trinomial is advisable for both, and the populations may be known as *Taeniopteryx andrei andrei* and *Taeniopteryx andrei klagesi*, respectively.

The adult male of *andrei* may be described as follows. Forehead and a broad stripe over the eye and around the back of the head near Chestnut; rest of the top of the head occupied by a black crest (the longest feathers 18 or 19 mm. in length) which overlies and conceals the rufous of the nape (when the crest is flat); whole back and tail deep black; chin, throat, and sides of the head below the orbit dark ferruginous, lighter than the superciliaries; breast occupied by a broad black band continuous with the black of the dorsum; belly abruptly gray, lightening medially on the lower portion, and tinged with Vetiver Green on the flanks and under tail-coverts. Wings largely black, with prominent light yellow bases of the outer webs of all the remiges except the outermost primaries and crossing to the inner webs of the tertials, especially extensively on the longest tertial; tertials furthermore with their outer webs entirely of the same light yellow. Bill (in dried skin) black; feet grayish brown. Wing, 55–62 mm. (57.6); tail, 43–48.5 (45.0); culmen from base, 13–14.5 (13.7); tarsus, 15–16 (15.4).

Adult females have the head pattern of the males but the black crest is a little shorter; back Brownish Olive; tail dull blackish, with outer margins near Prout's Brown; breast (below the rufous throat) from Light Neutral Gray to Deep Olive-Gray; belly more broadly whitish medially and more strongly tinged with Vetiver Green on the flanks and under tail-coverts; wings patterned as in the male but with the outer margins of the remiges noticeably brownish from near the tips basad but not so far as the yellowish bar, leaving a blackish interspace; upper wing-coverts margined with the color of the back. Wing, 50–56.5 (52.7); tail, 41–44 (42.5); culmen from base, 13–13.5 (13.2); tarsus, 14–15 (14.3).

There is noticeable variation in the development of the bright

yellowish bar at the base of the remiges, both in width and in clarity, and several specimens show a weakening of the marking on the inner primaries without losing the general pattern. A young male is farther advanced in development than the type and is like the adult males in all but wings and tail which show the modification seen in the females but with a little darker brown color on the margins of wings and tail.

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

T. a. andrei.—

VENEZUELA:

La Prisión, 1 ♂ (type);

Araguamujo, Delta Amacuro, 1 ♂, 5 ♂¹, 2 ♀¹, 1 (?)¹;

Salto Pará, Alto Caura, Bolívar, 1 ♂¹;

Erebenequén, Río Carún, 1 ♀¹.

BRAZIL:

Base Canoas, Rio Padauri, 1 ♂¹.

¹ Specimens in Phelps Collection, Caracas, Venezuela.