NACC Proposals 2007-A

Remove parentheses around authors' names for two species in Aimophila

AOU (1983, 1998) among many others followed Hellmayr (1938) in enclosing in parentheses the names of authors who described species now in the genus *Aimophila* with the generic name *Haemophila*. There are two species in our list: *A. humeralis* Cabanis and *A. sumichrasti* Lawrence. Hellmayr listed *Haemophila* Cabanis, 1851 in the synonymy of *Aimophila* Swainson, 1837 and incorrectly indicated that it was a new name for *Aimophila.*

In fact, Cabanis clearly proposed *Haemophila* as an emendation of *Aimophila*, not a new or replacement name. This was recognized by Sharpe (1883) and Ridgway (1901), who listed it as an emendation. [The name *Haemophila* was used for a few species and subspecies of southern Mexico and Central America in the late 1800s, when the northern (e.g., U.S.) species now place in *Aimophila* were treated in *Puecaea*.]

The Code, Article 51.3.1 (ICZN 1999) states that "Parentheses are not used when the species-group name was originally combined with an incorrect spelling or an emendation of the generic name . . . ."

To be in compliance with the Code, we must remove parentheses around the names of Cabanis and Lawrence in the headings for the two species mentioned above This action should be introduced by a sentence or two of rationale, e.g., : "To comply with Article 51.3.1 of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999), parentheses are removed from the names of Cabanis and Lawrence in the headings of the species *Aimophila humeralis* and *Aimophila sumichrasti*, respectively."

Richard C. Banks
3 February 2007

Technical corrections

1. p. 463, The page number in the citation of the genus *Poecile* should be 114, not 92. This is fide Normand David.

2. p. 623. The page number in the citation for *Zonotrichia leucophrys* should be 403, 426, not 340. This is fide Alan Peterson. The description in Forster appeared on two separate pages, either of which has been cited. Our present 304 is probably a scrambling of 403. The name is first given on 403 as a new species, with type locality, followed by a discussion in English. On p. 426-8 there is a very complete Latin description.

Richard C. Banks,
25 Apr. 2007

Adoption of IOC guidelines involving use of one word or two words for compound names

SUBMITTED BY: The North American Subcommittee of the IOC Standing Committee on English Names
Steve Russell, Chair
Kenn Kaufman
Bud Tordoff

19 April 2007

As you are aware, the IOC's *Birds of the World: Recommended English Names* (Gill and Wright) was recently published. We recommend that the AOU Check-list Committee adopt the guidelines and names proposed by the IOC. You have heard the arguments for adoption of a universal list of English names and we won't repeat them here.

We plan to submit several proposals, each dealing with a specific aspect of the English name issue. Here we propose that the NACC adopt the IOC guidelines and spelling rules for the use of one word or two word compound English names, including hyphens. Following the presentation of these guidelines is a list of the current AOU names that would be modified by the IOC rules.

Please consider adoption of the IOC guidelines for one word or two word compound names, and in so doing, adopt the modification of current AOU names. We will be pleased to address any of your questions and concerns.

The Introduction to *Birds of the World: Recommended English Names* defines compound names as follows.

1. Compound words conform to a series of rules that consistently address relationships between the two words and readability.
2. Use of hyphens is minimized.
3. For compound group names, hyphens are used only to connect two names that are birds or bird families (e.g., Eagle-Owl, Flycatcher-shrike) or when the name would be difficult to read (e.g., Silky-flycatcher, White-eye).

A. **Single words**. Compound names are spelled as single words if

1) the second word is *bird* (e.g., Bluebird, Tropicbird, Secretarybird) or its equivalent (e.g., Woodcock, Waterhen);
2) the second word is a body part of a bird (e.g., Hookbill, Bufflehead, Yellowlegs);
3) the name describes a bird's call or song (e.g., Chickadee, Dickcissel, Poorwill, Killdeer);

4) it describes a bird's behavior or activity (e.g., Flycatcher, Roadrunner, Honeyeater).

The only exception is to use a hyphen if otherwise the name would be hard to pronounce or would look odd (e.g., White-eye, Wattle-eye, Thick-knee, Huet-huet, Chuck-will's-widow). "Whip-poor-will" was deemed borderline and the committee decided to follow perceived general usage.

5) the second word is a kind of bird (e.g., Nighthawk, Bushtit, Waterthrush, Meadowlark).

The critical point here is that the spelling chosen should not suggest that the taxon is a member of the bird family named if it is not one. A Meadowlark is not a Lark; a Cuckooshrike is not a Shrike. Thus the name cannot be spelled as two words without a hyphen (e.g., Meadow Lark), or spelled with a hyphen followed by a capital letter (e.g., Cuckoo-Shrike). The committee adopted the rule that a single word will be used except where it would be hard to pronounce or look odd (e.g., Silky-flycatcher, Stone-curlew, Flycatcher-shrike).

A corollary of this rule is that if the second word is a type of bird and the taxon is in that bird family, the name would be spelled with two words, either without a hyphen or with a hyphen followed by a capital letter (e.g., Bush Lark, Eagle-Owl). Converting these to single words can suggest that the taxon is not in that family but is rather something different. Exceptions have been made in a few cases where long and widespread usage dictates a single word, such as Goldfinch, Skylark, Woodlark, and Sparrowhawk.

B. **Two words**. The most difficult problem is with compound words that are not to be spelled as single words. The choices for Storm Petrel, for example, are Storm Petrel, Storm-Petrel, or Storm-petrel. After much debate, we decided that the third of these - a hyphen followed by a lowercase letter - was appropriate only where the taxon is not a member of the family or taxon stated, such as Silky-flycatcher or Stone-curlew. That is the only correct spelling of such names if they are not spelled as a single word.

The choice, then, in most such cases was whether to hyphenate the two words or not, and this became the single most contentious point in the entire project because the committee members had very different attitudes toward the hyphen. At one extreme was the position that a hyphen should never be used except when absolutely necessary to clarify pronunciation or make a necessary word connection. Tied to this position were arguments that hyphens tend to violate otherwise ordinary rules of grammar; that common usage usually does not support hyphens; and that hyphens violate the principle that names should be simple. At the other extreme is the view that hyphens should be used liberally in bird nomenclature to indicate relationships among taxa, and that if two or more

taxa have the same “last name” the words should be hyphenated, and new splits should add a hyphen.

Faced with these differing viewpoints, the committee adopted the following rules for the use and spelling of two-word compound names:

1. Two words should be used to spell all names not falling within the rules for single-word names.

2. As a general rule a hyphen should not be used, and both words should begin with capital letters (e.g., Black Tyrant, Screech Owl, Green Pigeon, Storm Petrel, Wood Partridge).

3. Where both words are the names of birds or bird families a hyphen should be inserted to signify that the taxon belongs to the family of the second word, not the first (e.g., Eagle-Owl, Nightingale-Thrush).

4. If a name covered by #3 is of a taxon that is not a member of the stated bird family, the letter after the hyphen should be lowercase to clarify that status (e.g., Flycatcher-shrike). This is a companion to the rule, described above, applicable to single-word names that hyphenates them to avoid confusion, as in Silky-flycatcher or Stone-curlew.

5. If application of any of the above rules would produce a name that is contrary to long-established and widespread usage, the rule may be modified or not applied. For example, Goldfinch, Skylark, and Sparrowhawk - all taxa that are within the family name stated and thus do not come within the single-word rules described above - can nevertheless be spelled as single words, despite #1, because of long usage.

PROPOSED CHANGES TO FOLLOW IOC SPELLING RULES AND GUIDELINES

1. Removal of hyphens

Current AOU Name	Name Following IOC Guidelines
White-faced Whistling-Duck	White-faced Whistling Duck
Black-bellied Whistling-Duck	Black-bellied Whistling
West Indian Whistling-Duck	West Indian Whistling Duck
Fulvous Whistling-Duck	Fulvous Whistling Duck
Greater Prairie-Chicken	Greater Prairie Chicken
Lesser Prairie-Chicken	Lesser Prairie Chicken
Bearded Wood-Partridge	Bearded Wood Partridge
Long-tailed Wood-Partridge	Long-tailed Wood Partridge
Buffy-crowned Wood-Partridge	Buffy-crowned Wood
Marbled Wood-Quail	Marbled Wood Quail

Black-eared Wood-Quail	Black-eared Wood Quail
Tacarcuna Wood-Quail	Tacaruna Wood
Black-breasted Wood-Quail	Black-breasted Wood Quail
Spotted Wood-Quail	Spotted Wood
Wilson’s Storm-Petrel	Wilson's Storm Petrel
White-faced Storm-Petrel	White-faced Storm Petrel
European Storm-Petrel	European Storm Petrel
Black-bellied Storm-Petrel	Black-bellied Storm Petrel
Fork-tailed Storm-Petrel	Fork-tailed Storm Petrel
Leach’s Storm-Petrel	Leach's Storm
Ashy Storm-Petrel	Ashy Storm Petrel
Band-rumped Storm-Petrel	Band-rumped Storm Petrel
Wedge-rumped Storm-Petrel	Wedge-rumped Storm
Black Storm-Petrel	Black Storm
Guadalupe Storm-Petrel	Guadalupe Storm Petrel
Markham’s Storm-Petrel	Markham's Storm Petrel
Tristram’s Storm-Petrel	Tristram's Storm Petrel
Least Storm-Petrel	Least Storm
Rufescent Tiger-Heron	Rufescent Tiger Heron
Fasciated Tiger-Heron	Fasciated Tiger Heron
Bare-throated Tiger-Heron	Bare-throated Tiger Heron
Western Reef-Heron	Western Reef
Chinese Pond-Heron	Chinese Pond
Black-crowned Night-Heron	Black-crowned Night Heron
Yellow-crowned Night-Heron	Yellow-crowned Night
Steller’s Sea-Eagle	Steller’s Sea Eagle
Common Black-Hawk	Common Black Hawk
Mangrove Black-Hawk	Mangrove Black Hawk
Great Black-Hawk	Great Black Hawk
Barred Forest-Falcon	Barred Forest Falcon
Slaty-backed Forest-Falcon	Slaty-backed Forest Falcon
Collared Forest-Falcon	Collared Forest Falcon
Rufous-necked Wood-Rail	Rufous-necked Wood Rail
Gray-necked Wood-Rail	Grey-necked Wood Rail
European Golden-Plover	European Golden Plover
American Golden-Plover	American Golden Plover
Pacific Golden-Plover	Pacific Golden
Lesser Sand-Plover	Lesser Sand
Greater Sand-Plover	Greater Sand
Oriental Turtle-Dove	Oriental Turtle Dove
African Collared-Dove	African Collared
European Turtle-Dove	European Turtle
Eurasian Collared-Dove	Eurasian Collared Dove
Common Ground-Dove	Common Ground Dove
Plain-breasted Ground-Dove	Plain-breasted Ground
Ruddy Ground-Dove	Ruddy Ground
Blue Ground-Dove	Blue Ground
Maroon-chested Ground-Dove	Maroon-chested Ground
Jamaican Lizard-Cuckoo	Jamaican Lizard Cuckoo
Puerto Rican Lizard-Cuckoo	Puerto Rican Lizard

Great Lizard-Cuckoo	Great Lizard
Hispaniolan Lizard-Cuckoo	Hispaniolan Lizard Cuckoo
Lesser Ground-Cuckoo	Lesser Ground Cuckoo
Rufous-vented Ground-Cuckoo	Rufous-vented Ground
Oriental Scops-Owl	Oriental Scops
Western Screech-Owl	Western Screech
Eastern Screech-Owl	Eastern Screech
Balsas Screech-Owl	Balsas Screech
Pacific Screech-Owl	Pacific Screech
Whiskered Screech-Owl	Whiskered Screech Owl
Tropical Screech-Owl	Tropical Screech
Bearded Screech-Owl	Bearded Screech
Vermiculated Screech-Owl	Vermiculated Screech Owl
Bare-shanked Screech-Owl	Bare-shanked Screech Owl
Puerto Rican Screech-Owl	Puerto Rican Screech Owl
Northern Pygmy-Owl	Northern Pygmy
Costa Rican Pygmy-Owl	Costa Rican Pygmy Owl
Central American Pygmy-Owl	Central American Pygmy
Tamaulipas Pygmy-Owl	Tamaulipas Pygmy Owl
Colima Pygmy-Owl	Colima Pygmy
Ferruginous Pygmy-Owl	Ferruginous Pygmy Owl
Cuban Pygmy-Owl	Cuban Pygmy
Antillean Palm-Swift	Antillean Palm Swift
Western Slaty-Antshrike	Western Slaty Antshrike
Northern Beardless-Tyrannulet	Northern Beardless
Southern Beardless-Tyrannulet	Southern Beardless
Northern Scrub-Flycatcher	Northern Scrub Flycatcher
Bronze-olive Pygmy-Tyrant	Bronze-olive Pygmy Tyrant
Black-capped Pygmy-Tyrant	Black-capped Pygmy
Scale-crested Pygmy-Tyrant	Scale-crested Pygmy
Pale-eyed Pygmy-Tyrant	Pale-eyed Pygmy Tyrant
Western Wood-Pewee	Western Wood Pewee
Eastern Wood-Pewee	Eastern Wood
Pied Water-Tyrant	Pied Water Tyrant
Florida Scrub-Jay	Florida Scrub Jay
Island Scrub-Jay	Island Scrub Jay
Western Scrub-Jay	Western Scrub Jay
Common House-Martin	Common House Martin
White-breasted Wood-Wren	White-breasted Wood Wren
Gray-breasted Wood-Wren	Gray-breasted Wood Wren
Japanese Bush-Warbler	Japanese Bush Warbler
Middendorff's Grasshopper-Warbler	Middendorff's Grasshopper Warbler
Elfin-woods Warbler	Elfin Woods Warbler
Common Bush-Tanager	Common Bush Tanager
Tacarcuna Bush-Tanager	Tacarcuna Bush Tanager
Pirre Bush-Tanager	Pirre Bush
Sooty-capped Bush-Tanager	Sooty-capped Bush
Yellow-throated Bush-Tanager	Yellow-throated Bush
Ashy-throated Bush-Tanager	Ashy-throated Bush
Black-crowned Palm-Tanager	Black-crowned Palm

Gray-crowned Palm-Tanager	Gray-crowned Palm
Nicaraguan Seed-Finch	Nicaraguan Seed Finch
Thick-billed Seed-Finch	Thick-billed Seed Finch
Grassland Yellow-Finch	Grassland Yellow Finch
Wedge-tailed Grass-Finch	Wedge-tailed Grass Finch
White-naped Brush-Finch	White-naped Brush Finch
Rufous-capped Brush-Finch	Rufous-capped Brush Finch
Chestnut-capped Brush-Finch	Chestnut-capped Brush
Green-striped Brush-Finch	Green-striped Brush Finch
Stripe-headed Brush-Finch	Stripe-headed Brush Finch
Rusty-crowned Ground-Sparrow	Rusty-crowned Ground
Prevost's Ground-Sparrow	Prevost's Ground Sparrow
White-eared Ground-Sparrow	White-eared Ground
Gray-crowned Rosy-Finch	Gray-crowned Rosy Finch
Black Rosy-Finch	Black Rosy Finch
Brown-capped Rosy-Finch	Brown-capped Rosy Finch

2. Addition of hyphens

Northern Hawk Owl	Northern Hawk-Owl
Nightingale Wren	Nightingale-Wren
Red-cheeked Cordonbleu	Red-cheeked Cordon-bleu

3. Two words (w hyphen) to one word

Green-throated Mountain-gem	Green-throated
Green-breasted Mountain-gem	Green-breasted
White-bellied Mountain-gem	White-bellied Mountaingem
Purple-throated Mountain-gem	Purple-throated
White-throated Mountain-gem	White-throated

Split *Anas zonorhyncha* from *A. poecilorhyncha*

We include *A. poecilorhyncha* in our list on the basis of records from the Aleutians and Kodiak Island. At least one specimen, from Kodiak Island, has been identified as the subspecies *A. p. zonorhyncha* (Trapp and Macintosh 1978). One earlier report from Adak, in the Aleutians, was based on a photograph. I do not have information about the Attu record at hand, but we can get it.

Leader (2006) has now reported sympatric breeding of *A. p. haringtoni* of southeastern Asia and the northern form *zonorhyncha*, at Hong Kong in southern China. This seems to be the only place where the breeding ranges of the otherwise allopatric populations meet. In 1994 and 1997-2005, 23 pairs of Spot-billed Duck were recorded. Eleven pairs were *haringtoni*, ten were *zonorhyncha*, and two were mixed. The female of one mixed pair was identified as a hybrid, the only record of a hybrid. Apparently the outcome of the mixed nestings was not recorded.

In Hong Kong, the timing of the breeding cycle of the two taxa overlap extensively, but mixed pairs are rare. That 91% of pairs are pure (as to species) suggests a high degree of assortative mating and supports Leader's (2006) suggestion that the two forms deserve specific status.

I recommend that we follow [the] Leader (2006) in recognizing *Anas zonorhyncha* as a species, and replace our account of *poecilorhyncha* with one for *zonorhyncha*. However, I defer to Pam's ideas on this split, because she has studied at least part of the complex for the Ripley Guide.

Gill and Wright (2007) have made this split and have used the name Eastern Spot-billed Duck for *zonorhyncha*, and Indian Spot-billed Duck for *peocilorhyncha*.

Gill, F., and M. Wright. 1007. Birds of the world, recommended English names. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Leader, P. J. 2006. Sympatric breeding of two Spot-billed Duck *Anas poecilorhyncha* taxa in southern China. Bulletin of the British Ornithologists' Club 126:248-252.

Trapp, J. L., and R. A. Macintosh. 1978. First North American specimen of the Spotbill Duck. Western Birds 9:127-128.

Richard C. Banks
7 May 2007

Remove *parvus* from *Hemignathus* to *Magumma*

Although the relationships of the Hawaiian Honeycreepers (Drepanidinae) remain unsettled, one aspect seems to be resolved to nearly every worker's satisfaction. That is that the Anianiau, *Hemignathus parvus*, should be placed din its own genus, for which the name *Magumma* Mathews, 1925 is available.

According to Olson (2006), the Anianiau may have been first separated out by Perkins *in* Wilson and Evans (1899) under the name *Rothschildia*, although that name was preoccupied. Mathews (1925) proposed the replacement generic name *Magumma* for *parva*. No characters were given. However, that name was not used and the Anianiau was generally placed with the amakihis, in a variety of genera.

On the basis of mtDNA, Tarr and Fleischer (1995) found parvus well separated from and basal to other Hemignathus. Conant et al. 1998 pointed out that parva differs from the amakihis in having sexual dimorphism less pronounced, lacking dork lores, having the bill short and only slightly decurved and flesh colored with a dusky culmen. Pratt (2001) analyzed phenotypic characters and showed that parvus did not fit well into Hemignathus, a conclusion reached also by Fleischer et al. (2001) on the basis of mtDNA.

I recommend that we remove the species *parvus* from *Hemignathus* and place it in the monotypic genus *Magumma* Mathews, 1925 as *M. parva*. That genus should be placed just before *Hemignathus.* No English name change is required.

Conant, S., H. D. Pratt, and R. J. Schallenberger. 1998. Reflections on a 1975 expedition to the lost world of the Alaka'i and other notes on the natural history, systematics, and conservation of Kaua'i birds. Wilson Bulletin 110:1-22.

Fleischer, R. C., C. L. Tarr, H. F. James, B. Slikas, and C. E. McIntosh. 2001. Phylogenetic placement of the Po'ouli, *Melanprosops phaeosoma*, based on mitochondrial DNA sequence and osteological characters. Studies in Avian Biology 22: 98-103.

Olson, S. L. 2006. Possible etymology of the generic name *Magumma* for the Anianiau (Draepanidini). Bulletin of the British Ornithologists' Club 126:323-324.

Pratt, H. D. 2001. Why the Hawai'i Creeper is an *Oreomystis*: what phenotypic characters reveal about the phylogeny of Hawaiian Honeycreepers. Studies in Avian Biology 22: 81-97.

Tarr, C. L., and R. C. Fleischer. 1995. as in 1998 lit. cit.

Richard C. Banks, 7 May 2007

Separate *Pelecanus thagus* from *P. occidentalis*
SACC Proposal 271

Effect on North American CL: This remove the *thagus* group from the account of Pelecanus *occidentalis*, Brown Pelican.

Background: The last review of the Brown Pelican is Wetmore's (1945) paper, in which he described two new subspecies. These are extralimital *urinator* (Galapagos), and *murphyi* (Pacific Colombia and Ecuador. He did not split *thagus*, but went into considerable detail as to how it differs, and clearly was on the side of splitting it, but felt that he had incomplete information to do so (see below for his direct quote).

I am not certain when *thagus* (Molina, 1782) was included as part of *occidentalis*, but in recent years some have considered it a separate species, although most of these have been field guide authors (Ridgely and Greenfield's Birds of Ecuador, Jaramillo et al. Birds of Chile, etc.). However there has not been any published logic on why it should or should not be part of *occidentalis* as far as I am aware. There has also not been much attention paid to the fact that the non-breeding distributions of both *murphyi* and *thagus* broadly overlap breeding areas of the other taxon, yet no hybridization is known.

Analysis and Proposal: The pelicans as a group are well accepted, although the relationship between them and the Shoebill has been suggested to be close, although this has not been resolved. All pelicans are classified in the genus *Pelecanus*, although the Brown Pelican differs from classic *Pelecanus* in many ways (marine, plunge-diving behavior, dark plumage etc.); a subgenus, *Leptopelicano*, has been applied to the Brown Pelican.

The Brown Pelican separates into three groups. One is *thagus* in the Humboldt Current region. Large size and various other soft part and plumage features (see below) set it apart from the others. Then there is *californicus*, on the Pacific Coast of Baja California etc.; it is larger than the *occidentalis* group, has a darker brown hindneck stripe, and most importantly develops a red base to the gular pouch during breeding. Finally, the *occidentalis* group is found on the Atlantic and Pacific, the classic Brown Pelican, smaller with a nice caramel brown hindneck stripe and a yellowish color on the gular pouch during breeding. Biogeographically it may seem like a jumble to have one form in both oceans, and then these larger isolates in the north and south end of the Pacific. However, the pattern clarifies when you look at water temperature. The form *occidentalis* is associated with warmer waters, whereas *californicus* and *thagus* are cold-water taxa. As is often the case with marine birds, water temperature creates the major biogeographical patterns, and is likely what is maintaining them as separate entities.

Wetmore (1945) classified various subspecies of the Brown Pelican based on differences in size, soft part colors in breeding adults, and darkness of the hindneck stripe on breeders. The two taxa of relevance to this situation are *thagus*, which breeds from northern (or is it central?) Peru south to central Chile (Isla Mocha); and murphyi from Pacific Colombia, and Ecuador (southernmost breeding locality being Isla Santa Clara in the Gulf of Guayaquil) (Ridgely and Greenfield 2001). The gap between the southernmost *murphyi* and northernmost *thagus* is not huge. They are broadly sympatric during the non-breeding season, and Ridgely and Greenfield (2001) noted a large non-breeding flock of subadult *thagus* at Isla Santa Clara, one of the breeding localities of *murphyi*. Similarly, *murphyi* is regular south to northern Chile (Jaramillo pers. obs.), and it is likely overlooked in many coastal pelican concentrations throughout Peru. Given the broad overlap in distribution, and the fact that these pelicans may breed throughout the year, it is interesting that there are no specimens or reports published of any intermediate birds. There is no evidence of hybridization whatsoever.

One of the differences between *thagus* and *murphyi*, and from all other "Brown" Pelicans, is its large size. At the end of this account I have copied the size data from Wetmore (1945), which show the substantially larger size of *thagus*. Because these are linear measurements, the true magnitude of the difference is not apparent. Below is an excerpt from the BNA account (Shields 2002) of Brown Pelican detailing mass:

"Males 15-20% heavier than females. Mean mass of adult *P. o. carolinensis* from Florida: male: 3,290 g ± 509 SD (range 2,380-4,040, n = 13); female: 2,824 g ± 677 SD (range 1,830-3,990, n = 13; Schreiber et al. 1989). Individual male and female Peruvian Pelicans weighed 7,030 g and 5,055 g, respectively (Murphy 1936)."

In fact compared to *carolinensis* (similar in size to *murphyi*), *thagus* weighs roughly twice as much! That is a heck of a difference, and immediately obvious in the field. The size difference is enough that even the mechanics of successful interbreeding are likely difficult.

In addition to the huge size difference, *thagus* has a different plumage than other Brown Pelicans. As adults they show extensive pale (whitish gray) scapulars, and upperwings that contrast with a dark brown patch on the inner wing (humerals). Furthermore each feather on the underparts is streaked with pale, giving the body a more ornate, pale streaked look. The pale crest is very long, and looks like a long tuft on many *thagus*, and the neck stripe is blackish rather than brown. The facial skin is blackish, with restricted pink around the eye, much less pink than in the *occidentalis* group. On average the extent of reddish on the bill tip is much greater on *thagus* than other Brown Pelicans, usually extending to half of the bill length, not just restricted to the tip. The bill base is brighter, more yellowish rather than dull horn. But most importantly, *thagus* has an extensive

bright blue striped gular pouch, quite unlike that of the *occidentalis* group, or *californicus*, and this blue color is retained for much of the year in adults, although brighter during breeding. In the loral area, *thagus* develops little black bumps (papillae) unlike any other Brown Pelican, and also the base of the culmen often shows reddish caruncles. The end product of bill, pouch, facial skin, and tuft size gives *thagus* a radically different look during breeding, than any other Brown Pelican. This in addition to the large size sets it apart.

All of this was not lost on Wetmore (1945), who ended his paper with: "The markedly larger size, the caruncles on the bill in the adult, and the brighter coloration of the bare skin of the head and pouch are so different from what is found in other Brown Pelicans that it may develop with complete information that *thagus* should stand as a species."

Thinking of the white pelicans as a group, the various different species differ subtly, mainly in facial or soft part features which develop in the breeding season, or differences in extent of dark on the wings or upperparts. If *thagus* was a "white pelican," then the various differences it shows in plumage and breeding display colors (presumably important in pair formation!) would be equivalent to differences seen in currently accepted white pelican species. The size difference alone (it is twice the size) is remarkable, and if you want to see photos of the two species side by side, here is an example:
http://www.birdsofchile.com/updates.htm.

Ecologically, *thagus* is common well offshore, being more pelagic than *occidentalis*. It also does little plunge-diving; it scoops up fish from the surface or makes shallow dives as opposed to the more spectacular dives of the smaller *occidentalis* group. Again perhaps due to its size, *thagus* tends to roost on cliffs, rocks, islands, or other stable surfaces, and it does not tend to roost in trees as does *occidentalis*.

This proposal is odd in that it is not based on any new data, but largely asks to assess bits and pieces available in the literature to change the status of this pelican. *P. o. thagus* is a subspecies of *occidentalis* currently, but really there has not been any reasoning for why this is the correct ranking of this taxon. I realize that one could say this of many taxa in the Neotropics, but this is one where we have huge overlap in distribution (*thagus* ranges north to central Ecuador, and murphyi as far south as northern Chile) and no evidence of hybridization.

Recommendation: I suggest a YES vote to separate *thagus* from *occidentalis*.

References: Ridgely, R.S. and P. J. Greenfield 2001. The Birds of Ecuador. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

Shields, M. 2002. Brown Pelican (*Pelecanus occidentalis*). In The Birds of North America, No. 609 (A. Poole and F. Gill, eds.). The Birds of North America, Inc., Philadelphia, PA.

Wetmore, A. 1945. A review of the forms of the Brown Pelican. Auk 62: 577-586.

Appendix 1. Linear measurements (mm) of museum specimens of Brown Pelicans from various locations. Data presented as mean (range, n). From Wetmore 1945.

Subspecies/location	Wing length	Culmen length	Tail length	Tarsus length
P. o. murphyi				
Ecuador, Colombia				
Male	513 (505-526, 11)	328 (310-346, 11)	135 (127-162, 11)	77 (69-81, 11)
Female	485 (478-494, 8)	293 (289-297, 8)	139 (123-175, 8)	71 (61-76, 8)
P. o. urinator				
Galapagos Is.				
Male	561 (552-570, 9)	361 (340-379, 9)	140 (130-148, 9)	85 (82 89, 9)
Female	527 (516-546, 5)	329 (307-372, 5)	137 (129-145, 5)	80 (77-85, 5)
P. o. thagus				
Peru, Chile				
Male	606 (575-625, 6)	397 (340-425, 6)	152 (140-177, 6)	106 (95-113, 6)
Female	576 (520-606, 14)	354 (332-390, 14)	146 (135-174, 14)	100 (87-107, 14)

Alvaro Jaramillo, May 2007

==========

Comments posted with the proposal at SACC site:

Comments from Remsen: "YES. Placed in the comparative framework of species limits in current classification of Pelecanus, Alvaro's synopsis places burden on those who would continue to rank *thagus* as a subspecies, in my opinion. With major differences in body size, bare parts coloration, and plumage, *thagus* seems to differ as much from *occidentalis* as some of the white pelicans do from one another."

Comments from Stiles: "YES. Differences between *thagus* and *occidentalis* are of similar magnitude to those between various other currently recognized pelican species. Also it would appear that the opportunity to hybridize exists but this has never occurred, a persuasive point to me."

Comments from Cadena: "YES. Morphologically, *thagus* clearly stands out as different, and I agree that the lack of hybridization despite apparent opportunities

is a persuasive point. I wonder, however, whether these birds truly overlap in space at times where interbreeding might be possible (Alvaro only mentioned sympatry of non-breeding individuals). If they only overlap when there is no reproduction going on, the argument does not seem as solid, and the situation would not seem to differ much from that of species that have migratory and sedentary populations that come together during part of the year when they are not breeding (e.g. *Tyrannus melancholicus* in Amazonia)."

Comments from Robbins: "YES. As Thomas, Van, and Gary have correctly pointed out, the morphological differences between *thagus* and *occidentalis* are as great or greater than that between the white pelicans that are recognized as species."

Comments from Manuel Marín A.: "The proposal indicates that in recent years some have treated them as separate species. In Chile, they have always been treated as separate species. Chilean and Peruvians (all?) never treated as *thagus* as a subspecies of *occidentalis*

"Peters 1931 was the first to place *thagus* under *occidentalis*. Hellmayr (1932, Birds of Chile) under *thagus* wrote " The Brown Pelican of North America is probably conspecific." Hellmayr (1948, Birds of The Americas- 13, part 1 No 2) classified *thagus* as subspecies of *occidentalis*, and added a note " it is clearly a geographical representative of the Brown Pelican". Peters 1979 (second edition vol 1) classified it as *P. occidentalis thagus*.

"Murphy (1936, Oceanic birds; Vol II: 809] under *P. o. thagus* gave measurements smaller than on those on the proposal. Measurements in Blake (1977, Manual of Neotropical Birds) under *occidentalis thagus* are exactly the same as the ones given by in the proposal - are those of Blake or Wetmore?

"*P. [o] thagus* certainly differs in size, soft part colors (culmen (ad breeding) pouch and bare skin around the eye) from other subspecies, but it seems that all subspecies differ in soft part colors and size to some degree, e. g., *P. o. carolinensis* and *P. o. californicus*. For plumage differences see Schreiber et al. (1989, Plumages and molt of Brown Pelicans, Contributions in Science No 402, Nat Hist Mus of Los Angeles Co.)

"The place to look for potential hybridization would be northern Peru, but most likely nobody has being looking. They do have a very complex plumage sequence (see Schreiber et al.). Murphy (1936; 810) indicated that all examples seen by him between Costa Rica and Point Pariñas in (northern) Peru agree well with examples from Florida and Gulf of Mexico'."

Comments from Pacheco: "YES. Voto em favor da proposição, especialmente porque as diferenças entre *thagus* e *occidentalis* são equivalentes ou maiores que aquelas encontradas entre outros pares de espécies de pelecanos."

Comments from Zimmer: "YES. Along with the obvious morphological differences, the ecological differences as noted by Alvaro would argue for the split. In addition to the huge size disparity, one can't help but think that differences in facial/gular skin coloration during the breeding season would be important isolating mechanisms even if the two forms were spatially and temporally in a position to interbreed."

Received from SACC via Remsen, June 2007

Transfer *Piculus rubiginosus* and *P. auricularis* from *Piculus* to *Colaptes*
SACC Proposal 265

The genus *Piculus* has included two very disparate groups of woodpecker for most of the past century. Prior to Peters (1948), the members of the genus were placed in *Chloronerpes* Swainson, a name first given to *P. rubiginosus* in 1837 (Ridgway 1914, Cory 1919). However, Peters (1948) found that the name *Piculus* Spix, originally described for *P. chrysochloros* in 1824, predated *Chloronerpes*, and thus had priority. The unique, red-backed *P. rivolii* was briefly maintained in the monotypic genus *Hyoxanthus* Bonaparte, but most subsequent authors placed it with the fairly similar *P. rubiginosus*, first in *Chloronerpes* and later *Piculus*.

In modern works, ten species-level taxa have been assigned to the genus *Piculus* (Peters 1948, AOU 1998, Winkler and Christie 2002, Dickinson 2003, SACC). Seven of these taxa (*P. chrysochloros*, *P. aurulentus*, *P. flavigula*, *P. simplex*, *P. callopterus*, *P. litae*, and *P. leucolaemus*; hereafter called the "true *Piculus*") all share similar morphological characters states suggesting that they make up a natural, monophyletic assemblage: rufous underwings, *Dryocopus*-like crest, yellow "bridal" mark on face (absent in *P. simplex*, includes solid yellow auriculars in *P. flavigula*), and raspy voice (raspy quality lacking in *P. aurulentus*), with no rapid rattle. The remaining three species currently included in the genus, *P. rubiginosus* (including the northeast Mexican subspecies, *aeruginosus*, sometimes considered a full species), *P. auricularis*, and *P. rivolii* (hereafter, called the "*Chloronerpes* group"), lack all the above character states. Instead, these three species share different character states among themselves suggesting that they can be excluded from *Piculus* without causing paraphyly in that genus: yellow underwings, no crest, solid cream-colored auriculars, and clear single-note and rattle vocalizations (although single-note call appears to be missing from trans-Andean subspecies *P. rubiginosus rubripileus* and *gularis* from Colombia, Ecuador, and Peru, and voice of Mexican *P. r. aeruginosus* also appears to be strikingly different). Most members of the genus *Colaptes* share the states exhibited by the *Chloronerpes* group.

Genus *Colaptes*, the "flickers," are a group of woodpeckers that were formerly placed in several genera, now considered subgenera following Short (1965a): *Chrysoptilus* Swainson (type species *C. punctigula*), *Colaptes* Vigors (type species *C. auratus*), *Nesoceleus* Sclater and Salvin (monotypic, *C. fernandinae*), *Soroplex* Gloger (type species *C. campestris*), and *Pituipicus* Bonaparte (monotypic, *C. pitius*, now generally thought to be nested within *Soroplex*, e.g., Short 1972). Short was not the first to suggest that *Soroplex* and *Pituipicus* were best placed in *Colaptes* (e.g., Peters 1948). Indeed, most of the species in these subgenera were originally described as members of *Colaptes*. However, Short was novel in suggesting that *Colaptes* be enlarged to include

Neoceleus and *Chrysoptilus*, giving his reasoning in a series of papers (Short 1965a, 1965b, 1967, 1972). Interestingly, he repeatedly conceded the similarity, and hence close relationship, between the *Chrysoptilus* "forest flickers" and the *Piculus* woodpeckers, particularly the *Chloronerpes* group. By modern phylogenetic and systematic standards, to suggest a close relationship between certain taxa placed in two genera but without including both genera in their entirety is to suggest polyphyly.

Several authors, most recently, Ridgely and Greenfield (2001), have maintained *Chrysoptilus* and stated that the differences between it and *Colaptes* "far outweigh the similarities" without giving details to support this statement. However, Ridgely and Greenfield (2001) do not make clear if their *Chrysoptilus* contained *melanochloros* and *atricollis* as well as *punctigula*.

Among plumage characters, the only obvious character that seems to separate the *Chloronerpes* group from *Colaptes* flickers appears to be the lack of barring on the back. However, some individuals of *P. rubiginosus rubripileus* (from the Pacific coast of Ecuador and northern Peru) do, in fact, have a noticeably strong suggestion of back barring (specimens at Louisiana State University Museum of Natural Science). Thus, this character seems a far weaker reason for separation. In fact, based on voice, plumage pattern, and biogeography, I predict that the trans-Andean *rubripileus* group (including Colombian *gularis*) will be found to be closely related to *Colaptes* atricollis of western Peru; the *rubripileus* group is worthy of additional taxonomic study, as it may warrant specific separation from *rubiginosus*.

In the phylogenetic tree of Prychitko and Moore (2000), two members of *Colaptes* (*C. atricollis*, generally considered a member of the "forest flickers," and *C. rupicola*, a species of open treeline and puna habitats in the high Andes mountains) and two *Piculus* (*P. rubiginosus* and *P. rivolii*) were chosen; unfortunately no member of the true *Piculus* was also included. This taxon-sampling oversight was corrected by Bentz et al. (2006) who showed that, indeed, *Piculus rubiginosus* is nested within *Colaptes*, whereas *Piculus chrysochloros* is basal to the *Colaptes* clade. Bentz et al. (2006) subsequently stated the following;

"Finally..., we confirmed paraphyly in *Colaptes* and *Piculus* through inclusion of additional taxa including the type species of *Piculus* (*P. chrysochloros*). Consequently, *Piculus* should be defined more narrowly to include only *P. chrysochloros*, *P. leucolaemus*, *P. flavigula*, and *P. aurulentus*; given their likely close relationships with taxa studied, *P. simplex*, *P. callopterus*, and *P. litae* would fall into this group. The remainder of *Piculus*, including *P. rubiginosus* and *P. rivolii*, and likely *P. auricularis* (given its close association with *P. rubiginosus*), should be reallocated to *Colaptes*."

In summary, I suggest removing the species "*Piculus*" *rubiginosus*, *P.* auricularis (extralimital), and *P. rivolii* from the genus *Piculus* and placed within *Colaptes*.

Recommendation: A vote of "YES" supports the transfer of the "*Chloronerpes*" woodpeckers from their current allocation in *Piculus* to be placed within *Colaptes*.

Literature cited:

American Ornithologists' Union. 1998. Check-list of North American birds, 7th ed. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

Benz, B. W., M. B. Robbins, and A. T. Peterson. 2006. Evolutionary history of woodpeckers and allies (Aves: Picidae): placing key taxa on the phylogenetic tree. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution: 40: 389-399.

Cory, C. B. 1919. Catalogue of birds of the Americas and the adjacent islands. Field Museum of Natural History Zoological Series XIII, Part 2, Number 2:317-607.

Dickenson, E. C. (ed.). 2003. The Howard and Moore complete checklist of the birds of the world. Christopher Helm, London.

Peters, J. L. 1948. Check-list of birds of the world. Volume VI. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

Prychitko, T. M., and W. S. Moore. 2000. Comparative evolution of the mitochondrial cytochrome b gene and nuclear B-fibrinogen intron 7 in woodpeckers. Molecular Biology and Evolution 17: 1101-1110.

Ridgway, R. 1914. The birds of North and Middle America. Part VI. Bulletin of the United States National Museum 50.

Ridgely , R. S., and *P.* J. Greenfield. 2001. The birds of Ecuador. Vol. I. Status, distribution, and taxonomy. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

SACC <webpage>. A classification of the bird species of South America. < http://www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCBaseline.html>

Short, L. L. 1965a. Hybridization in the flickers (*Colaptes*) of North America. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 129 (4): 309-428.

Short, L. L. 1965b. Variation in West Indian flickers (Aves, *Colaptes*). Bulletin of the Florida State Museum 10(1):1-42.

Short, L. L. 1967. Variation in Central American flickers. Wilson Bulletin 79:5-21.

Short, L. L. 1972. Systematics and behaviour of South American flickers (Aves, *Colaptes*). Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 149(1): 1-109..

Winkler, H., and D. A. Christie. 2002. Family Picidae (woodpeckers). Pages 296-555 in Handbook of birds of the world, volume 7. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.

Daniel Lane (March 2007)

Comments posted at SACC site:

Comments from Robbins: "YES, based on Moore et al.'s (2000) and our (Benz et al. 2006) data sets it is clear that *rubiginosus* and *rivolii* should be moved to *Colaptes*."

Comments from Stiles: "YES. Genetic, morphological and vocal evidence support this move, I see no reason to delay it."

Comments solicited from Bill Moore: "The summary statement I quote from Dan Lane's proposal, and the reasoning justifying it is correct."

" 'In summary, I suggest removing the species "*Piculus*" *rubiginosus*, *P.* auricularis (extralimital), and *P. rivolii* from the genus *Piculus* and placed within *Colaptes*.' "

"Although publication on *Colaptes* and *Piculus* by my lab is scattered - and for that I apologize - the correct placement of *P. rivolii* and *P. rubiginosus* in *Colaptes* is implicit in that scattering. I don't think we have published this, but inclusion of *P. auricularis* in *Colaptes* is correct also. We have an unpublished (but hope to be published) phylogeny that confirms Dan Lane's proposal (265). It is also the case that *P. rubiginosus*, as he suggests, is paraphyletic: the Mexican form is sister to *P.* auricularis, the Peruvian form is sister to *C. atricollis*."

Comments from Jaramillo: "YES - This seems like a clearly needed change, based on molecular, plumage, and vocal data."

Comments from Pacheco: "YES. Duas análises independentes convergem neste ponto, em combinação com outros dados disponíveis, dão suficiente suporte a esta transferência como bem apresentado por Lane."

Received from SACC via Remsen, June 2007

Transfer *Veniliornis fumigatus* to *Picoides*
SACC Proposal 263

Proposal: This proposal (and 262) would reflect better the conclusions of Moore et al. (2006)'s molecular study of *Veniliornis* and *Picoides* species. Rather different issues are involved in each proposal, so they are treated separately. A new linear order is needed, but this would vary depending on the outcome of the two votes, so a proposal is postponed for now.□□*V. fumigatus* has always been a rather odd member of *Veniliornis* due to its plain-brown plumage with a lack of strong barring. Moore et al. (2006) showed it to be an early offshoot of a predominantly large North American *Picoides* clade, not closely related to any *Veniliornis*. The relevant nodes have strong support. This is an interesting and perhaps surprising result. However, Moore et al. note some plumage similarities between *V. fumigatus* and *P. villosus sanctorum* of Central America. Also, the distribution of this species north into Central America is unusual among *Veniliornis*.

A change is clearly mandated here. The only question is whether NACC should wait before doing so. As noted above, *Picoides* is likely to be paraphyletic as presently constituted, meaning that new genera will probably be necessary for several species at some point in the future. The type species of the genus (*P. tridactylus*) is a Eurasian species not part of the current *fumigatus* clade (although sampling of *Picoides* is limited and this could conceivably change). Moore et al. (2006) strongly recommended that *V. fumigatus* should be moved to the genus *Picoides* for now. Transferring to *Picoides* is clearly a vast improvement on *Veniliornis* for this species and I would suggest that the SACC should follow this recommendation. Splitting of *Picoides* could be regarded as a question for another date once the relevant research is done and publications are out, given that such a move has not been formally proposed in recent publications".

Recommendation: YES.

References:
MOORE, W. S., A. C. WEIBEL, AND A. AGIUS. 2006. Mitochondrial DNA phylogeny of the woodpecker genus *Veniliornis* (Picidae, Picinae) and related genera implies convergent evolution of plumage patterns. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 87: 611–624.□

Thomas Donegan, January 2007.

Comments with proposal at SACC site:

Comments from Stiles: "YES. Although the Moore et al. study uses only 2 mitochondrial genes, other studies using nuclear genes are consistent with the

results presented in different aspects. So I think that the evidence for sending *fumigatus* to *Picoides* and mixtus and lignarius to *Veniliornis* looks pretty solid. I like the comments of the authors regarding the parallel recurrence of "modules" of plumage patterns among different members of a clade or family in response to ecological or other conditions - certainly this seems to occur from time to time in hummingbirds, and implies that one must be cautious in reading too much into plumage patterns!"

Comments from Nores: "YES. Aunque nunca hubiera pensado que fuera así y como dice Donegan con menos énfasis que en el caso anterior. De todos modos hay muy pocos elementos de juicio para poner en duda el análisis mitocondrial. En otras palabras, no veo otra opción que aceptar."

Comments from Cadena: "A tentative NO. I'm not entirely sure what to do here. Clearly, *V. fumigatus* does not appear to belong in *Veniliornis* and appears closely allied to species currently placed in *Picoides*, which calls for a change in classification. However, the Moore et al. study shows that *Picoides* as currently defined is not a monophyletic group, and the group in which *V. fumigatus* falls is not part of the clade that these authors call "*Picoides* sensu stricto". This implies that that clade will probably need a new genus name. Thus, although here we would tinker the classification with a reasonable goal (excluding *fumigatus* from a genus where it does not belong), the solution would not be entirely satisfactory because we would end up moving the species in question to a genus that is paraphyletic anyway. I see two possible solutions, which are actually not mutually exclusive: (1) Wait on this until a set of proposals solving the issue of the polyphyly of *Picoides* are dealt with and put *fumigatus* in a monophyletic genus, and (2) place "*Veniliornis fumigatus*" as incertae sedis regarding its generic placement. And of course, there's always the issue that a single gene is being used here, and I'd prefer to have evidence from a nuclear marker for changes at this level."

Comments from Robbins: "YES, although as pointed out by Daniel, this likely will lead to only a short-term adjustment. It may be some time before there is complete taxon sampling of *Picoides*, thus I think we should go ahead and make a change based on the data at hand. Nevertheless, I could be convinced to follow option two proposed by Daniel, i.e., placing *fumigatus* as incertae sedis."

Comments on woodpecker phylogeny from Laurent Raty:

http://www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCprop263Raty.html

Comments from Stiles: "YES. Raty's comments give one pause, but I do not think that the currently unsettled situation in *Picoides* should prohibit placing *fumigatus* there. Separating *fumigatus* as "incertae sedis" without doing the same for the other "misplaced" *Picoides* would simply have the effect of separating this species from its closest relatives. One might decide to place all of

the currently sequenced "small pied NA *Picoides*" as "incertae sedis" along with *fumigatus*, but given that a number of species have not been sequenced, including possible OW relatives of minor, such a move would simply extend the nomenclatural uncertainty.

It seems better to place *fumigatus* in *Picoides* with its relatives for now, while noting that this genus requires additional study and almost certainly will be divided; when the relevant evidence appears, then move *fumigatus* and kin as a block to whatever generic allocation is appropriate. Removing *fumigatus* from *Veniliornis* clearly corrects a wrong allocation; no definitively "right" allocation is at present available but placing it with a group of species now known to be its closest relatives is at least a step in the "right" direction."

Comments solicited from Bill Moore: "This is a tough one because moving *fumigatus* to *Picoides* would place it in a "genus" we know is paraphyletic. On the other hand, it clearly does belong to a clade (the "North American Large *Picoides*") now assigned to *Picoides*. *Picoides* is destined to be split and a genus that will result is the clade of "North American Large *Picoides*." Plausibly that clade could be named as a genus now-the biggest problem being uncertainty as to whether it would include borealis (most likely). Again, accepting that a classification should be dynamic, I agree that it should be moved to *Picoides* because it certainly is not *Veniliornis*, acknowledging that this will be short-lived."

Comments from Zimmer: "YES on removing it from *Veniliornis*. I would prefer Daniel's incertae sedis suggestion to moving it to *Picoides*, from which it might soon be moved anyway."

Comments from Jaramillo: "YES - See comments on proposal 262 as well. It seems clear that leaving *fumigatus* in *Veniliornis* is not the way to go, based on the published data. The problem is that we are putting it into *Picoides*, a genus we are pretty certain is polyphyletic. A suggestion is to put *fumigatus* in incertae sedis but I am not comfortable with that arrangement. Taxonomy is fluid, and things do change as better data come around. Right now we are reasonably certain that *fumigatus* is not a *Veniliornis*, and that it belongs with the large North American "*Picoides*," let's put it in *Picoides* for now and when the new data arrive which may split up *Picoides* we re-arrange again. It seems to me a logical and orderly progression, much more so than moving *fumigatus* to the limbo land that is incertae sedis. Additionally, the call note of *fumigatus* always sounds much more like a North American Woodpecker (Hairy) to me than anything else."

Comments from Pacheco: "YES. Considero por ora a melhor medida. Um futuro e necessário trabalho acerca da filogenia do atual parafilético gênero *Picoides* deverá se ocupar, oportunamente, da subordinação mais apropriada de *Picoides fumigatus*."

Received from SACC via Remsen, June 2007

Split *Conopias parvus* from *C. albovittatus*
SACC Proposal 251

Effect on North American CL: This proposal would elevate a taxon to species rank currently treated as a subspecies group of *C. albovittatus* and thus remove this extralimital taxon from anything but the Notes.

Background: *Pitangus parvus* was described by Pelzeln in 1868 from a specimen collected at Marabitanas, Rio Negro, Brazil. *Pitangus albovittatus* had previously been described from the Isthmus of Panama by Lawrence (1862). Ridgway (1906) erected a new genus *Coryphotriccus*, to which *parvus* and *albovittatus* were transferred, with *albovittatus* designated as the type of the genus. Hellmayr (1927) maintained *Coryphotriccus* Ridgway, while recognizing that it was "most nearly allied to *Conopias*, but differs by its relatively much larger bill which is both wider and longer." The type of the genus *Conopias* was *trivirgata*, described in 1831 by Wied. Hellmayr treated *parvus* and *albovittatus* as conspecific, mistakenly granting priority to *parvus*, an error that was perpetuated by several subsequent authors. *Coryphotriccus* was merged into *Conopias* without comment by Traylor (1977), and by Lanyon (1984), who found the syringes of *parva* and *trivirgata* to be similar. Meyer de Schauensee (1970) and Traylor (1979) treated *parvus* and *albovittatus* as subspecies under the name of *Conopias parva*. Pinto (1944), Phelps & Phelps (1950) and Sibley & Monroe continued to treat the two forms as separate species. The latter authors cited vocal differences between *parva* and *albovittata* (based on a personal communication with R. Ridgely) as the reason for maintaining the two as species. Meanwhile, the 6th Edition of the A.O.U. Check-list (1983), following Wetmore (1972) maintained the genus Coryphotriccus and kept *albovittatus* and *parvus* as a single species (while noting that "the two groups are often regarded as distinct species"), while restoring the priority of *albovittatus*. Ridgely & Tudor (1994), citing "marked plumage and vocal differences" and "widely disjunct" ranges, treated the two as separate species, White-ringed Flycatcher (*Conopias albovittata*) and Yellow-throated Flycatcher (*Conopias parva*). This treatment has been followed by most authors of field guides (e.g. Ridgely & Greenfield 2001, Hilty 2003) and other popular works (e.g. Fitzpatrick et al 2004 in Volume 9 HBW), but the A.O.U., in its 7th Edition of the North American Check-list (1998) continued to treat the two forms as conspecific, while adapting *Conopias* as the genus.

Analysis: Few taxa have been received such erratic treatment, in terms of recognized species-limits, nomenclatural priority and generic allocation as these two. *C. albovittatus* occurs from E. Honduras through Panama to W. Colombia and NW. Ecuador, and is found only west of the Andes (Fitzpatrick et al 2004). *C. parvus* occurs from extreme E. Colombia east through S. & E. Venezuela, the Guianas, Amazonian Brazil and very locally in NE. Ecuador and extreme NE.

Peru (Fitzpatrick et al 2004). Its range in Amazonian Brazil is now known to be much more extensive than most published descriptions, with many documented records from widespread localities south of the R. Solimões/Amazon. The two taxa are ecological counterparts, being canopy species that travel with mixed-species flocks, and that are conspicuous by their loud, frequently repeated calls. Morphologically, the two differ primarily in the color of the throat, which is white in *albovittatus* and yellow in *parvus*.

Vocal differences are pronounced. Although there has never been a published vocal analysis, there are a number of published qualitative descriptions of the voices, as well as commercially available recordings (e.g. Jahn et al 2002 for *albovittatus*, Marantz & Zimmer 2006 for *parvus*). The song of *albovittatus* is a hard rattle, often preceded by a differentiated first note with a squealing quality. The song of *parvus* is shorter, more musical, with a tremoring or reverberating quality, which sounds, to my ears like "queveret queveret". Fitzpatrick et al (2004) describes the voice of *albovittatus* in this way: "Call very distinctive, commences with a long note, followed by rapid, rattling or whirring repetitive trill, "tre-r-r-r-r, tre-r-r-r.", "kree-ee-ee-eer", or short, slightly nasal and descending "wheeer" whistle followed by rattling "qua-tre-e-e-e-e", "wheereeeeee-e-e-e", or "wheeeurrrr-rreek" that rises in pitch and may slow near end; also gives prolonged, relatively higher pitched, petulant trill that slows and ends with several discrete notes. Conversely, they describe the voice of *parvus* thusly: "Call a distinctive, quick, rhythmic, petulant sounding, and nearly trilled or ringing "quee-le-le", "cue-le-le", or "weedle-de, weedle-de-wee", rather loud and often repeated numerous times. Ridgely & Greenfield (2001) described the voice of *albovittatus* as: "a dry, fast, whirring or rattling trill "tree-r-r-r, tree-r-r-r" that commences with a longer note. They described the voice of *parvus* as "a loud, ringing, rhythmic "kluyuyu kluyuyu kluyuyu", sometimes continued for long periods. Vocal descriptions by other authors are variations on these common themes. Having extensive personal experience with both taxa, I have no doubts that a quantitative vocal analysis would reveal significant species-level differences.

Fitzpatrick et al (2004) also cited molecular-sequence data indicating "substantial divergence between them [*albovittatus* and *parvus*], but also that they are closely related and represent a sister-group to a clade consisting of *C. cinchoneti* and *C. trivirgata*." Because of the lack of direct citation inherent in the HBW series, it is difficult to track this statement to its source, but I believe the source to be an unpublished PhD dissertation by Mobley (2002).

Summary & Recommendation: The two forms, *albovittatus* and *parvus*, were described as different species. None of the subsequent treatments lumping them provided any justification for doing so. The two taxa are geographically isolated from one another, and exhibit consistent plumage and vocal differences. The vocal distinctions are extreme, and although no formal analysis has been published, both detailed qualitative descriptions and published tape recordings leave no doubt as to the degree of the differences. On top of this, an

unpublished molecular study (cited in HBW) apparently revealed species-level degree of divergence between the two forms. I would say that the preponderance of evidence strongly favors treatment as two species, and that even given the lack of any published analysis, the burden of proof lies on those that would alter the original taxonomy.

Accordingly, I recommend a "YES" vote for splitting *C. parvus* from *C. albovittatus*. This course has been followed in most of the field guide literature, which has been consistent in using the English names of "Yellow-throated Flycatcher" and "White-ringed Flycatcher" respectively for the two forms. Both names are appropriately descriptive, and are well established, so I would favor retaining them.

Literature Cited:

AMERICAN ORNITHOLOGISTS' UNION. 1983. Check-list of North American birds, 6th ed. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

AMERICAN ORNITHOLOGISTS' UNION. 1998. Check-list of North American birds, 7th ed. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

FITZPATRICK, J. W. 2004. Family Tyrannidae (tyrant-flycatchers). Pp. 170-462 in "Handbook of the Birds of the World, Vol. 9. Cotingas to pipits and wagtails." (J. del Hoyo et al., eds.). Lynx Edicions, Barcelona.

HELLMAYR, *C.* E. 1927. Catalogue of birds of the Americas. Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Publ., Zool. Ser., vol. 13., pt. 5.

HILTY, S. L. 2003. Birds of Venezuela. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

JAHN, O., J. V. MOORE, P. M. VALENZUELA, N. KRABBE, P. COOPMANS, M. LYSINGER, AND R.S. RIDGELY. 2002. The birds of northwest Ecuador, Volume II: The lowlands and lower foothills. John V. Moore Nature Recordings, San Jose, California.

LANYON, W. E. 1984. A phylogeny of the kingbirds and their allies. American Museum Novitates 2797:1-28.

LAWRENCE. 1862. Ibis 11 [Pitangus *albovittatus*]

MARANTZ, *C.* M., AND K. J. ZIMMER. 2006. Bird Voices of Alta Floresta and southeastern Amazonian Brazil. The Macaulay Library, Cornell Laboratory of Ornithology, Ithaca, New York.

MEYER DE SCHAUENSEE, R. 1970. A guide to the birds of South America. Livingston Publishing Co., Wynnewood, Pennsylvania.

MEYER DE SCHAUENSEE, R. 1982. A guide to the birds of South America, 2nd edition. Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

MOBLEY, J. A. 2002. Molecular phylogenetics and the evolution of nest building in kingbirds and their allies (Aves: Tyrannidae). PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, California.

PELZELN. 1868. Ornith. Brasil 2:111, 181 [Pitangus *parva*].

PHELPS, W. H., AND W. H. PHELPS, JR. 1950. Lista de las aves de Venezuela con su distribucion. Parte 2. Passeriformes. Boletín Sociedad Venezolana Ciencias Naturales 12: 1-427.

PINTO, O. M. DE O. 1944. Catalago das aves do Brasil. Parte 2. Departamento de Zoologia da Agricultura, Industria e Comercio, São Paulo, Brasil, 700 pp.

RIDGELY , R. S., AND P. J. GREENFIELD. 2001. The birds of Ecuador. Vol. I. Status, distribution, and taxonomy. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, New York.

RIDGELY, R. S., AND G. TUDOR. 1994. The birds of South America, vol. 2. Univ. Texas Press, Austin.

RIDGWAY, R. 1906. Coryphotriccus Ridgway. Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash., 19:115.

SIBLEY, *C.* G., AND B. L. MONROE, JR. 1990. Distribution and taxonomy of birds of the World. Yale University Press, New Haven, Connecticut.

TRAYLOR, M. A., JR. 1977. A classification of the tyrant flycatchers (Tyrannidae). Bull. Mus. Comparative Zool. 148: 128-184.

TRAYLOR, M. A., JR. 1979. Subfamily Tyranninae. Pp. 186- 229 in "Check-list of birds of the World, Vol. 8" (Traylor, M. A., Jr., ed.). Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

WETMORE, A. 1972. The birds of the Republic of Panamá, part 3. Smithsonian Misc. Collect., vol. 150.

Kevin J. Zimmer, December 2006

Comments on proposal at SACC site:

Comments from Jaramillo: "YES - It seems like the evidence available supports the division of these two species, although some data such as voice have not been published, and neither has the genetic work. Given that adequate reasons for the original lump have not been detailed, the available information tips the scale towards splitting these two. Note that both taxa are represented with recordings on xeno-canto, and what appear to be homologous calls are different, although not drastically."

Comments from Robbins: "YES. Long overdue to "officially" recognize *Conopias parvus* as a species!"

Comments from Remsen: "NO. As noted by Kevin and Alvaro, the vocal differences may be clearcut, but they have never been published and analyzed in a comparative setting. I think that as a committee of scientists, we should maintain the stance that until the data are actually presented and formally analyzed, status quo stays unchanged, no matter how painful. Listening to a couple of recordings from a couple of spots within the reasonably large and perhaps fragmented ranges of these two suggests that two species are involved but can only be used to spur more analyses, not used as status-changing evidence. As for the molecular data, not only is it unpublished (therefore essentially hearsay) but there is no such thing as "species level" distances between two sister taxa. I look forward to changing my vote on this one when data are published."

Comments from Stiles: "YES. Given that the original lumpings were essentially unsupported, the color difference is clear-cut, vocal differences appear to be also in spite of a lack of quantitative analysis, the existence of numerous species pairs separated by the Andes, and the fact that a number of modern treatments do split them, I regard the evidence in favor of the split to be much stronger than the contrary."

Comments from Nores: "YES. A pesar de que comparto el criterio argumentado por Remsen, pienso que en este caso hay muchas evidencias de que se trata de dos especies distintas aunque no esté todo publicado: color, canto, datos moleculares y distribución geográfica. Además, todas las guías modernas de Venezuela, Ecuador, Colombia y Perú, además del HBW y Birds of SA de Ridgely, los consideran especies diferentes."

Comments from Cadena: "NO, for reasons outlined by Van: none of the relevant data have been analyzed in detail in a publication."

Comments from Pacheco: "YES. Nenhuma análise está disponível para corroborar o tratamento arbitrário de *Conopias parvus* e *C. albovittatus* como formas de uma única espécie implementado por Hellmayr (1927). As informações acerca de um distinto repertório vocal são para mim suficientes

para a adoção até prova em contrário do tratamento de boas espécies para ambas."

Received from SACC via Remsen, June 2007

Change classification of the Formicariidae
SACC Proposal 235

Note that this proposal requires 5 votes. If accepted, it will add two families to the NA Check-list.

Background: This proposal would revise the family-level classification of the Formicariidae, which as currently defined is not a monophyletic group.

Currently, the Formicariidae includes species in the following genera:

Formicarius
Chamaeza
Pittasoma
Grallaria
Hylopezus
Myrmothera (extralimital)
Grallaricula

New Information: Several recent studies (Irestedt et al. 2002, Chesser 2004, Rice 2005a, 2005b) have assessed the relationships among these genera and genera of other suboscine families based on mitochondrial (cytochrome b, ND2, ND3, COI) and nuclear (cmyc, RAG-1, myoglobin intron 2, Beta-fibrinogen intron 7) sequence data, employing different taxon-sampling strategies. Based on the conclusions of these studies, which are consistent with those of a forthcoming publication by R. Moyle et al. using nuclear RAG-1 and RAG-2 data (which was partially presented at the AOU meeting in 2004), it is clear that there are three distinct lineages of "Formicariidae":

(1) *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza*
(2) *Grallaria, Myrmothera, Hylopezus*, and *Grallaricula*
(3) *Pittasoma*

The affinities of these three groups are not yet well-established, except for the strongly supported sister relationship between *Pittasoma* and the extralimital genus *Conopophaga*, currently placed in its own monogeneric family (Conopophagidae). Despite the lack of strong support for "deep" relationships, a clade formed by any of the possible combinations of groups (1), (2), and (3) to the exclusion of birds presently included in other families has not been recovered in any analysis conducted so far.

Analysis: Taken together, these data strongly suggest that Formicariidae is not monophyletic, and that it comprises three phylogenetically distinct groups.

Clearly, this calls for a change in classification at the family level to be consistent with phylogenetic relationships.

Based on the results of the phylogenetic analyses, Irestedt et al. (2002) proposed to limit membership in the Formicariidae only to *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza*. I believe this is a sensible option. Rice (2005b) presented a somewhat different alternative, in which he suggested that the Formicariidae could include not only *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza*, but also the tapaculos (Rhinocryptidae), as these two seemed to be sister clades based on some molecular work. This is only a matter of taste, but it seems to me that this would result in a highly heterogeneous family, although I could easily be convinced that Rhynocryptids are already quite heterogeneous to begin with, and that *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza* do not really add much variation. More importantly, however, I don't think this is the best alternative because support for the ((*Formicarius*, *Chamaeza*), Rhinocryptidae) arrangement is not strong. In fact, ongoing work based on c. 4000 bp of RAG sequence by Moyle et al. shows that *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza* are sister to the Furnariidae (i.e. Furnariidae + Dendrocolaptidae) with strong support, not to the Rhinocryptidae.

Irestedt et al. also proposed to erect a new family (Grallariidae) for the clade formed by *Grallaria*, *Myrmothera*, *Hylopezus*, and *Grallaricula*. I cannot think of a better alternative regarding the placement of these taxa.

In addition, we need to decide on what to do with *Pittasoma*. There are two alternatives: one is to merge this genus with *Conopophaga* in a single family (Conopophagidae), as advocated by Rice (2005b) and endorsed by Krabbe and Schulenberg (2003, HBW). The other alternative would be to place *Pittasoma* in a new monogeneric family, Pittasomidae (?). Considering the morphological uniformity of the species of *Conopophaga* and how distinct these are from *Pittasoma* (as evidenced by traditional, morphology-based taxonomy), at first glance it would seem that the option of placing them in different families represents the best possible course. However, Rice (2005a) presented information on several different traits (morphology, natural history, vocalizations) that support the close relationship between *Pittasoma* and *Conopophaga*. Whether one wants to recognize one or two families is open for discussion - all the traits discussed by Rice only help strengthen the support for this clade by providing synapomorphies that complement the mitochondrial and nuclear data, but do not resolve the issue of the taxonomic rank that should be given to its two constituent lineages. An additional argument that one could put forward in favor of Rice's proposal is that by placing *Pittasoma* in Conopophagidae, we avoid introducing new family names, which could be said to be conservative.

To summarize, there are five subproposals here:

(a) new circumscription of Formicariidae: *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza*

(b) new circumscription of Formicariidae: *Formicarius*, *Chamaeza*, and the tapaculos.
(c) accept family Grallariidae
(d) place *Pittasoma* in Conopophagidae
(e) erect family Pittasomidae

Recommendation: (a) YES, (b) NO, (c) YES, (d) YES, (e) NO.

Literature Cited: See SACC website.

C. Daniel Cadena (in consultation with Nate Rice and Rob Moyle),

---

Comments on proposal posted at SACC site

Comments from Robbins: "Cadena summarizes data from various studies and presents (with input from Rice and Moyle) logical arguments for all five subproposals. Thus, I vote as follows:

a) yes
b) no
c) yes
d) yes
e) no

Comments from Stiles: "The question here is, are the published data sufficient to justify the splits proposed? The Moyle et al. data sound good but as they are unpublished, hence unreviewed (?), they should not be taken as evidence at this point. As a general rule, I feel that the data supporting arguments for taxonomic changes should at least be accepted for publication Iis this the situation with this MS?); a manuscript only submitted, or only a first draft, may suffer major changes before acceptance, including incorporation of additional data and possible changes of some or all conclusions.

Aside from the Moyle et al. data, concordant results from two independent studies using several genes plus morphology do appear sufficient to justify splitting Formicariidae into at least two families: Formicariidae sensu stricto (*Formicarius*, *Chamaeza*) and Grallariidae (*Grallaria*, *Grallaricula*, *Hylopezus*, *Myrmothera*). The *Pittasoma* + *Conopophaga* clade also seems well established, the main question being whether to put *Pittasoma* in its own family or subsume it into Conopophagidae. If only because I find tiny families unedifying if reasonable alternatives exist for combining them to better indicate relationships, I favor transferring *Pittasoma* to the Conopophagidae, at least for now. Hence, YES to all (a,b,c) of the "sub-proposals").

Comments from Zimmer: "YES. My votes on the various options of this proposal are as follows: a) yes; b) no; c) yes; d) no; e) yes.

I think that restricting Formicariidae to *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza* makes the most sense. Rhinocryptidae is so heterogeneous that its inclusion within Formicariidae is not only uninformative, but it would obscure relationships. Grallariidae seems like a natural grouping. The real dilemma is what to do with *Pittasoma*. The evidence for its relationship with *Conopophaga* appears strong, not only from a molecular standpoint, but also from a morphological and vocal standpoint. The question is at what level do we treat the similarities and differences between the two genera. In spite of certain similarities in plumage pattern and some vocal characters, I'm more impressed by the differences between the two groups. The difference in size and build is obvious. The two species of *Pittasoma* average 96-110 g in weight. The various gnateaters range from 20-28 g, except for the outsized melanogaster, which is still only 36-43 g, less than half of the size of any *Pittasoma*. The two species of *Pittasoma* lack the distinctive white or silvery postocular tufts that characterize all but one (melanops) of the species of *Conopophaga*. These postocular tufts are a conspicuous feature of the gnateaters, and are used prominently in display and territorial interactions with conspecifics. The tufts are arguably most developed and prominent in *C. melanogaster*, which, in its size, more terrestrial habits, vocalizations, and lowland Amazonian distribution, would otherwise seem to be the gnateater that is a possible bridge to *Pittasoma*. *Pittasoma* does not produce a mechanical wing-whirring sound, nor an accompanying chatter call, both of which are prominent features of all *Conopophaga* species except melanops. Both the wing-whirring and the chatter are regular features of male-female chases in the gnateaters, and nothing similar is seen in either species of *Pittasoma*. The two species of *Pittasoma* both have songs that involve incredibly long series (often lasting minutes rather than seconds) of well separated whistled notes (not linked together in a rattle), and arresting alarm calls that recall squirrels (*Sciurus*) more than birds. None of the gnateaters has a similar song, and only melanogaster has calls that even remotely resemble those of *Pittasoma*. Ecologically, the two groups are even more dissimilar, with *Pittasoma* being truly terrestrial birds that regularly follow army ant swarms, whereas *Conopophaga* are understory birds that descend to the ground but are not terrestrial, and they rarely attend ant swarms. The two *Pittasoma* species and the various gnateaters, treated separately, comprise two very distinct, and internally cohesive, uniform groups. Combined, they become much more heterogeneous, from a vocal, morphological, and ecological standpoint. The question becomes one of whether we treat the differences at the generic or familial level. I would favor treating them as being in separate families."

Comments from Jaramillo: "Great summary by Daniel of various results recently published on this subject. I agree with the recommendations, and do think that

erecting a Pittasomidae seems unwarranted. The expanded Conopophagidae just takes a bit of getting used to, but otherwise it makes sense to me.

(a) YES- new circumscription of Formicariidae: *Formicarius* and *Chamaeza*
(b) NO- new circumscription of Formicariidae: *Formicarius*, *Chamaeza*, and the tapaculos.
(c) YES- accept family Grallariidae
(d) YES- place *Pittasoma* in Conopophagidae
(e) NO - erect family Pittasomidae"

Received from SACC via Remsen June 2007