N&MA Classification Committee: Proposals 2011-A

2011-A-1formerly 2010-C-15) N&MA Classification Committee

Set a minimum standard for the designation of a holotype for extant avian species

The ICZN states: A holotype is the single specimen upon which a new nominal species-group taxon is based in the original publication.

And subsequently recommends:

Recommendation 73A. Designation of holotype. An author who establishes a new nominal species-group taxon should designate its holotype in a way that will facilitate its subsequent recognition.

Recommendation 73B. Preference for specimens studied by author. An author should designate as holotype a specimen actually studied by him or her, not a specimen known to the author only from descriptions or illustrations in the literature.

Clearly, as currently defined in the ICZN, there is no baseline standard for what constitutes a holotype other than “the single specimen” upon which a new taxon is based. In several cases, the above recommendations have not been adhered to when assigning holotype designation, e.g., *Laniarius libertatus* and *Grallaria fenwickorum*. The scientific controversies stemming from these minimalistic designations of holotypes have led us to conclude that the current standard for defining a holotype for extant avian species is inadequate. We feel that ornithology needs a standard for defining a holotype that maximizes the holotype’s utility for the subsequent recognition of the new species-group taxon and for additional scientific investigation.

Therefore, we request that the Checklist Committee of the American Ornithologists’ Union adopt the following version of Recommendation 73A:

Recommendation 73A (AOU). Designation of holotype. An author who establishes a new nominal species-group taxon should designate its holotype in a way that will maximize its subsequent recognition and long-term scientific value.

We further recommend that a holotype for birds be required to be a traditional study skin specimen, with appropriate ancillary data. The recent examples of issues created when collecting more limited material (e.g., photos, feathers and blood samples) that are then defined as the "holotype" (e.g., *Laniarius libertatus*) compared with alternative holotype examples that reflect fully comparative material (e.g., *Laniarius willardi*) provide clear evidence of the scientific value for more complete holotypes in ornithology. We would extend this request to the description of new species utilizing syntypes rather than a holotype, but do not extend this request to any other elements of the ICZN.

In rare instances, we can envision conservation issues related to taking a complete study skin as the holotype. Such rare instances might include new species for which there is substantial evidence that taking a single complete specimen could have negative consequences for the population biology of said new species (e.g., an oceanic island endemic, with limited habitat). However, we also see the value of collecting full study specimen holotype from such a species, to permanently record its existence in the most useful way possible for future scientific study. In situations such as this when it is not possible to obtain a traditional study skin specimen, then the holotype should be "the most complete documentation of an individual possible", and should be accompanied by empirical evidence of rarity.

Submitted by:

John Bates, Associate Curator of Birds, Field Museum of Natural History
Scott Lanyon, Professor, Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior, University of Minnesota
Gary Voelker, Assistant Professor and Curator of Birds, Texas A&M University

Date of proposal: 6 April 2011

2011-A-2 N&MA Check-list Committee pp. 282-314

Change linear sequence of genera in Trochilidae to reflect recent genetic data

Description of the problem:

This proposal will bring our current sequence of genera in the Trochilidae into alignment with the one used by SACC, which reflects the phylogenetic data from the Jim McGuire lab. It also proposes a new subfamily in the family, the Topazinae. Our current sequence is largely the product of tradition and historical momentum.

New information:

For reasons to change, see Gary Stiles's proposal to SACC:

http://www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCprop267.html

This was written before the McGuire et al. (2009) paper, which presented a more complete tree. The McGuire phylogeny sampled almost all genera. The sequence proposed by Stiles and adopted by SACC was based on the usual conventions of linear sequencing, including minimizing change to existing sequence.

The only change included in the proposal that is not related to the sequence is the merger of *Stellula* into *Selasphorus*. Even with the limited taxon-sampling published so far, *Stellula* is clearly embedded in *Selasphorus* (as anyone who knows Calliope Hummingbird would predict).

Below is the table I used to organize the genera and create the sequence. For the branching patterns, see the McGuire (2009) paper (I can send pdf if needed).

AOU current sequence	**SACC**	**H&M NEW**	**AOU NEW**
TOPAZINAE			
	Topaza	***Topaza***	
	Florisuga	***Florisuga***	***Florisuga***
PHAETHORNITHINAE			
	Eutoxeres	***Eutoxeres***	***Eutoxeres***
	Ramphodon	***Ramphodon***	***Ramphodon***
Glaucis	***Glaucis***	***Glaucis***	***Glaucis***

Threnetes	***Threnetes***	***Threnetes***	***Threnetes***
	Anopetia	***Anopetia***	
Phaethornis	***Phaethornis***	***Phaethornis***	***Phaethornis***
Eutoxeres			
Androdon			
TROCHILINAE			
	POLYTMINI		
Doryfera	***Doryfera***	***Doryfera***	***Doryfera***
Phaeochroa	***Schistes***	***Schistes***	
Campylopterus	***Augastes***	***Augastes***	
Florisuga	***Colibri***	***Colibri***	***Colibri***
Colibri	***Androdon***	***Androdon***	***Androdon***
Anthracothorax	***Heliactin***	***Heliactin***	
Eulampis	***Heliothryx***	***Heliothryx***	***Heliothryx***
Chrysolampis	***Polytmus***	***Polytmus***	***Polytmus***
Orthorhyncus	***Avocettula***	***Avocettula***	
Klais	***Chrysolampis***	***Chrysolampis***	***Chrysolampis***
Abeillia	***Anthracothorax***	***Anthracothorax***	***Anthracothorax***
Lophornis		***Eulampis***	***Eulampis***
Discosura	**LOPHORNITHINI**		
Chlorostilbon	***Heliangelus***	***Heliangelus***	
Cynanthus	***Sephanoides***	***Sephanoides***	
Cyanophaia	***Discosura***	***Discosura***	***Discosura***
Thalurania	***Lophornis***	***Lophornis***	***Lophornis***
Panterpe	***Phlogophilus***	***Phlogophilus***	

Damophila	***Adelomyia***	***Adelomyia***	
Lepidopyga	***Anthocephala***	***Anthocephala***	
Hylocharis	***Aglaiocercus***	***Aglaiocercus***	
Goldmania	***Sappho***	***Sappho***	
Goethalsia	***Polyonymus***	***Polyonymus***	
Trochilus	***Taphrolesbia***	***Taphrolesbia***	
Amazilia	***Oreotrochilus***	***Oreotrochilus***	
Eupherusa	***Opisthoprora***	***Opisthoprora***	
Elvira	***Lesbia***	***Lesbia***	
Microchera	***Ramphomicron***	***Ramphomicron***	
Chalybura	***Chalcostigma***	***Chalcostigma***	
Lampornis	***Oxypogon***	***Oxypogon***	
Lamprolaima	***Oreonympha***	***Oreonympha***	
Heliodoxa	***Metallura***	***Metallura***	
Eugenes	**COELIGINI**		
Haplophaedia	***Haplophaedia***	***Haplophaedia***	***Haplophaedia***
Heliothryx	***Eriocnemis***	***Eriocnemis***	
Heliomaster	***Loddigesia***	***Loddigesia***	
Calliphlox	***Aglaeactis***	***Aglaeactis***	
Doricha	***Coeligena***	***Coeligena***	
Tilmatura	***Lafresnaya***	***Lafresnaya***	
Calothorax	***Ensifera***	***Ensifera***	
Archilochus	***Pterophanes***	***Pterophanes***	
Mellisuga	***Boissonneaua***	***Boissonneaua***	
Calypte	***Ocreatus***	***Ocreatus***	

Stellula	***Urochroa***	***Urochroa***	
Atthis	***Urosticte***	***Urosticte***	
Selasphorus	***Heliodoxa***	***Heliodoxa***	***Heliodoxa***
	Clytolaema	***Clytolaema***	
	Patagona	***Patagona***	
	Sternoclyta	***Sternoclyta***	
Not in S. America	***Hylonympha***	***Hylonympha***	
	LAMPORNITHINI		
		Eugenes	***Eugenes***
		Panterpe	***Panterpe***
	Heliomaster	***Heliomaster***	***Heliomaster***
		Lampornis	***Lampornis***
		Lamprolaima	***Lamprolaima***
	MELLISUGINI		
	Myrtis	***Myrtis***	
	Eulidia	***Eulidia***	
	Rhodopis	***Rhodopis***	
	Thaumastura	***Thaumastura***	
	Chaetocercus	***Chaetocercus***	
	Myrmia	***Myrmia***	
	Microstilbon	***Microstilbon***	
	Calliphlox	***Calliphlox***	***Calliphlox***
		Doricha	***Doricha***
		Tilmatura	***Tilmatura***
		Calothorax	***Calothorax***

	Archilochus	***Archilochus***
	Mellisuga	***Mellisuga***
	Calypte	***Calypte***
	Atthis	***Atthis***
	Selasphorus	***Selasphorus***
	“Stellula”	***“Stellula”***
TROCHILINI		
Chlorostilbon	***Chlorostilbon***	***Chlorostilbon***
	Cynanthus	***Cynanthus***
	Cyanophaia	***Cyanophaia***
Klais	***Klais***	***Klais***
	Abeillia *	***Abeillia*** *
	Orthorhynchus	
Stephanoxis	***Stephanoxis***	
Phaeochroa	***Phaeochroa***	***Phaeochroa***
Campylopterus	***Campylopterus***	***Campylopterus***
Eupetomena	***Eupetomena***	
	Eupherusa	***Eupherusa***
	Elvira	***Elvira***
	Microchera	***Microchera***
Chalybura	***Chalybura***	***Chalybura***
Thalurania	***Thalurania***	***Thalurania***
Aphantochroa	***Aphantochroa***	
Taphrospilus	***Taphrospilus***	
Leucochloris	***Leucochloris***	

Leucippus	***Leucippus***	
Amazilia	***Amazilia***	***Amazilia***
	Trochilus	***Trochilus***
Chrysuronia	***Chrysuronia***	
Goethalsia	***Goethalsia***	***Goethalsia***
Goldmania	***Goldmania***	***Goldmania***
Lepidopyga	***Lepidopyga***	***Lepidopyga***
Damophila	***Damophila***	***Damophila***
Hylocharis	***Hylocharis***	***Hylocharis***

* not genetically sampled; placement according to Schuchmann HBW

This proposal does not deal with whether we should also use the tribe designations of McGuire et al. (2009), but I would appreciate feedback on this. Those groupings are strongly supported in the tree.

Recommendation:

As co-author on the McGuire et al. papers, I can hardly claim to have an unbiased view of this, but I also know the tree very well and think that the proposed sequence reflects the data well. Alternatives are possible, but unless someone spots a true mistake, it's not worth fiddling with in my opinion. [If anyone does see a mistake, let me know, because the sequence is the one that I am using in the Howard-Moore world classification revision.] The institution of the new subfamily is required if we maintain the traditional two. So, I recommend a Yes on this one.

Additional papers will hopefully be published with denser taxon-sampling, but from the unpublished data I have seen, these are unlikely to affect the sequence (but will provide data for mergers such as *Eulampis* into *Anthracothorax*, and *Cynanthus* and *Cyanophaia* into *Chlorostilbon*, all retained for now). The one area those additional papers will affect is the final set of genera, *Amazilia* through *Hylocharis*, which are a total mess, e.g., the only ones that are monophyletic are the monotypic ones.

Literature cited:

McGuire, J. A., C. C. Witt, J. V. Remsen, Jr., R. Dudley, & D. L. Altshuler. 2009. A higher-level taxonomy for hummingbirds. Journal of Ornithology 150: 155-165.

McGuire, J. A., C. C. Witt, D. L. Altshuler, & J. V. Remsen, Jr. 2007. Phylogenetic systematics and biogeography of hummingbirds: Bayesian and maximum likelihood analyses of partitioned data and selection of an appropriate partitioning strategy. Systematic Biology 56: 837-856.

Submitted by:
Van Remsen, Louisiana State University

Proposal date: 3 May 2011

A new generic name for some sparrows formerly placed in *Amphispiza*

Description of the problem and new information:

Klicka and Spellman (2007) showed convincingly that the genus *Amphispiza* as then recognized was not monophyletic; rather it was made up of two different clades. The two species, *bilineata* and *belli*, are not closely related. The type species of *Amphispiza* is *bilineata.* Thus, a new genus is needed for the "sage" sparrows, all presently grouped as *belli*. Klicka and Banks (2011) suggest calling those taxa ***Artemisospiza*****,** which combines the Latin generic name for sage (*Artemisia*) with the Greek word for finch (*spiza*); this name is feminine. The species *belli* currently includes *nevadensis* (Ridgway), which may be a separate species, as well as *cinerea* (Townsend), *clementeae* (Ridgway), and *canescens* (Grinnell).

Recommendation:

To avoid polyphyletic genera, I recommend that we accept this change.

Literature cited:

Klicka, J, & Banks, R. C. (2011). A generic name for some sparrows (Aves: Emberizidae). *Zootaxa* **2793**:67-68.

Klicka, J, & Spellman, G. M. (2007). A molecular evaluation of the North American "grassland" sparrow clade. *Auk* **124**:537-551.

Submitted by:

James D. Rising, University of Toronto

Date of proposal: 17 May 2011

Split Gray Hawk (*Buteo nitidus*) into Two Species

Description of the problem:

Gray Hawk (*Buteo nitidus*, hereafter *B. n. nitidus*) was described by Latham (1790) as *Falco nitidus,* based on a specimen from Cayenne, French Guiana. Subsequently, a new taxon based on a specimen from Veracruz, Mexico, was described by Schlegel (1862) as *Asturina plagiata* (hereafter *B. n. plagiatus*). Schlegel considered *B. n. plagiatus* a separate species from *B. n. nitidus* because it was larger, had more robust tarsi and feet, and had a greater number of tail bands. In their review of North American birds, Baird et al. (1874) concluded the two taxa were climatic races of the same species, and this view has largely prevailed since (Bierregaard 1994, Ferguson-Lees and Christie 2001, AOU 2010). However, not all ornithologists agree with this treatment. Miller and Griscom (1921), van Rossem (1930), and Sibley and Monroe (1990) treated the taxa as distinct species. Friedmann (1950), Stresemann and Amadon (1979), and the AOU (1983) treated them as conspecific, but commented that the taxa might be full species. Johnson and Peeters (1963), in their detailed analysis of plumage variation of woodland hawks, concluded that “striking differences between the [northern and southern] races [of Gray Hawk] are obvious.” These authors noted that the plumage discontinuity occurs coincident with a gap in the species’ distribution in Costa Rica, which is also described by Stiles and Skutch (1989). Blake (1977) presented measurement data for all recognized subspecies of Gray Hawk, but he did not quantitatively analyze measurement differences between taxa; he treated them as conspecific, but noted that many consider them separate species. Millsap (1986) and Riesing et al. (2003) evaluated morphological and genetic differences between the two taxa, respectively, and concluded that they differed markedly.

New information:

Until recently there was no comprehensive published analysis of plumage, measurement, and vocal data for the Gray Hawk on which to base a decision regarding the species-level status of the two taxa (Banks et al. 2006). In a recent paper, Millsap et al (2011) compared plumages, morphology, and vocalizations of *B. n. nitidus* and *B. n. plagiatus,* and found that allopatric *B. n. nitidus* and *B. n. plagiatus* differ diagnosably at very high probability levels in all age and sex classes across a range of plumage, measurement, and vocalization characters. Adjacent *B. n. nitidus* and *B. n. plagiatus* populations were entirely separable based on plumage, even where ranges of the two taxa approach one another in Costa Rica. Discriminant function analysis (DFA) using measurements of body and tail pattern characters of 405 museum specimens resulted in correct classification of $\geq$ 98% of juveniles and adult males and 88% of adult females, and DFA using alarm call measurements resulted in correct classification of 100% of the vocalizations. These results parallel findings by Riesing et al. (2003) that the mtDNA difference between the two taxa is on the order of 9%.

Recommendation:

Collectively, all lines of evidence strongly suggest that the current conspecific treatment of *B. n. nitidus* and *B. n. plagiatus* does not accurately reflect the extent of differentiation between the two taxa. We recommend they be considered two species as described below:

In addition, we propose to change the distribution description for *B. plagiatus* to reflect regular occurrence in southern New Mexico in the breeding season, based on Williams and Krueper (2008), and to reflect occurrence of *B. nitidus* to 1600 m elevation based on Hilty (2003).

Buteo nitidus (Latham). Gray-lined Hawk.

> *Falco nitidus* Latham, 1790, Index Ornithol. 1: 41. Based on the “Plumbeous Falcon" Latham, Gen. Synop. Birds (suppl.) 1: 37. (in Cayana = Cayenne.)

Habitat.—Gallery Forest, Tropical Deciduous Forest, Tropical Lowland Evergreen Forest Edge, River-edge Forest (0-1600 m; Tropical and Subtropical zones).

Distribution.—*Resident* from Costa Rica (except northwest), Panama, Colombia, Venezuela, Tobago, Trinidad, and the Guianas south, west of the Andes to western Ecuador and east of the Andes to northern Argentina, Paraguay, and southern Brazil.

Buteo plagiatus (Schlegel). Gray Hawk.

> *Asturina plagiata* Schlegel, 1862, Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle des Pays-Bas, Revue méthodique et critique (Catalogue) des Collections déposées dans cet Établissement, livr. 1, No. 4 (Sept.), Astures, p.1, note. (Veracruz, Mexico)

Habitat.—Gallery Forest, Tropical Deciduous Forest, Tropical Lowland Evergreen Forest Edge, River-edge Forest (0-1300 m; Tropical and Subtropical zones).

Distribution.—*Resident* from southern Arizona (rarely), southern New Mexico (rarely), western (rarely) and southern Texas south through Middle America (including the Bay

Islands, off Honduras) to northwestern Costa Rica (Gulf of Nicoya region). Northernmost breeding populations in Arizona, New Mexico, and western Texas are largely migratory southward in nonbreeding season.

Literature cited:

American Ornithologists' Union. 1983. Checklist of North American Birds. 6th ed. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D.C.

American Ornithologists' Union. [Online]. 2010. Check-list of North American Birds. American Ornithologists' Union, Washington, D. C. <http://www.aou.org/checklist/index.php3> (24 February 2010).

Baird, S. F., T. M. Brewer, and R. Ridgway. 1874. A history of North American birds, Volume 3. Little Brown and Company, Boston, MA.

Banks R. C., C. Cicero, J. L. Dunn, A. W. Kratter, P. C. Rasmussen, J. V. Remsen Jr., J. D. Rising, and D. Stotz. 2006. Forty-seventh supplement to the American Ornithologists' Union Check-list of North American birds. Auk 123:926-36.

Bierregaard, R. O. 1994. Grey Hawk. *In* J. del Hoyo, A. Elliot, and J. Sargatal [eds.], Handbook of the Birds of the World, Volume II. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.

Blake, E. R. 1977. Manual of Neotropical Birds. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Ferguson-Lees, J., and D. A. Christie. 2001. Raptors of the World. Christopher Helm, London.

Friedmann, H. 1950. Birds of North and Middle America. Falconiformes. U.S. National Museum Bulletin, no. 50, part 2.

Hilty, S. L. 2003. Birds of Venezuela. Second Edition. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

Johnson, N. K., and H. J. Peeters. 1963. The systematic position of certain hawks in the genus *Buteo.* Auk 80:417-446.

Latham, J. 1790. Supplement to the general synopsis of birds. Leigh and Southeby, London.

Miller, W. D., and L. Griscom. 1921. Description of proposed new birds from Central America, with notes on some other little-known forms. American Museum Novitates, no. 25.

Millsap, B. A. 1986. Biosystematics of the Gray Hawk, *Buteo nitidus* (Latham). M. Sc. thesis, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Millsap, B. A., S. H. Seipke, and W. S. Clark. 2011. The Gray Hawk (*Buteo nitidus*) is two species. Condor 113:326-339.

Riesing, M. J., L. Kruckenhauser, A. Gamauf, and E. Haring. 2003. Molecular phylogeny of the genus *Buteo* (Aves: Accipitridae) based on mitochondrial marker sequences. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 27:328-342.

Schlegel, H. 1862. Asturinae. Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle des Pays-Bas, Revue Méthodique et Critique des Collections Déposées dans cet Éstablissement, vol. 2, monograph 6. Leyden, Netherlands.

Sibley, C. G., and B. L. Monroe. 1990. Distribution and Taxonomy of Birds of the World. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Stiles, F. G., and A. F. Skutch. 1989. A guide to the birds of Costa Rica. Comstock, Ithaca, NY.

Stresemann, E., and D. Amadon. 1979. Falconiformes. *In* E. Mayr and G. W. Cottrell [eds.], Checklist of birds of the World, volume 1. Museum of Comparative Zoology.

van Rossem, A. J. 1930. A northwestern race of the Mexican Goshawk. Condor 32:303-304.

Williams, S. O. III, and D. Krueper. 2008. The changing status of the Gray Hawk in New Mexico and adjacent areas. Western Birds 39:202-208.

Name and affiliation of submitter: Brian A. Millsap, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Sergio H. Seipke; and William S. Clark

Date of proposal: 6 Jun 2011

Transfer *Deltarhynchus flammulatus* to *Ramphotrigon*

Description of the problem:

Deltarhynchus flammulatus was separated by Ridgway (1893) from *Myiarchus*. It has since been consistently recognized as a monotypic genus endemic to Mexico.

New information:

In the course of my DNA barcoding project for the birds of Mexico I found a sequence (CO1 fragment) of a bird that we had identified as *Myiarchus* coming outside the other *Myiarchus.* In comparing the sequence with that of other birds being sequenced (with permission from the author of those sequences, Kevin Kerr), the different bird formed a clade with *Ramphotrigon fuscicauda* (genetic distance 6%), sister to *R. ruficauda* (9%). Although I first thought that this could be a new species of an unrecorded genus in Mexico, I then realized that this was indeed a *Deltarhynchus.* Please see the attached ID tree from BOLD (Barcode of Life Data System).

After searching the literature, Kevin Kerr and I realized that there is already substantial information about this finding. Lanyon suggested a sister relationship between *Deltarhynchus* and *Ramphotrigon* in 1985 based on syringeal morphology. This relationship was upheld in a cladistic reanalysis of previously published morphological and behavioral data (Birdsley 2002). More recently, a molecular phylogeny (Ohlson et al. 2008) based on three nuclear genes indicated that *Ramphotrigon* is paraphyletic with respect to *Deltarhynchus*. This latter study sampled *D. flammulatus*, *R. megacephalum*, and *R. ruficauda* and showed that *D. flammulatus* is sister to *R. ruficauda*, with *R. megacephalum* sister to this pair (>.95 posterior probability). Thus, *Deltarhynchus* nested within *Ramphotrigon*, as in our mitochondrial tree.

Recommendation:

I recommend that *Deltarhynchus flammulatus* be transferred to *Ramphotrigon*.

Literature cited:

Birdsley, J. S. 2002. Phylogeny of the tyrant flycatchers (Tyrannidae) based on morphology and behavior. Auk 119:715–734.

Lanyon 1984. A phylogeny of the kingbirds and their allies. American Museum Novitates, no. 2797.

Ohlson, J., J. Fjeldså & P. G. P. Ericson. 2008. Tyrant flycatchers coming out in the open: Ecological radiation in Tyrannidae (Aves, Passeriformes). Zool. Scripta. 37: 315–335.

Ridgway, R. 1893. Remarks on the avian genus *Myiarchus*, with special reference to *M. yucatanensis.* Lawrence. Proc. U.S. Natl. Mus. 16: 605-608.

Submitted by:

Patricia Escalante, Colección Nacional de Aves, Instituto de Biología UNAM

Date of proposal: 14 Jun 2011

2011-A-6 N&MA Check-list Committee pp. 133, 136

Change the gender ending of two species names

N. David and M. Gosselin have published another paper (2011) on gender agreement of species group names in birds, concentrating on words that could be either nouns or adjectives (Code Art. 31.2.2). Results of their study indicate that the spelling of five specific names of birds in the Americas should be changed (if they now agree with Dickinson 2003) to conform to the Code. These changes are necessary because names previously treated as nouns in apposition are really adjectives, or vice versa.

Two species occur in North America:

Aramides cajanea should be *A. cajaneus*
Porphyrio martinica should be *P. martinicus*

Literature Cited:

David, N., and M. Gosselin. 2011. Gender agreement of avian species-group names under Article 31.2.2 of the ICZN Code. Bull. Brit. Ornithol. Club 131:103-115.

Dickinson, E. C.. 2003. Howard and Moore Checklist

Submitted by:
Richard C. Banks, U.S. National Museum

Date of proposal: 20 Jun 2011

Change English Name of the Bahama Warbler to Pinelands Warbler

Description of the problem:

When the split of *Dendroica flavescens* from *D. dominica* was approved, the Committee followed without comment the English name recommended by McKay et al. (2010), who state (p. 938) "…given its endemism in the Bahamas, we suggest "Bahama Warbler" as an appropriate common name…". This name was selected essentially by default and without consideration of other criteria, and did not reflect the views of all of the co-authors of that paper. However, by the time the subject was raised by Pratt (cover illustrator for the Auk paper), it was too late to change the manuscript, and not all of the co-authors agreed on an alternative name.

Note that *D. flavescens* is not found throughout the Bahamas, but is restricted to Caribbean (*Pinus taeda*) pinelands of Grand Bahama and Abaco. But this distribution does not help in providing a more specific geographic modifier. Note also that *D. flavescens* is not the only endemic warbler in the Bahamas, although the Bahama Yellowthroat does not use "warbler" in its name. Although makers of international checklists favor geographic names for island endemics, the result for birders, and more importantly for local conservationists, is a numbing list of the "X Island This" and the "X Island That". These names are not informative on a local scale, and certainly unlikely to spark anyone's interest. In addition to the yellowthroat, this name joins Bahama Woodstar, Bahama Swallow, Bahama Mockingbird, and Bahama Oriole on the AOU Checklist, with possible future additions of Bahama Parrot and Bahama Nuthatch, or even Bahama Bananaquit. Each of these names was chosen in its own context, without any consideration of the overall pattern that results. The AOU committee is in the position to take a broader overview. The name Bahama Parrot is already used informally by residents of the Bahamas, but the residents of these islands also have loyalty and conservation concerns for specific islands (or habitats) within the country.

New information:

One of the most distinctive features of *D. flavescens* is its restriction to forests of Caribbean pine, a habitat that is not only a focus of Bahamian biodiversity, but is under severe threat from logging and development. It is also the focus of a campaign by the Bahamas National Trust (BNT) to save what remains. Part of that effort will be to use *D. flavescens* as a flagship endemic to represent the Bahamian pinelands. "Pinelands" is used interchangeably with “pine forests” in much of the literature of the BNT. The name Pinelands Warbler would be very helpful to these efforts because it is more evocative and more accurate than the unimaginative geographical designation. Such a habitat-based name is not unprecedented in the West Indies, (consider Elfin Woods Warbler) or among warblers (numerous examples; of course, Pine Warbler is already taken). It also would, for once, break the monotony of Bahama This and Bahama That.

Recommendation:

We urge the committee to make this change soon, before the name Bahama Warbler becomes entrenched. The name “Pinelands Warbler” will be a boon to conservation efforts on Abaco and Grand Bahama, and could even be the key to the survival of this newly recognized endemic.

Literature cited:

Hallett, B. 2006. Birds of the Bahamas and the Turks and Caicos Islands. Macmillan Education, Oxford, UK.

McKay, B. D., M. B. J. Reynolds, W. K. Hayes, and D. S. Lee. 2010. Evidence for the species status of the Bahama Yellow-throated Warbler (*Dendroica “dominica” flavescens*). Auk 127:932-939.

See also discussion under proposal 2010-B-8.

Submitted by:

H. Douglas Pratt, Research Curator of Birds, North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences
David S. Lee, The Tortoise Reserve, Inc. (Retired Curator of Birds, NCMNS)
J. C. Haney, Chief Scientist, Defenders of Wildlife
Bruce Hallett, Author (Hallett 2006)
Eric Carey, Executive Director, Bahamas National Trust
David C. Wege, Senior Caribbean Program Manager, BirdLife International

Date of proposal: 20 Jun 2011

Reorganize the classification of the *Thryothorus* wrens

This proposal would split wrens currently classified in the genus *Thryothorus* into four genera (three previously recognized, one new), restricting application of this genus name to the type (*Thryothorus ludovicianus*), and changing the sequence of species.

Description of the problem:

Until 1934, wrens currently in the genus *Thryothorus* were classified in three genera: *Thryothorus*, *Pheugopedius*, and *Thryophilus*. In a footnote comment based on observations of van Rossem (1930) and his own examination of wren nasal opercula, Hellmayr (1934) united all these wrens in the single genus *Thryothorus*, which treatment has become standard and remained unchanged to date.

New Information:

Barker (2004) first showed using a combination of nuclear and mitochondrial DNA sequence data that *Thryothorus ludovicianus* (the type of genus *Thryothorus*) appeared only distantly related to other *Thryothorus*, forming a clade with *Campylorhynchus* and *Thryomanes*. Mann et al. (2006) used more extensive (nearly complete) sampling of *Thryothorus* to demonstrate that no other Central or South American *Thryothorus* was allied to *T. ludovicianus*. Because the remaining "*Thryothorus*" fell into three well-supported clades that could not conclusively be shown to be monophyletic, Mann et al. suggested resurrection of the two previously-recognized wren genera, *Pheugopedius* and *Thryophilus*, for two of those clades, and described the genus *Cantorchilus* to house the third.

Subsequently, Mann et al. (2009) reported variation in species-typical song characteristics for most species of "*Thryothorus*". This qualitative and quantitative study demonstrated that the four clades of "*Thryothorus*" are characterized by unique combinations of song features, including the presence, frequency, and type of vocal duetting behavior; the temporal coordination of duets; and the presence of male-specific introductory notes. As such, not only the three pre-Hellmayr genera, but also the new genus *Cantorchilus*, are distinguishable by both molecular and behavioral characteristics.

Recommendation:

Based on the available molecular and behavioral data, as well as widespread taxonomic practice prior to Hellmayr (1934), I propose recognition of four genera for wrens currently in the genus *Thryothorus*. To reflect these relationships, I propose resequencing the *Thryothorus* wrens as follows:

Thryothorus ludovicianus

Pheugopedius spadix
Pheugopedius atrogularis
Pheugopedius rutilus
Pheugopedius maculipectus
Pheugopedius felix
Pheugopedius fasciatoventris

Thryophilus rufalbus
Thryophilus sinaloa
Thryophilus pleurostictus

Cantorchilus leucopogon
Cantorchilus thoracicus
Cantorchilus modestus
Cantorchilus nigricapillus
Cantorchilus semibadius
Cantorchilus leucotis

This proposal has been adopted by the SACC for use in South America, and I recommend adoption here.

Literature cited:

Barker, F. K. (2004). "Monophyly and relationships of wrens (Aves: Troglodytidae): a congruence analysis of heterogeneous mitochondrial and nuclear DNA sequence data." Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 31: 486-504.

Hellmayr, C. E. (1934). Catalogue of birds of the Americas and the adjacent islands. Part 7. Chicago, IL, The Field Museum of Natural History.

Mann, N. I., F. K. Barker, et al. (2006). "Molecular data delineate four genera of "*Thryothorus*" wrens." Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 40: 750-759.

Mann, N. I., K. A. Dingess, et al. (2009). "A comparative study of song form and duetting in Neotropical *Thryothorus* wrens." Behaviour 146:1-43.

van Rossem, A. J. (1930). "New Sonora races of *Toxostoma* and *Pheugopedius*." Transactions of the San Diego Society of Natural History 6(11): 207-208.

Submitted by:
Keith Barker, University of Minnesota

Date of proposal: 27 Jun 2011

Recognize the genus *Dendroplex* Swainson 1827 (Dendrocolaptidae) as valid

Adoption of this proposal would transfer polytypic *Xiphorhynchus picus* to *Dendroplex*. This proposal passed SACC in a close vote; see the votes and discussion of the proposal at http://www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCprop316.html

Description of the problem:

Since 1951, authors (Peters 1951, Clements 2000, Marantz *et al.* 2003, Dickinson 2003) have placed the Straight-billed (*X. picus*) and Zimmer's (*X. kienerii*) woodcreepers in the genus *Xiphorhynchus*, even though earlier authors classified them in the genus *Dendroplex* (Sclater 1890, Hellmayr 1925, Zimmer 1934, Todd 1948). The original characterization of *Dendroplex* (1827: 354) provided only a brief diagnosis of the new taxon, and no reference to a type species. Ten years later, the same author (Swainson 1837: 313-314) provided essentially the same diagnosis of the original description, but this time it was accompanied by an illustration showing the straight culmen and lateral compression of the type species. However, at the end of the characterization, Swainson added: "The scansorial type *D. guttatus* Spix i, 91, f. 1", which refers to figure 1 of plate 91 in Spix (1824), thereby satisfying the requirements of ICZN for type species designation by subsequent monotypy (ICZN 1999). Subsequently, Hellmayr (1925: 288) pointed out that Swainson's diagnoses of 1827 and 1837 and bill outline correspond to the characters of the Straight-billed woodcreeper (originally described as *Oriolus picus*), although the only species mentioned (*D. guttatus* Spix i, 91, f. 1), "belongs to the genus *Xiphorhynchus* Swainson". Following Hellmayr (1925), Peters (1951: 36) recognized that "*D. guttatus* Spix i, 91, f. 1" depicts in fact a bird now known as *Xiphorhynchus ocellatus* (Spix 1824), and stressed that under Opinion 65 (Schenk & McMasters 1948: 54) the case of misidentification had to be formally presented to the ICZN for ruling, and that until a decision was reached, *Xiphorhynchus ocellatus ocellatus* = *Dendrocolaptes ocellatus* Spix, 1824, continued to be the type of *Dendroplex*.

New information:

Aleixo (2002) showed that the genus *Xiphorhynchus* (*sensu* Peters 1951) is paraphyletic, and that the sister taxa *X. picus* and *X. kienerii* are the only species which do not belong in a clade with the remaining *Xiphorhynchus* species. He suggested that they might be grouped in a different genus, in which case the name *Dendroplex*

Swainson, 1827, would be available if problems with its type species designation were resolved. Because the latest (fourth) edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN 1999) now allows a misidentified type species to be set aside without the requirement of a ruling from the Commission, Aleixo et al. (2007) proposed the conservation of *Dendroplex* Swainson, 1827, as a valid taxon. According to them, the following lines of evidence support Hellmayr's (1925) interpretation that Swainson's (1837) identification of "*D. guttatus* Spix, i, 91, f. 1" as the type was a case of misidentification, and that *D. picus* = *Oriolus picus* J. F. Gmelin 1788 was the taxon upon which Swainson actually based *Dendroplex*:

1) Swainson (1827: 354) himself was unsure whether the taxon on which he based *Dendroplex* had been described or not. Ten years later, when he next cited *Dendroplex* (Swainson 1837: 313-314), the original diagnosis was maintained and even illustrated in detail (see Fig. 1), but "*D. guttatus* Spix, i, [pl.] 91. f. 1." was mentioned as belonging to the genus apparently in accordance with Lesson (1830: 313), who a few years before explicitly equated "*D. guttatus* Spix, pl. 91" with "*Oriolus picus* Gm

2). There is a significant discrepancy between the levels of detail and resolution of the bill outline presented in figure 281e of Swainson (1837: 313) as diagnostic of *Dendroplex* (see Fig. 1) and that of *D. guttatus* as illustrated in Spix's plate, chosen by Swainson (1837) as the type of *Dendroplex*. Although the latter illustration is poor in resolution and depicts a bird which in fact resembles several taxa currently classified in the genus *Xiphorhynchus*, figure 281e of Swainson (1837), on the other hand, is very clear and refers unambiguously to the only species in the entire family Dendrocolaptidae known to this day to possess such a bill shape: *X. picus* = *Oriolus picus* J. F. Gmelin, 1788 (Marantz *et al.* 2003).

Recommendation:

Those taxa originally described or classified as *Dendroplex* according to Gray (1840), Sclater (1890), Hellmayr (1925), Zimmer (1934), and Todd (1948), but later transferred to *Xiphorhynchus* by Peters (1951), should be returned to *Dendroplex*, which will contain only two distinct sister biological species: *Dendroplex picus* and the extralimital *Dendroplex kienerii*, as delineated by Marantz *et al*. (2003).

Literature cited:

Aleixo, A., S. M. S. Gregory &J. Penhallurick. 2007. Fixation of the type species and revalidation of the genus *Dendroplex* Swainson, 1827 (Dendrocolaptidae). *Bull. B. O. C.* 127: 242-246.

Aleixo, A. 2002. Molecular systematics and the role of the “várzea”–“terra-firme” ecotone in the diversification of *Xiphorhynchus* Woodcreepers (Aves: Dendrocolaptidae). *Auk* 119: 621-640.

Clements, J.F. 2000. *Birds of the World, A Checklist*. Pica Press, Robertbridge, East Sussex.

Dickinson, E.C. 2003. *The Howard & Moore Complete Checklist of the Birds of the World*. Christopher Helm, London.

Gray, G.R. 1840. *A List of the Genera of Birds, with an indication of the typical species of each genus. Compiled from various sources*. Richard and John E. Taylor, London.

Hellmayr, C.E. 1925. *Catalogue of Birds of the Americas and the adjacent Islands*, part 4. Furnariidae–Dendrocolaptidae. Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago.

I.C.Z.N.1999. *International Code of Zoological Nomenclature.* 4th. Edition. The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, London.

Lesson, R.P. 1830-31. *Traité d’Ornithologie ou Tableau Méthodique*. F. G. Levrault, Paris.

Marantz, C., Aleixo, A., Bevier, L. R. & Patten, M. A. 2003. Family Dendrocolaptidae (Woodcreepers). Pp. 358-447 *in* J. del Hoyo, A. Elliott & Christie, D., (eds.) *Handbook of the Birds of the World*, Vol. 8, Broadbills to Tapaculos. Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, Spain.

Peters, J.L. 1951. *Check-list of Birds of the World*, vol. 7. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Schenk, E. T & McMasters, J. H. 1948. *Procedure in taxonomy*. Revised ed. Stanford University Press, Stanford California.

Sclater, P.L. 1890. *Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum*, vol. 15. Catalogue of the Passeriformes or perching birds, in the collection of the British Museum. Tracheophonæ, or the families Dendrocolaptidæ, Formicariidæ, Conopophagidæ, and Pteroptochidæ. Trustees of the British Museum, London.

Spix, J.B. 1824. *Avium species novae, quas in itinere per Brasiliam.* vol. 1. Hübschmanni, Munich.

Swainson, W. 1827. Several new groups in Ornithology. *Zoological Journal* 3: 158-363.

Swainson, W. 1837. *The Natural History and Classification of Birds,* vol. 2. Longman, Rees etc., London.

Todd, W.E.C. 1948. Critical Remarks on the Wood-hewers. *Ann. Carnegie Mus.* 31(2): 5-18.

Zimmer, J.T. 1934. Studies of Peruvian Birds, part 14. *Am. Mus. Nov.* 753: 1-26.

Submitted by:
A. Aleixo

Date of proposal: 27 Jun 2011

Change the sequence of wren genera

This proposal would resequence the wren genera to reflect relationships inferred in recent phylogenetic work. It presumes passage of Proposal 2011-A-8, a reorganization of species currently in the genus *Thryothorus*.

Description of the problem:

The current sequence of wren genera reflects outdated hypotheses of relationship. For instance, the genus *Campylorhynchus* is listed first within the family because it has been recognized as a separate family by Baird (1858). Similarly, some (but not all) semi-terrestrial forms (e.g., *Thryorchilus*, *Microcerculus*, *Cyphorhinus*) were perceived as derived, and listed at the end of the sequence. Other genera have also been associated based on superficial similarity (e.g., *Thryomanes* and *Ferminia*; Barbour 1926, 1928)

New Information:

Several studies now have contradicted aspects of this sequence. For instance, Rice et al. (1999; see also Martinez Gomez et al. 2005) demonstrated that *Thryorchilus* is closely allied to the house wren complex (*Troglodytes*). More recently, Barker (2004) presented evidence that several petrophilous forms (*Salpinctes*, *Microcerculus*, *Catherpes*, *Hylorchilus*) appear basally within wren phylogeny, with *Salpinctes* possibly the sister to other wrens. By contrast, other forms traditionally associated with these (e.g., *Cyphorhinus*, *Henicorhina*) appear more closely related to some (but not all) members of the genus *Thryothorus*. Paraphyly of the genus *Thryothorus* (Mann et al. 2006) also mandates reorganization of this genus and the resurrected and new genera housing other species formerly within it (see Proposal 2011-A-8).

Recommendation:

The current sequence reflects a lot of outdated ideas that are clearly contradicted by available data. Although the published record is not (quite) comprehensive, I favor reorganization of the family to reflect current knowledge, especially in light of the paraphyly of *Thryothorus*. The only really good reason to keep the current arrangement is to await publication of results pertaining to *Ferminia*, but this would mean retaining a sequence that is misleading in a number of details. The alternative of rearranging all of the genera but maintaining the placement of *Ferminia* near *Thryomanes* based on tradition seems absurd, especially given that the placement proposed here also has basis in the published record (Barbour 1928). Although the two lists cover slightly different sets of genera, the SACC has already adopted a sequence consistent with the one presented here.

Based on the available (primarily molecular) data, I propose reordering of the wren genera as follows:

Salpinctes
Microcerculus
Catherpes
Hylorchilus
Ferminia
Troglodytes
Thryorchilus
Cistothorus
Thryothorus
Thryomanes
Campylorhynchus
Pheugopedius
Thryophilus
Cantorchilus
Uropsila
Henicorhina
Cyphorhinus

This sequence reflects the basal position of the petrophilous wrens; the splitting of *Thryothorus*, with *T. ludovicianus* associated with *Thryomanes* and *Campylorhynchus* (e.g., Barker 2004, Mann et al. 2006); the association of *Thryorchilus* with *Troglodytes* (Rice et al. 1999); and the association of *Uropsila*, *Henicorhina* and *Cyphorhinus* with former members of *Thryothorus* to the exclusion of *T. ludovicianus* (Barker 2004, Mann et al. 2006). This sequence also reflects the traditional association of *Troglodytes* and *Cistothorus*, which is supported by molecular data (Barker 2004; Martinez Gomez et al. 2005). The only taxon lacking published data on its placement is the Cuban endemic *Ferminia*: unpublished data from my lab demonstrate that it is allied to the *Troglodytes*/*Cistothorus* clade. Although it is the policy of this committee not to make changes based on unpublished data, this is an alternative placement previously suggested by F.M Chapman (cited in Barbour 1928), and it makes little sense to rearrange all of the remaining genera and pretend ignorance of *Ferminia*'s true placement.

Literature cited:

Baird, S. F. (1858). Birds. Report of explorations and surveys to ascertain the most practical and economical route for a railroad from the Mississippi River to the Pacific Ocean. Washington, U.S. Congress.

Barbour, T. (1926). A remarkable new bird from Cuba. Proceedings of the New England Zoological Club 9: 73-75.

Barbour, T. (1928). Notes on three Cuban birds. Auk 45: 28-32.

Barker, F. K. (2004). Monophyly and relationships of wrens (Aves : Troglodytidae): a congruence analysis of heterogeneous mitochondrial and nuclear DNA sequence data. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 31(2): 486-504.

Mann, N. I., F. K. Barker, et al. (2006). Molecular data delineate four genera of "*Thryothorus*" wrens. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 40(3): 750-759.

Martínez Gómez, J. E., B. R. Barber, et al. (2005). Phylogenetic position and generic placement of the Socorro wren (*Thryomanes sissonii*). Auk 122(1): 50-56.

Rice, N. H., A. T. Peterson, et al. (1999). Phylogenetic patterns in montane *Troglodytes* wrens. Condor 101(2): 446-451.

Submitted by:

Keith Barker, University of Minnesota

Date of proposal: 28 Jun 2011

Transfer the genus *Paroaria* to the Thraupidae

Note: This is a proposal that passed SACC nearly unanimously in 2007 [http://www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCprop276.html]; the text below comes largely from that proposal.

Description of the problem (from SACC website):

"The genus *Paroaria* has been placed traditionally in the Emberizidae, sometimes with the cardinal grosbeaks (e.g., Hellmayr 1938, Meyer de Schauensee 1966, 1970), which in this classification are considered a separate family, Cardinalidae. Tordoff (1954) concluded that it was not a cardinaline but an emberizine genus, based on skeletal data. Genetic data indicate that the genus *Paroaria* belongs in the Thraupidae (Yuri & Mindell 2002, Burns and Naoki 2004), as suspected long ago by Paynter (1970a)."

New information:

Yuri and Mindell (2002) analyzed about 3200 base-pairs of at least four mitochondrial gene regions and found that *Paroaria* was embedded in their very limited group of tanagers including *Tangara* and *Buthraupis*. Their analysis of cyt-b sequences for a much larger set of taxa found that *Paroaria* was embedded in the tanagers, and clustered with *Cissopis*, *Schistochlamys*, and *Neothraupis*, but with low support. Burns & Naoki (2004) analyzed DNA sequences of about 1475 base pairs of two mitochondrial genes. They found that *Paroaria* (*P. coronata*) was deeply embedded within core tanagers, with 100% Bayesian support for a group that includes it, *Neothraupis*, *Cissopis*, and *Schistochlamys*, and 98% Bayesian support for the inclusion of that group within a much larger group of genera that includes *Thraupis*, the type genus for the family.

Paroaria has always been recognized as enigmatic. The bright spectral red coloration is unlike that of any other members of the traditional Emberizidae other than *Rhodospingus* and *Coryphospingus*, themselves also probably tanagers. Unlike the latter, however, *Paroaria* has bright monomorphic plumage, something unknown in true Emberizidae or Cardinalidae (except perhaps for *Piranga rubriceps*), but a routine plumage theme in true tanagers.

Recommendation:

With the impending dismantling of Emberizidae and likely transfer of many genera to Thraupidae, we could simply wait until additional genetic data appear from the labs of Burns, Klicka, and colleagues. The reason to go ahead with this one is that we have two independent data sets that already say the same thing, namely definitely within core Thraupidae and definitely not within core Emberizidae. Maintaining it in Emberizidae does not reflect current knowledge of its relationships, so I favor moving forward with a YES on this one.

Literature Cited:

Burns, K. J., AND K. Naoki. 2004. Molecular phylogenetics and biogeography of Neotropical tanagers in the genus Tangara. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 32: 838-854.

Yuri, T., & D. P. Mindell. 2002. Molecular phylogenetic analysis of Fringillidae, "New World nine-primaried oscines" (Aves: Passeriformes). Molecular Phylogenetics & Evolution 23: 229-243.

Submitted by:
Van Remsen, Louisiana State University

Date of proposal: 3 Aug 2011

Change species limits in the *Arremon torquatus* complex

Description of the problem and new information:

Cadena and Cuervo (2010) conducted an assessment of species limits in the *Arremon* (formerly *Atlapetes* and *Buarremon*) *torquatus* complex. Their analyses indicated that forms *assimilis* and *atricapillus*, which could be considered sympatric, are reproductively isolated taxa. Also, forms *torquatus* and *poliophrys*, which are parapartically distributed, are likely isolated as well. Based on these results, and considering marked patterns of morphological, vocal, ecological, and genetic variation (see also Cadena et al. 2007, 2011), they proposed splitting the complex into eight different species. The South American Checklist committee recently accepted such proposed changes (SACC proposal 468); seven of the recognized species occur within the area of SACC coverage.

Two of the forms erected to the species level by Cadena and Cuervo (2010) occur in the area of NACC coverage: *A. costaricensis* in Costa Rica and western Panama, and *A. atricapillus* in central to eastern Panama, extending into Colombia. These species will replace *Arremon torquatus*, which is now restricted to South America.

Recommendation:

To be consistent with the new taxonomic treatment adopted by SACC, the representatives of the *A. torquatus* complex occurring in Central America should be treated as two separate species, *A. costaricensis* and *A. atricapillus*. Cadena and Cuervo (2010) did not propose English names for their newly recognized species. However, SACC has accepted the existing name Black-headed Brush-finch for *atricapillus*. We suggest Costa Rican Brush-finch as the English name for *costaricensis*, although we are open to other suggestions.

Literature cited:

Cadena, C. D., Z. A. Cheviron, and W. C. Funk. 2011. Testing the molecular and evolutionary causes of a 'leapfrog' pattern of geographical variation in coloration. Journal of Evolutionary Biology 24:402-414.

Cadena, C. D., and A. M. Cuervo. 2010. Molecules, ecology, morphology, and songs in concert: How many species is "*Arremon torquatus*" (Aves, Emberizidae)?. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society 99:152-176.

Cadena, C. D., J. Klicka, and R. E. Ricklefs. 2007. Evolutionary differentiation in the Neotropical montane region: molecular phylogenetics and phylogeography of *Buarremon* brush-finches (Aves, Emberizidae). Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 44:993-1016.

Submitted by:
C. Daniel Cadena, in consultation with Van Remsen

Date of proposal: Aug 2011

Change the English name of *Pseudonestor xanthophrys* (Maui Parrotbill) to the Hawaiian name Kiwikiu

Description of the problem:

Pseudonestor xanthophrys (Fringillidae: Drepanidinae), unlike most other Hawaiian birds, did not have a surviving common name in the Hawaiian language. It was most likely lost in the spoken language due to the species' severe range constriction. It has commonly been referred to by the English name it was given, the Maui Parrotbill.

New information:

The Hawaiian name Kiwikiu was developed by the Hawaiian Lexicon Committee, which was contacted by the Maui Forest Bird Recovery Project to select an appropriate name. A naming ceremony was held in the bird's habitat in September 2010. The "kiwi" part of the name means bent or curved (e.g., sickle-shaped), which refers to the shape of the bill of this bird. "Kiu" has a double meaning, referring both to the bird's secretive ways and to a cold, chilly wind, such as the breezes in the bird's habitat. This has been accepted in the Hawaiian dictionary, Mamaka Kaiao, and is now widely used in avian conservation in Hawaii.

For more information:

"Parrotbill's got Hawaiian name". The Maui News. 2010-05-21. Retrieved 2010-09-13.

"Endangered bird to receive Hawaiian name". The Maui News. 2010-09-10. Retrieved 2010-09-13.

www.mauiforestbirds.org/articles/1

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the common name of *Pseudonestor xanthophrys* be changed to the Hawaiian name Kiwikiu. The vast majority of Hawaiian honeycreepers (19 of the other 22 species, or all that have Hawaiian names) are already listed on the AOU Check-list by their Hawaiian, not English, common names.

Changing the common name of this species to Kiwikiu would allow scientific research to be published under this name. Kiwikiu is currently being used among projects that work closely with this species, as are the rest of the Hawaiian common names.

Submitted by:
Hanna Mounce

Date of proposal: 18 Aug 2011

Revise the citation for *Anser anser*

When *Anser anser* was moved from the Appendix to the main list in Supplement 50 (2009:707), the citation given was that from the Appendix, which also had been in Appendix B of the 6th edition (1983:779) of the Check-list. This citation properly attributes the name to Linnaeus, 1758, but states that the basis for the name (the species named) is "the Laughing Goose" of Edwards, Nat. Hist. Birds. The first use of this citation for the name, as far as I have determined, is Johnsgard (1979:438, in Peters revised vol. 1). This is undoubtedly what we followed in 1983 (and thus in 1998).

Anser anser, the Graylag Goose, first appeared in our lists in the 5th (1957:645) edition, in the hypothetical list. The citation there is to Linnaeus 1758, but only the type locality ("in Europa & America maxime boreali") is given. Peters (1931:146) states only that the restricted type locality is Sweden. Vaurie (1965:94) cites Linnaeus and the type locality merely as Sweden.

When Linnaeus (1758:123) listed the species *Anser* (in the genus *Anas*), his first reference was to his Fauna Svecica, which is undoubtedly the basis for restriction of the type locality to Sweden. In addition to the basic description, Linnaeus listed three other names and references, as additional indications of what he included in the species. These are *Anser ferus, Anser domesticus,* and *Anser canadensis fuscus maculatus*, attributing the last to "Edwards, av., 153, t. 153."

This species is, of course, the type species of the genus *Anser* Brisson, by tautonomy. For the citation to the genus, Peters (1931:146) gives "Type, by tautonomy, *Anser domesticus* = *Anas anser* Linnaeus." AOU 1957:65) gives essentially the same thing, as do later editions of the Check-list. Even Johnsgard (1979:434) uses this designation of the type species of *Anser*. Why he would change the basis of the species name *anser* from *domesticus* (as everyone else has always listed it) to Edwards's Laughing Goose is incomprehensible—as well as erroneous.

Edwards's Laughing Goose as depicted on his plate 153 is actually *Anser albifrons*, Greater White-fronted Goose. Linnaeus apparently did not distinguish between the several kinds of gray geese in Europe (and North America). Linnaeus did name *erythropus,* the Lesser White-fronted Goose, in 1758, but even the Bean Goose was not recognized for another 20 years. Later editions of Systema Naturae corrected the error: Gmelin (1789:509) correctly placed the Laughing Goose under *Anas albifrons*, not mentioning it with the species *anser*.

Thus I propose that we correct the citation of *Anser anser* to: *Anas anser* Linnaeus, 1758, Syst. Nat. 10, 1, p. 123. (in Europa & America maxime boreali = Sweden.), reverting to our 5th edition citation.

The basis for this proposal is information posted by someone identified as “mb1848” on BirdForum, in a lengthy discussion on the white-fronted goose, on 24 Jan. 2010.

Submitted by:
Richard C. Banks, U.S. National Museum

Date of proposal: 2 Sep 2011

Move *Veniliornis fumigatus* to *Picoides*

Description of the problem and new information:

Moore et al. (2006), using two mtDNA genes (cyt *b* and COI), produced a fairly well-resolved phylogeny of the woodpecker genus *Veniliornis* (their sampling did not include *sanguineus* and *maculifrons*). That genus was found to contain two *Picoides* (*lignarius* and *mixtus*, South American taxa since moved to *Veniliornis* by SACC) and to exclude *Veniliornis fumigatus*. The latter species was found to belong to the clade of 'large' North American *Picoides*. This recommended change would make the genus *Veniliornis* monophyletic. The recognition of *Veniliornis* exacerbates a problematic *Picoides*, which is a paraphyletic mess still to be resolved (see, for example, the position of the type species *P. tridactylus* in Fuchs et al. 2007), but that does not change the fact that this "*Veniliornis*" is not a member of true *Veniliornis*. Eventually, when all taxa in *Picoides* have been sampled and sequenced, we are highly likely to have to split it up, and this particular clade containing *fumigatus* will likely receive a different name (perhaps *Leuconotopicus*, as Raty suggests; see link below), but this recommended change would clearly ally *fumigatus* with its closer relatives and give us a good, monophyletic *Veniliornis*, a solid first step in getting this larger group correct taxonomically.

This proposal would bring us in line with changes that SACC has already made. See the proposal and comments here: www.museum.lsu.edu/~Remsen/SACCprop262.html

Recommendation: I support moving *Veniliornis fumigatus* to *Picoides*.

Literature Cited:

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.

Fuchs J., J. I. Ohlson, P. G. P. Ericson, and E. Pasquet. 2007. Synchronous intercontinental splits between assemblages of woodpeckers suggested by molecular data. Zoologica Scripta 36:11-25.

Submitted by:
Kevin Winker

Proposal date: 10 Sep 2011