A New Flycatcher from Venezuela, with Remarks on the Mocquerys Collection and the Piculet, *Picumnus squamulatus*

By John T. Zimmer and William H. Phelps

The finding in the Phelps Collection of a new subspecies of *Myiophobus flavicans* from Caripe, Venezuela, while at the same time there are two Mocqueries specimens in the American Museum of the race *venezuelanus* (north-central and western Venezuela), also labeled “Caripé,” has led to a review of all the Mocqueries specimens. For a long time, in literature, the accuracy of the Mocqueries “Caripé” locality has been questioned.

Specimens listed as examined are in the American Museum of Natural History unless otherwise specified. Names of colors are capitalized when direct comparison has been made with Ridgway’s “Color standards and color nomenclature,” 1912.

*Myiophobus flavicans caripensis*, new subspecies

**Type**: From Cerro Negro, Caripe, Estado Monagas, Venezuela; 1500 meters. No. 23170, Phelps Collection, Caracas, Venezuela. Adult male collected August 24, 1943, by Fulvio Benedetti. (Type on deposit at the American Museum of Natural History.)

**Diagnosis**: Nearest to *M. f. venezuelanus* (Hellmayr) of the mountains of north-central and northwestern Venezuela but differs from all races of *M. flavicans* by having the mandible flesh color instead of brown, and the maxilla brownish instead of blackish. Differs additionally from *venezuelanus* by lacking the buffy inner margins of the rectrices, by having the outer margins darker, sooty olive, the outer web of the outermost rectrix less obviously pale, and the general ground color of the tail darker, more sooty; upper parts darker, more brownish, less yellowish; the olivaceous wash across the breast lacking; wing bands less prominent; inner
margins of remiges paler, duller, less deeply buffy; outer margins of primaries dark, in contrast to those of secondaries which, in turn, are darker and duller than in *venezuelanu*s; tertials without broad pale margins; and wing shorter.

RANGE: Known only from the Subtropical Zone on Cerro Negro, Caripe, at 1500 meters elevation.

DESCRIPTION OF TYPE: Top of head Olive-Citrine, merging into the Dull Citrine of the nape which, in turn, merges into the more Medal Bronze × Dark Citrine of the back, lighter and warmer on the uropygium; a large semi-concealed crown patch near Lemon Chrome; lores and faint eye ring pale yellowish; ear-coverts light Yellowish-Citrine; point of chin slightly whitish; throat, breast, and abdomen light Citron Yellow; sides and thighs washed with olivaceous, and flanks with ochraceous brown. Wings dusky brown; tertials heavily margined externally, except apically, with Chamois × Warm Buff; remiges edged internally with pale buffy, except apically, more extensively inwardly; upper wing-coverts, except primary ones, margined with brownish citrine; bend of wing pale yellowish; under wing-coverts and axillaries largely yellowish white, pale brownish at base of primaries. Tail Hair Brown × Chaetura Drab; rectrices, except outermost, finely margined with citrine to near tips; outer web of outermost pair slightly paler except apically. Bill (in life) with maxilla "black," mandible "yellow"; (in dried skin) maxilla brown, mandible flesh color. Wing, 63 mm.; tail, 52; culmen from base, 13.5; tarsus, 16.

REMARKS: Sexes alike in color except that the female lacks the crown patch and is smaller. Wings shorter than in *venezuelanu*s. Measurements of one adult female: wing, 58 mm.; tail, 47; culmen from base, 13.5. Measurements of *venezuelanu*s (eight from Galipán, the type locality): five adult males: wing, 66.5–68 (64.9); tail, 53–56 (54.4); culmen from base, 13–14 (13.7); five adult females: wing, 61–63 (62); tail, 50–53 (50.8); culmen from base, 12–13.5 (13).

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

*M. f. caripensis.*—VENEZUELA: Cerro Negro, Caripe,1 1♂ (type), 1♀.

*M. f. venezuelanu*s.—VENEZUELA: Cerro Pejochaína, Perijá, 6♂, 5♀; Páramo Zumbador, Táchira,1 1♂ juv., 1♀; Queníquera,1 2♂; Seboruco,1 2♂, 1♀; Quintero, Mérida,1 1♂; Valle,1 1♂; Páramo La Culata, 1 (?) Páramo El Escorial, 1 (?); Cerro Niquitaz, Trujillo,1 1♀; Cubiro, Lara,1 1♂; Cumbre de Valencia, 1♂, 1♀; Colonia Tovar,1 1♂, 1♀; El Junquito, 2♂, 3♂,1 1♀, 2♀; Galipán, 7♂, 3♀; Silla de Caracas, 1♀; Cerro El Avila,1 1 juv. (?); Hacienda Izcaragua, Guarenas,1 1♂, 3♀.

1 Specimens in the Phelps Collection, Caracas, Venezuela.
M. f. flavicans.—COLOMBIA: El Roble, 2 ♂; Río Toché, 1 ♂; Tochecito, 1 ♂; Cocal, 1 ♂; Cerro Munchique, 1 ♂; El Edén, 1 ♂, 2 ♀; San Antonio, 2 ♀; Santa Elena, 1 ♂, 1 ♀; Anolaima, 1 ♀; “Bogotá,” 14. ECUADOR: Pichincha, 1 ♀; Canzacota, 1 ♂; lower Sumaco, 2 ♂, 2 ♀; Puente del Río Quijos, 1 ♀; Salvas, 1 (?) Zen; Zaruma, 2 ♂, 2 ♀, 1 (?) Zen; Papallacta, 2 ♂; San Bartolo, 2 ♂, 2 ♀; Baeza, 4 ♂, 2 ♀, 1 (?) Zen; El Chiral, 5 ♂, 3 ♀, 1 (?) Zen; Alamor, 3 ♂, 3 ♀; Río Oyacachi, below Chaco, 3 ♂, 2 ♀; “Ecuador,” 1 (?). PERÚ: Chaupe, 4 ♂, 2 ♀.

M. f. superciliaris.—PERÚ: La Lejía, 1 ♀.

In the Rothschild Collection of the American Museum of Natural History, there are two specimens of this species, collected by Albert Mocquerys and labeled “Caripe, January, 1894,” collector’s no. 207, male [juvenile], and no. 234, female, respectively. These are different from the form we are describing here but are similar to topotypical specimens of venezuelanus from the Caracas mountains. There is no doubt, therefore, that the given locality is erroneous, especially in view of other evidence of somewhat the same nature.

Two “Caripe” specimens of Pipreola formosa should be P. f. rubidior but are quite clearly P. f. formosa, characterized by the large size of the white spots on the tertials. This species, therefore, joins Myiophobus flavicans venezuelanus in supplying positive evidence of erroneous labeling, since neither could have come from Caripe as stated.

Hellmayr and others long suspected that the Mocquerys specimens from Caripe and the near-by El Guácharo (and possibly some other places) were unreliable, and in various of Hellmayr’s papers the accuracy of the locality was queried for the following species (including also a Basileuterus discussed in another paragraph, below):

Dysithamnus plumbeus tucuyensis
Herpsilochmus rufimarginatus frater
Chamaea ruficauda chionogaster
Grallaricula loricata
Henicorhina leucophrys venezuelensis
Tanagra xanthogaster exsul
Tangara arthus arthus
Compsocoma flavinucha venezuelana
Rhodinocichla rosea rosea

To these doubtful records we now add the following:

Odontophorus columbianus
Coeligena coeligens coeligens
teleonema filicauda
Chlorospingus ophthalamicus jacqueti
Atlapetes brunnneinucha xanthogenys

In all these cases the doubt arises because of the fact that, except for the Mocquerys specimens and in spite of other collections made in the
region, there is no evidence of the occurrence of the species in question (in the case of the present new flycatcher, of the subspecies) in that part of Venezuela. We find it incredible that Mocquerys, who made a brief and hurried excursion to Caripé for the express purpose of collecting the “Guácharo” (*Steatornis caripensis*), should have obtained as many unique records as his labels would indicate, especially since he obtained only one “Guácharo”! On the other hand, his birds, ostensibly from that place, agree with examples from farther west, some of which are of his own collection.

In one other case, mentioned by Phelps and Phelps (1948, Bol. Soc. Venezolana Cien. Nat., no. 72, pp. 193, 194), a Mocquerys specimen of *Philydor rufus* from “Caripé” is somewhat different from the known forms of its species from any other part of Venezuela and cannot well be assigned to any of them. No member of the species is otherwise known from Caripé, but it is just possible that the locality in this case is correct.

Two additional cases are of less positive significance but deserve mention as possibly being erroneous:

*Basileuterus tristriatus meridanus*

*Cyanocompsa cyanoides cyanoides*

The first of these was queried by Hellmayr. Neither species has been found certainly in the Caripé region, but both are now known to occur on the Paria Peninsula, farther eastward, in each case in a different subspecies from that of the Mocquerys birds. The known specific ranges, however, enclose Caripé, and it is thus possible that both species occur there, although in what form remains to be determined. In the case of *Cyanocompsa*, if a local form exists at Caripé, the bird may be *C. c. cyanoides* but could be *C. c. rothschildi* or new; the *Basileuterus* should be *B. t. pariae*, *B. t. bessereri*, or new, but quite improbably *meridanus*, to which the Mocquerys birds belong.

In addition to the species listed as of questionable origin, there are various others also labeled “Caripé” and “El Guácharo” that may well have been taken at these places, but the assurance is given not by these specimens themselves but by material collected by subsequent workers of greater reliability. Since the forms are thus known to occur there, these Mocquerys birds may be accepted as validly labeled, at least until future evidence may be forthcoming.

We are greatly indebted to Miss Phyllis Thomas of the Tring Museum for an opportunity to examine some of the Mocquerys correspondence from Venezuela, written to Lord Rothschild. It appears, for example, that the “Caripé” collection was not forwarded from the neighboring port of
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Cumaná but from Puerto Cabello, Mocquerys' center of operations for much of his other work. His letters bewail the scarcity of birds on the Caripe trip (perhaps only the "Guácharo" was meant although not so stated) and the hardships of the road inland from the coast, neither of which statements supports the idea of an outstanding series of specimens and new records. The conclusion is evident that the meager collection from Caripe, if indeed it comprised more than a "Guácharo," was augmented by additions obtained nearer Puerto Cabello where he could operate at minimum expense—a factor of much importance to him, judging by some of his correspondence. Irregularity in the numbering of some of his specimens further suggests that some material was added out of order.

An interesting sidelight on what may have been a romantic strain in

**FIG. 1.** Photograph taken at the Hacienda "Mariara," between Valencia and Maracay, Venezuela, in 1894. Seated, left to right: Federico Moser, Albert Mocquerys, Emilio Visot. Standing, left to right: Walter Blau, Alberto Moser.
Albert Mocquerys is provided by a story he told to friends in Venezuela to account for a lameness in one of his legs. According to his account he was one of five members of an expedition in the Belgian Congo who were captured by cannibals and who had their legs broken to prevent their escape before their time came to be eaten. He was rescued by the Belgians who had been notified by other members of the expedition who had escaped capture. His story is interesting but, like the dubious Caripe records, requires confirmation. For this biographical note we are indebted to Señor Luis Taborda of Valencia, Venezuela, to whom it was related by Don Alberto Moser, presumably the same gentleman whose picture appears with that of Mocquerys and others in figure 1.

*Picumnus squamulatus squamulatus* Lafresnaye


Todd (1946, Ann. Carnegie Mus., vol. 30, p. 313) was unable to confirm the distinctness of our *Picumnus squamulatus röhli* (Zimmer and Phelps, 1944, Amer. Mus. Novitates, no. 1270, p. 6), since his north Venezuelan specimens were not different from his large series of specimens from northeastern Boyacá, Colombia, which he assumed to be practically topotypical *squamulatus*.

Unfortunately for his contention, this assumption was incorrect. Examination of the type of *squamulatus* in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, shows it (and another original Lafresnaye specimen, also labeled “Colombia”) to be like “Bogotá” specimens which, in turn, are different from the Boyacá series, having wider and blacker squamulations below.

In the Carnegie Museum, beside the large series of *röhli* from several localities near the northeastern border of the Department of Boyacá, there is one specimen from Santa Marta. All these are similar one to the other and to the large series of *röhli* from northern Venezuela in the Carnegie Museum, the American Museum of Natural History, and the Phelps Collection, Caracas.

The two Lafresnaye skins in the Museum of Comparative Zoology labeled “Colombia” (a male and the female type) are entirely similar one to the other and with fully as black and heavy margins on the feathers of the under parts as the blackest of the eight “Bogotá” skins in the American Museum.

The Bogotá trade skins in the American Museum have these margins blacker than does the series from Villavicencio, Buena Vista, and Llanos del Meta, also in the American Museum, but the latter have definitely
blacker and wider squamulations than those from northern Venezuela, the Department of Boyacá, and Santa Marta. Quite correctly, de Schauens-
see (1949, Caldasia, vol. 5, p. 642) calls the birds of the Santa Marta and Cúcuta regions of Colombia röhli.

In view of all the above we propose the restriction of the type locality of squamulatus to Villavicencio, Colombia.

SPECIMENS EXAMINED

*P. s. squamulatus.*—COLOMBIA: “Colombia” = Villavicencio,1 1 [♂], 1 [♀] (type); Villavicencio, 3 ♂, 1 [♀]; Buena Vista, 2 ♂, 3 ♀, 1 (?); Llanos del Río Meta, 2 [♂]; Quetame, 1 ♂; “Bogotá,” 6 [♂], 2 [♀].

*P. s. röhli.*—COLOMBIA2: Palmar, Boyacá, 3 ♂, 3 ♀, 2 juv.; Río Negro, Boyacá, 5 ♂, 1 juv.; La Colorada, Boyacá, 2 ♀; Fundación, Santa Marta, 1 ♀. VENEZUELA: La Fría, Táchira,1 1 ♀; Río Socuy, Zulia,3 1 ♀; Hacienda Izcaragua, Guarenas,1 1 ♂; Cumanacoa,1 1 [♂], 1 ♀. In Carnegie Museum, 52 (Guachi, Zulia; Sabana de Mendoza; Anzoátegui; Guarico; El Hacha; Aroa; Las Quiguas; San Esteban; Sierra de Carabobo; El Trompillo; El Limón; Puerto de La Cruz; Pie del Cerro; Santa Lucia; San Rafael, Sucre; Mirasol; Cumanacoa). In the American Museum of Natural History, 25 (La Ortiza, Táchira; Egido; Tucacas; Las Quiguas; Cumbre Chiquita; La Silla; Cotiza [type]; “Cumaná”; Rincón de San Antonio; Cumanacoa; Los Palmales; Caripe). In Phelps Collection, Caracas, 127 (States of Zulia, 39; Táchira, 13; Barinas, 8; Apure [Guasdualito, El Amparo], 12; Mérida, 3; Falcón, 6; Lara, 1; Portuguesa, 2; Carabobo, 6; Aragua, 4; Distrito Federal, 8; Miranda, 14; Guárico, 4; Anzoátegui, 4; Sucre [Los Altos], 2; Monagas [Caripe], 1).

*P. s. obsoletus.*—VENEZUELA: El Pilar (type), 1 ♂; Guaraúnos, El Pilar,4 1 ♂, 1 ♀; Yaguaraparo,4 2 ♂, 4 ♀.

---

1 Specimens in Museum of Comparative Zoology.
2 Specimens in Carnegie Museum.
3 Specimens in Pons Collection, Maracaibo.
4 Specimens in Phelps Collection, Caracas.