The authorities of the United States National Museum having, with their usual kindness, sent me for examination, at my request, several obscure specimens belonging to that establishment which I was anxious to see, I have studied them carefully, and now wish to offer some notes thereon. To the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and the Director of the National Museum my best thanks are due for thus facilitating my work.

I begin by offering some notes on the Humming-birds which are included in the lot.

1. Phaethornis superciliosus (Linn.) ex Bahia = Ph. pretrei (Less. & Del.).
   No. 4976. Bahia ex Lawrence.
   This specimen is by no means = Ph. superciliosus (L.) apud Elliot, but proves to be a Bahia skin of Ph. pretrei (Less. & Del.) in much faded plumage. Ph. pretrei of Lesson and Delattre was once believed by Messrs. Cabanis and Heine to be true superciliosus Lin. (ex Brisson), and Mr. J. Gould, when writing his monograph, unfortunately accepted this identification. More recently Messrs. Salvin and Elliot have shown that true superciliosus of Linnaeus is the same as Ph. freterculus Gould and Ph. consobrinus "Bourc." Reichh. or Ph. moorei Lawr. While I agree perfectly with the last-named authors in placing these names among the synonyms of Ph. superciliosus, I nevertheless regard the Ph. malaris Nordm. to be quite a distinct species, occurring in Cayenne along with Ph. superciliosus, from which it is distinguishable by its much superior size and other points of difference. I believe Ph. malaris to be restricted to Cayenne. The types, belonging to the Berlin Museum, which I have examined, are said to be from Brazil (through Gello and Olfers), but this statement is probably erroneous.*

2. Phaethornis longirostris (Less.) ex Pebas = Ph. superciliosus (L.).
   No. 55374, male Pebas, Peru (ex Williams College).
   In his catalogue of Trochilidæ in the collection of the U. S. National Museum (Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1880, p. 309, note,) Mr. Ridgway says...
that this specimen "is not distinguishable from northern specimens of Ph. longirostris." I, however, find that the skin in question belongs to true Ph. superciliosus (L.) apud ELLIOT, agreeing perfectly with other specimens from Upper Amazonia and British Guiana. Mr. Ridgway may have compared it with his Ph. superciliosus from Bahia, which is = pretrei. I may remark that Ph. superciliosus is easily distinguishable from Ph. longirostris in having the upper tail-coverts green, tipped with pale fulvous, while in longirostris they are deep fulvous, barred with 2 to 3 dark (greenish) bands.

3. Phaethornis longirostris (LESS.) ex Turbo; name correct
   No. 17918, male, Turbo (coll. Schott), type of Ph. cassini LAWRI.
   This is evidently a young bird presenting many signs of immaturity. Unfortunately it is a bad and imperfect skin, and in consequence of this it is difficult to make a close comparison with specimens of Ph. longirostris from Central America. I may, however, note that in the Turbo bird the upper tail-coverts are of a deeper tint, being more brownish fulvous. The back is dark brown, with slight bronze reflections, instead of being green. The stripe in the middle of upper throat and the mystacal stripe are of a deeper fulvous. The under parts are generally darker and more mixed with grayish brown.

4. Phaethornis squalidus (TEM.) ex Rio Negro; name correct, locality incorrect.
   No. 24534, Rio Negro (ex Dr. HEERMANN).
   The skin of this bird is of the peculiar make by which all skins of trade coming from Southern Brazil are recognizably primo visu. If Rio Negro means the northern confluent of the Amazon the locality is evidently erroneous, but there is a river "Rio Negro" on the northern frontier of Sta. Catarina where the skin may have really come from.

5. Phaethornis adolphi GOULD ex Turbo = Ph. striigularis GLD.
   No. 17915, female, Turbo (coll. Michler).
   This is by no means Ph. adolphi, but Ph. striigularis GLD., agreeing with specimens of that species from Bogota and Porto Cabello.

6. Campylopterus lazulus (VIEILL.) ex Peru; name correct, locality erroneous.
   No. 11741, male, Peru (C. Raymond).
   This species has not yet been stated to occur in Peru, and the locality attributed to the specimen is most probably erroneous. The skin looks like a Bogota skin, and agrees with others from that locality.

7. Lafresnaya flavicaudata (FRAS.) ex Popayan; name correct, locality erroneous.
   No. 24565, male, Popayan (Dr. Heermann).
   This species has not yet been mentioned from Popayan, where, however, L. saule (BOURC. & DEL.) has been stated to occur. I believe the specimen in question to be simply a so-called Bogota skin. It does not differ from specimens sent from that region. The species ought to be called L. lafresnayei (BOISS.), or, as I prefer, Entima lafresnayei (BOISS.).
8. Florisuga mellivora (L.) ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous.
No. 25851, male, Tres Marias Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus).

As in the case of other specimens of Humming-birds forwarded by J. Xantus and labeled as having been collected in the Tres Marias Islands, I believe this locality to be clearly erroneous. The specimen of *F. mellivora* in question is apparently of the same make as the skin of *Urano-mitra guatemalensis*, also said to be from Tres Marias. Both skins may have really come from Guatemala. The *Florisuga* specimen is a young male in imperfect plumage.

9. Helianthea Intetias (DEL. & BOURC.) ex Popayan; correct.
No. 29277, male, Popayan (D. G. Elliot).

This bird agrees with specimens from Quito in Museum. H. v. B.

10. Thalurania glaucopis (GML.) ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous.
No. 25851, female, Tres Marias Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus). Type of *Th. lucie*, LAWR.

I quite agree with the opinion expressed by Messrs. Elliot and Ridgway, viz, that the bird in question belongs to *Th. glaucopis* (GML.), male juvenile, the locality, Tres Marias, being no doubt erroneous. The skin is of the unmistakable make of all Rio skins, which are sent in large numbers annually to the great markets of Europe. The yellow spot on the under mandible, mentioned by Mr. Lawrence as the chief distinguishing character of his *Th. lucie*, only presents itself on one side of the under mandible and is simply the result of an injury, the rhamphotheca on that part having been rubbed away.

11. Thalurania eriphile (LESS.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.
No. 68314, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

Agrees with a specimen from Bahia in Museum H. v. B. I much doubt the correctness of the habitat Rio Grande do Sul, this species not having been stated to occur so far south.

12. Cephalolepis delalandi (VIEILL.) ex Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.
No. 68313, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

This is true *C. delalandi*, agreeing with specimens from Rio de Janeiro. The locality, Rio Grande do Sul, has not yet been mentioned for this species, and I do not believe it occurs there, as that province is the home of *C. loddigesi*.

13. Agleactis caumatonota (GOULD) ex Peru; correct.
No. 39931, Matara Ayaencho, October 22, 1864 (Walter S. Church). Type of *A. Oliveira* LAWR.

This specimen appears not to be different from true *A. caumatonota* GLD., the type of which came likewise from Peru.


This is evidently the species named *U. quadricolor* by Mr. D. G. Elliot, but it is not the *quadricolor* of Vieillot, which I believe to be the Proc. N. M. 88——36
same as the bird which we used to call *U. cyanocephala*. In his description of *Trochilus quadricolor*, Vieillot says, "un beau vert brille sur les flancs," which is by no means the case in *U. quadricolor* of Elliot, but applies well to *U. cyanocephala* auct. Therefore it becomes necessary to bestow a new name upon the species named *U. quadricolor* by Mr. Elliot, and I propose to call it in future *U. ellioti* BERL. I believe the locality, Mazatlan, has not been mentioned elsewhere for this species.

15. **Uranomitra quadricolor** (VIEILL.) juv. fere pull. ex Orizaba = *Sphenoproctus curvipennis* (LICHT.)

No. 38224 (juv. fere pull.) Orizaba (Botteri).

This is by no means an *Uranomitra*, but a very young bird of *Sphenoproc tus curvipennis*, which is evident from the long yellowish legs and claws, as well as from the structure of the wings and the blackish tail-feathers, also the grass green color of the back, etc.

16. **Uranomitra viridifrons** Elliot; correct.

No. 57774, male, Tehuantepec, Sta. Efigenia, 22d December, 1863 (Prof. F. Sumichrast).

This species, which agrees with *U. violiceps* in the coppery hue on the tail-feathers, I had never seen before. The locality, Tehuantepec, is interesting as showing that *U. viridifrons* occurs in a locality where *U. violiceps* is also found. I confess I am not quite convinced that these forms are really distinct specifically.

17. **Uranomitra guatemalensis** Gould ex Tres Marias; name correct, locality erroneous.

No. 25855, female, Tres Marias, July, 1861 (Xantus).

Agrees with specimens from Guatemala. The locality, Tres Marias, is doubtless erroneous. See remarks under the head of *Florisuga melivora*, etc.

18. **Agyrtria tephrocephala** (VIEILL.) ex Surinam = *A. viridissima* (LESS.).

No. 70577, Surinam (C. F. Hering).

This is by no means *A. tephrocephala* (VIEILL.), which is a much larger bird with uniform pure white under tail coverts, and is exclusively found in Southern Brazil. The Surinam bird belongs to the species sometimes called *A. lianeci*, or more recently by Mr. D. G. Elliott *A. tolaci* (GML.). I, however, believe it entitled to the name of *A. viridis sima* (LESS.), the *Trochilus tobaci* of Gmelin being most probably the same as *Pyrrhophenna erythronota*.

19. **Amazilia cyanura** GOULD ex Retaleuleu, Guatemala; correct.

No. 33654, Guatemala, Retaleuleu, Pacific coast, September, 1862 (O. Salvin).

This is an excellent species which I had not seen before, it being somewhat rare in collections. It comes nearest to *A. devillei sive mari e* (BOURC.), but is easily distinguishable by its steel-blue tail, bluish instead of rufous under tail coverts, and the greater restriction of the cinnamon color on the base of the secondaries. The green of the body above and
beneath is of a darker hue and of a more bluish cast, and this color extends over the middle of the back, which in *A. devillei* is of the same coppery bronze as the lower back.


No. 17902, male, Turbo (Schott).

The Turbo bird belongs to the race with a glittering brilliant crown, viz, true *D. julie* (Bourc.), of which *J. typica* Br. and *J. feliciana* Less. are synonyms, and not to the form with a dull colored crown inhabiting Panama, which I have named *D. panamensis* (*cf.* Journ. für Orn., 1884, p. 312).


No. 68312, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

Agrees with specimens from Rio de Janeiro and Bahia. I much doubt the correctness of the habitat Rio Grande do Sul, the species not having been mentioned from there elsewhere.

22. *Hylocharis cyanea* (Vieill.) *ex* Rio Grande do Sul; name correct, locality probably erroneous.

No. 68315, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

As in the case of *H. sapphirina*, I doubt the correctness of the habitat. The specimen agrees with others from Rio de Janeiro and Bahia.


This is by no means *C. caeruleigularis* (Gld.), but belongs to *C. luminosa*, agreeing perfectly with specimen No. 17911 (named *luminosa*) in size and general coloration. The blue on the throat appearing here and there I regard to be simply the result of an abrasion of the feathers. In fact the bird is in much worn plumage.


No. 17911, Cartagena (A. Schott).

Beyond the differences stated by Mr. George N. Lawrence to exist between this species and *S. goudoti* I may note that in *C. luminosa* the upper part of the head is of a much darker and a quite dull green of a bluish cast (being somewhat luminous green in *C. goudoti*), and that it has a much shorter bill.


No. 68310, male, Rio Grande do Sul (Albuquerque).

This is true *Chl. pucherani*, agreeing with specimens from Rio de Janeiro in my collection. In Rio Grande do Sul *Chl. pucherani* is replaced by *Chl. splendidus egregius* Heine, which has a much longer bill. It follows that the locality given by Albuquerque must be erroneous, and in fact his specimen is of the unmistakable make of all the skins imported from Rio de Janeiro.
26. Chlorostilbon pucherani (Bourc. & Mul.) ex Tres Marías; name correct, locality erroneous.
No. 25556, Tres Marías Islands, July, 1861 (John Xantus). Type of Ch. insularis Lawr.

This specimen is certainly referable to Chl. pucherani, as already pointed out by Messrs. Elliot and Ridgway. It is a young male in not quite mature plumage. The make-up of the skin is that of all the skins received from Rio de Janeiro, and the habitat, Tres Marías Islands, is no doubt erroneous.

27. Chlorostilbon angustipennis (Fras.) female, ex Cartago = Chl. salvini (Cab. & Heine).
No. 42986, female, Cartago, January, 1866 (J. Cooper).

I am not quite sure if this is really a female of Chl. assimilis Lawr., united by Mr. Elliot (incorrectly as I believe) with his "angustipennis" (not of Fraser). Before having seen an adult male of Chl. assimilis from Costa Rica I am rather inclined to believe the female from Cartago to be referable to Chl. salvini (Cab. & Heine). It has a uniformly black upper mandible, but the basal half of the under mandible is flesh-colored, while it is uniformly black in the male of Chl. assimilis.

28. Chlorostilbon angustipennis (Fras.) male, juvenile, ex Pebas = Chl. daphne "Bourc." Gould.
No. 55382, male, Pebas, Peru (Orton).

This is not angustipennis of Elliot, nor of Fraser, but belongs to the section of Chlorostilbon with a square tail, of which Chl. prasinus is the type. I believe the young male from Pebas entitled to the name of Chl. daphne "Bourc." Gould, of which Chl. peruanus Gould is probably a synonym.

The following notes relate to some other types of birds of different families belonging to the U. S. National Museum, which were kindly sent to me for examination in 1886:

1. Campylorhynchus brevipennis Lawr. = C. nuchalis Cab., juvenile!

This is certainly a very young bird of C. nuchalis Cab. I got a similar specimen from Puerto Cabello, which is in more advanced plumage, but presents still all the peculiarities of coloration which induced Mr. Lawrence to institute a new species. I possess also young birds of C. pardus Br. from Baranquilla, and of C. brevirostris Lajfr. from Bogota, which are in a similar stage of plumage.

2. Saltator fulviventris Lawr. = S. coerulescens Vieill., juvenile.

This is evidently an immature bird in transition plumage, and I have not the slightest doubt that it is the young of S. coerulescens Vieill.
S. fulviventris Lawr. has not been mentioned in Mr. Sclater's Catalogue of the Tanagridae (Vol. xi of Catalogue British Museum).

3. Philydor rufobrunneus Lawr.—bona species, potius Automolus!

Apparently an excellent species which seems to have its nearest ally in Automolus rubiginosus Scl. It is certainly not a Philydor. The type, as far as I know, remains still unique. From A. rubiginosus it may be distinguished by the following diagnosis:

Ph. rubiginosus affinis, sed coloribus multo dilutioribus, capite supra obscure olivaceo-brunneo (nec rufobrunneo), capitis lateribus ochraceo variegatis. Gula dilutior ochraceo plumis gule inferioris lateraliter fusco marginatis, pectore olivaceo tintoe pallide ochraceo striato. Abdomine brunneescintiore. Dorso uropygio, alis caudaeque necnon tectricibus subcaudalibus pallidioribus. Alis caudaeque longioribus, rostro vero multo breviore, mandibula fere omnino fusca distinguendus. Al. 94, caud. 92, mandibula 13\frac{3}{4}, tars. 26\frac{4}{4} mm.

4. Philydor virgatus Lawr.—bona species, potius Automolus.

This may be a valid species but not of the genus Philydor, as I think. In fact, it seems to be a close ally of Automolus subulatus (Spix) ex Amazonia, from which it may be distinguished by the following points of difference: Bill longer and somewhat stronger, the upper mandible darker in color. The ground color of the top of the head more blackish. The ochraceous stripes there and still more on the hind neck on the upper back are much more pronounced. The ground color everywhere on the upper parts darker or more blackish. The under parts of the body are rather lighter in color. Throat and breast of a clearer ochraceous. Wings and tail somewhat longer. (Al. 84\frac{3}{4}, caud. 72, culm. 23\frac{3}{4}, tars. 20\frac{4}{4} mm.)

5. Automolus rufescens Lawr.—Philydor panerythrus Scl.

I have had no typical specimens of Ph. panerythrus Scl. from Colombia for comparison, but a specimen from Veragua in my collection agrees very well with the type of A. rufescens Lawr. The latter is but a little paler and has somewhat shorter wings; al. 95\frac{2}{4}, caud. 86, culm. 19\frac{4}{4}, tars. 22\frac{2}{4} mm. Mr. O. Salvin, in Ibis, 1870, p. 110, has already stated the absolute identity of Lawrence's type with Sclate's type of Ph. panerythrus.

6. Anabazenops lineatus Lawr. should stand as A. subalaris lineatus (Lawr.).

In the Ibis, 1870, p. 110, Mr. O. Salvin declared that the type of A. lineatus Lawr. differed in no way from the types of A. subalaris Scl. from
Ecuador. Having compared the above type with another skin from Costa Rica in my collection and specimens from Western Ecuador (true subalaris), I have found several slight though apparently constant points of difference which induce me to regard A. lineatus as a northern form or subspecies of A. subalaris, from which it may be distinguished by the following diagnosis:

+ A. subalaris lineatus (Lawr.).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. subalaris SCL.:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, March 16, 1883</td>
<td>86²</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19⁴</td>
<td>22⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, February 13, 1883</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19⁴</td>
<td>22⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Male, Cayandeled, Western Ecuador, February 1, 1883</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19⁴</td>
<td>22⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Male, Pedregal (2,800'), Western Ecuador, February 14, 1883</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Female, Chaquarpata (5,700') Western Ecuador, March 5, 1883</td>
<td>83²</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>19⁴</td>
<td>21⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. subalaris lineatus LAWR.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female, Angostura, Costa Rica, April 21, 1864 (type)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20⁴</td>
<td>22⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Adult, Costa Rica, Mus. H. v. B.</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>21½</td>
<td>24⁴</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MUENDEN, May, 1889.
Berlepsch, Hans Hermann Carl Ludwig,


View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/32566
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5479/si.00963801.755.559
Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/40691

Holding Institution
Smithsonian Libraries

Sponsored by
Smithsonian

Copyright & Reuse
Copyright Status: NOT_IN_COPYRIGHT

This document was created from content at the Biodiversity Heritage Library, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org.

This file was generated 17 July 2023 at 12:56 UTC