AMERICAN MUSEUM NOVITATES

Published by
Number 1133 THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY August 6, 1941
New York City

BIRDS COLLECTED DURING THE WHITNEY SOUTH SEA EXPEDITION. XLV[1]

NOTES ON NEW GUINEA BIRDS. VIII[2]

By Ernst Mayr

FALCONIDAE

THE GEOGRAPHICAL VARIATION OF *FALCO PEREGRINUS* IN THE PAPUAN AND AUSTRALIAN REGIONS

Work in this species is handicapped by the scarcity of material from the tropical parts of the range. The Rothschild collection, for example, does not contain a single specimen from Borneo, the type locality of *ernesti* Sharpe, or from any of the other Sunda Islands. On the other hand, the Whitney–Rothschild collection contains ten specimens from New Guinea and New Britain. A single adult male from Celebes (Heinrich coll.) agrees perfectly with a series of four adult males from New Guinea and New Britain. If all of these birds are different from *ernesti* (Borneo), a point which I cannot decide for lack of material, the New Guinea population would have to take the name *heinrichi* Kleinschmidt given to a Celebes bird (type, Museum König, Bonn). According to Stresemann (1940, Journ. f. Orn., LXXXVIII, p. 469) there is no difference between Celebes and Java birds. The picture of Java birds published by Kuroda (1936, Birds of Java, II, Pl. XXIII) also agrees very well with the New Guinea series.

Falco peregrinus ernesti Sharpe

CHARACTERS (based on the New Guinea series).—Upper parts very black with irregular gray bars on middle and lower back, getting more pronounced on rump and upper tail-coverts; throat and breast rather pale with a not very pronounced rufous ochraceous wash; cheeks and malar region solid black; lower breast, abdomen, flanks, and under tail-coverts gray, heavily barred with black; most specimens also show a slight rufous wash of the under parts, particularly the females; immatures lack the grayness of the under parts but are very heavily streaked, on the flanks these streaks broaden to bars.

Wing, ♂ ad. 277, 279, 283, ♀ ad. 319, 322, 330, 331, 340, ♀ imm. 322, 328, 330. Culmen (from cere), ♂ ad. 20, 20, 21, 21, ♀ ad. 23, 24, 24.5, 25, 25, ♀ imm. 22, 24, 24.

Of Australian birds (*macropus*), not enough material is available to judge geographical variation. A single specimen from southwestern Australia is much more rufous underneath than eastern Australian birds. It was named *submelanogenys* by Mathews. A single adult female from northwestern Australia (Capt. Bowyer Bowen coll.) is much paler above and below than eastern Australian birds and has the barring of the under parts reduced. How far these differences are due to individual variation and how far to geographical variation cannot be decided on the basis of the present material.

East of Australia, on the New Hebrides, lives a form which in its characters is some-

[1] Previous papers in this series comprise American Museum Novitates, Nos. 115, 124, 149, 322, 337, 350, 356, 364, 365, 370, 419, 469, 486, 488, 489, 502, 504, 516, 520, 522, 531, 590, 609, 628, 651, 665, 666, 709, 714, 820, 828, 912, 915, 933, 939, 947, 977, 986, 1006, 1007, 1056, 1057, 1091 and 1116.

[2] The present paper is the last in my series of revisions of New Guinea genera. Submitted to the editor on Nov. 10, 1940.

what intermediate between the New Guinea and the Australian falcons but which is quite distinct from either race. It may be characterized as follows:

Falco peregrinus nesiotes, new subspecies

TYPE.—No. 306376, Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist.; ♂ ad.; Tanna Island, New Hebrides; April 8, 1936; L. Macmillan coll.

ADULT MALE.—Upper parts as black as those of *ernesti;* under parts similar to those of *macropus* (Australia), but black bars heavier; breast and under parts more deeply washed with rufous; black bars on under wing broader and more numerous, pale bars on primaries less pronounced; differs from *ernesti* by the much less heavy barring of the under parts, by the reduction of the gray wash to flanks and thighs and by the deeper rufous wash of the under parts.

ADULT FEMALE.—Differs from *macropus* by the blackish upper parts and the much more heavy barring of the under parts, and from *ernesti* by the absence of the gray wash of the under parts, the narrower black bars and the stronger rufous wash.

Wing, ♂ ad. 287+, ♂ imm. 295, ♀ imm. 327; tail, ♂ 131, 142, ♀ 160, 161; culmen, ♂ 18, 19, ♀ 22, 23.

RANGE.—Tanna Island, New Hebrides, and Beaupre Island, Loyalty Islands. Also observed by Macmillan on Uvea, Lifu and Maré Islands, Loyalty Islands. Reported by Layard from Efate, New Hebrides, and from New Caledonia. The species is, undoubtedly, present on all the islands where suitable cliffs exist.

This falcon has also been found in the Fiji Islands, but the material before me is very unsatisfactory. It consists of a native collected flat skin from Taviuni (♀ ad.) and an adult male in excellent condition which died after having lived in the New York Zoölogical Park for one year and four months. The captivity bird is much deeper rufous chestnut below than any of the wild-killed males of the neighboring races. The barring of the abdomen is intermediate between *ernesti* and *nesiotes*, and there is a considerable amount of gray wash, though not quite as much as in *ernesti*. I prefer to keep the Fiji population with *nesiotes* until more adequate material is available.

MUSCICAPIDAE

ON *RHIPIDURA RUFIFRONS LOUISIADENSIS* HARTERT

In a recent note in the Ibis (1938, p. 762), Charles M. N. White suggests that *Rhipidura rufifrons louisiadensis* Hartert might be based on migrating specimens of *Rh. r. rufifrons* (Latham) from Australia. This suggestion is quite misleading. *Rh. r. louisiadenis* has nothing to do with *rufifrons*, but it is closely related to *granti* and *commoda* from the Solomon Islands, differing from *granti* by the brown (not black) ear-coverts, and from *commoda* by its larger size (wing, ♂ ad. 76–81, ♀ ad. 71–75).

It differs from *rufifrons* by the much deeper coloration throughout. Forehead, lower back, rump and base of tail are deep rufous tawny, almost chestnut. The brown of crown and upper back is washed with rufous. The black spot on the throat is much larger. All the tail-feathers, except the central pair, are broadly tipped with pure white, while in *rufifrons* they are only shaded with pale buffy gray. Tail longer, about 83–93, against 75–85 in *rufifrons*.

I have examined 31 specimens of *louisiadensis* from various localities in the Louisiades and the D'Entrecasteaux Archipelagoes. Many were in breeding condition and most of them were collected during November to February, the Australian breeding season. Not one of the specimens from the Louisiades in the American Museum (including the Rothschild coll.) belongs to typical *rufifrons*. The winter range of *rufifrons* is apparently restricted to the Fly River region and the Gulf of Papua.

NOTES ON THE GEOGRAPHICAL VARIATION OF *MONARCHA ALECTO*

In 1928 G. M. Mathews (Bull. Brit. Orn. Club, XLVIII, p. 93) described some subspecies of this species, but as Dr. Hartert pointed out correctly (1930, Novit. Zool., XXXVI, p. 72), he compared his "new" forms in every case with those of other races of the species to which they were the least related. In a recent paper (1937, Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., LXXIII, p. 151) Rand and I pointed out the fact that there was considerable variation within the range of so-called *Monarcha alecto chalybeocephalus* and that the species was in urgent need of revision.

The following forms can be recognized:

Monarcha alecto alecto Temminck, 1827—northern Moluccas.

Monarcha alecto longirostris Mathews, 1928—Timorlaut.

These two forms are outside the scope of the present paper and shall not be discussed further. I may mention, however, that the adult females of *alecto* differ from New Guinea females by having the back washed with grayish which gives it an olive hue instead of the bright chestnut of *chalybeocephalus*.

Monarcha alecto nitidus Gould, 1841—northern Australia.

Mathews has separated from this form not less than four other subspecies. Prior to additional revisionary work, I shall group all Australian birds under the name *nitidus*. The females of this form have a very dark and dull rufous brown back, but the metallic blue of the crown does not spread to the upper back.

A series collected on Daru Island by the Archbold Expedition of 1933–1934 belongs clearly to this race. It is probable that the species breeds on Daru Island and is not just a winter visitor from Australia.

Monarcha alecto rufolateralis Gray, 1858—Aru Islands.

A very dark race. The metallic blue of the crown spreads in the adult female onto the upper back.

Monarcha alecto manumudari Rothschild and Hartert, 1915—Vulcan Island.

The largest race. Gloss of males rather greenish.

These are the clear-cut races. The remainder of the range of the species, comprising all New Guinea, the eastern and western Papuan Islands, the islands of Geelvink Bay, the Bismarck Archipelago and the Admiralty Islands are occupied by an intergrading and irregularly varying assemblage of populations.

Fairly clear-cut, but tending to intergrade on the D'Entrecasteaux Archipelago is the form of the Louisiades:

Monarcha alecto lucidus Gray, 1858—Sudest Island.

Size large, particularly of the bill; adult females light chestnut, distinctly lighter than New Guinea birds.

Seven females from Sudest and St. Aignan form a uniform series with very little individual variation. The darkest specimen is slightly lighter than the two darkest birds of a series of 16 adult New Britain females, and only the lightest Sudest bird falls outside the darkest third of the New Britain series.

Woodlark Island (7♀) and Trobriand Islands (2♀).—Form a uniform series which agrees perfectly with Sudest Island birds.

D'Entrecasteaux Archipelago.—Four of the five adult females form a uniform series and fall within the darkest third of the New Britain series. One single bird, however, is darker than the darkest New Britain bird, but agrees quite well with New Guinea specimens.

Monarcha alecto chalybeocephalus Garnot, 1828—New Ireland.

Under this name a great number of island populations are combined in some of which the females have a pale back, in others a dark chestnut one.

Pale birds are found on New Hanover, New Ireland, New Britain, the French Islands, Rook Island, Dampier Island and in the Astrolabe Bay district in New Guinea.

Dark birds are found on Feni Island, all New Guinea, Japen, Waigeu and Misol.

Very dark birds on the Admiralty Islands, Numfor and Biak. In view of the irregularity of this distribution and the considerable individual variation exhibited by the birds of the larger islands (for example, New Britain) it seems inadvisable to recognize two names, one for the populations

with light females (*chalybeocephalus*) and one for those with dark females (*novaeguineensis* Mathews). Dr. Hartert had already reached the same conclusion (1930, *loc. cit.*).

The gloss of males is sometimes more bluish, sometimes more greenish, but exceedingly variable within each population. This character is of no help in subdividing the above united assemblage of populations. Size variation is irregular. Populations from the following islands show large measurements and might conceivably be included with *lucidus:* Numfor, Dampier Island, and Manus, Admiralty Islands.

NOTES ON *POECILODRYAS PLACENS*

Poecilodryas placens (Ramsay)

There are absolutely no differences between fresh specimens from southeastern New Guinea, Astrolabe Bay and the type series of *clara* (*steini*) from the lower Menoo River. *Poecilodryas placens clara* Stresemann and Paludan must, therefore, be considered a synonym of typical *placens*.

THE GENERIC CLASSIFICATION OF SOME NEW GUINEA FLYCATCHERS (*MICROECA–POECILODRYAS* GROUP)

The generic subdivision of the New Guinea flycatchers has been a puzzle to the taxonomist ever since the various species were discovered. In recent years Mathews "simplified" matters by providing a generic name for nearly every species he knew. In many of the cases this was done without stating the characters that actually separate it from its nearest relative. In the difficult *Microeca–Poecilodryas* assemblage, we can distinguish two main groups, the *Microeca* group consisting of true flycatchers and the *Poecilodryas* group consisting (more or less) of undergrowth dwellers.

MICROECA GOULD

TYPE.—*Microeca leucophaea* (Latham).

A medium-sized species with a rather small and flat bill; feet weak and tarsus rather short (18–19% of the wing); tail short (63–64% of the wing). Detailed generic diagnosis in Mathews, Birds Australia, VIII, p. 62.

The following Papuan species are usually included in this genus:

Microeca flavigaster

Structurally very close to *leucophaea*. Fourth primary longest, third and fifth subequal instead of 3 = 4 > 5. Tail slightly longer (65–68% of the wing), tarsus shorter (17–18%).

It is quite impossible to separate this species generically from *Microeca* and *Kempia* Mathews is a clear synonym of *Microeca*.

Microeca griseoceps De Vis

A small species with rather weak feet (tarsus 17–18% of wing) but long tail (73–78% of wing). The first primary is much longer than in *leucophaea* (more than 50% of the second, against 35–40% in *leucophaea*).

In all other characters this is a typical *Microeca* and no reason exists to recognize *Kempiella* Mathews. Each one of these species presents certain structural peculiarities, but it would lead much too far to recognize monotypical genera for all of them.

Microeca flavovirescens Gray

A large bird also with a long tail (74–75% of wing), but with comparatively weak legs (tarsus 17% of wing). Bill rather long and deep and with a strong hook at the end. Second primary very short, first primary about 48% of second. Mathews proposed the genus *Dikempia* for this species (Birds Australia, VIII, p. 73).

Microeca papuana Meyer

A small bird with a short tail (60–63% of wing), but with strong feet and a long tarsus (22–24% of wing). The wing for-

mula is 4 = 5 > 3 > 6 > 7 > 2. The first primary is 54% of the second. The bill is comparatively small and flat. Mathews created the genus *Devioeca* for this species which is possibly justified as a subgenus.

In all these species the females are colored as the males and the birds in first-year plumage resemble adults except for wings and wing-coverts.

The juvenal dress is worn only for a very short time and is, therefore, unknown in some of the species, as for example, in *griseoceps*. In the species in which it is known (*leucophaea*, *flavigaster*, *flavovirescens*) it lacks the yellow lipochrom completely. The upper parts are brown with white tips on the feathers, the under parts are white with a liberal amount of brown, particularly on throat, breast and flanks. The juvenal plumage of *papuana* is not yet quite understood, since only immature birds with remainders of the nestling (juvenal) plumage are known. It is probably like that of the other species, but it is also possible that the feathers of the back are olive with yellowish-white tips. Such feathers are scattered through the back of immature birds, but do not seem to belong to the immature plumage.

TREGELLASIA MATHEWS

This genus was created for "*Eopsaltria*" *capito* Gould and in it was later included "*Poecilodryas*" *leucops* (Salvadori).

The genus differs from *Poecilodryas* principally by the flat bill and from *Microeca* by the much stronger feet and longer tarsus.

The type species is *capito* in which the tail is rather long (70–71% of the wing) and the tarsus 26.5–28.5% of the wing. The wing formula is 4 = 5 > 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 > 2. The first primary is short and the second very short.

Also included in this genus might be *leucops* with a much shorter tail (64–65% of the wing) but an equally long tarsus (26.5–27.5% of the wing). The bill is exactly as in *capito*. The wing formula is 4 = 5 > 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 = 2. First and second primaries are short, the first being exactly 50% of the second.

The genus differs from *Microeca* by its stronger and larger bill, its stronger feet and its more rounded wing. These characters are correlated with the habits of the species of this genus. They are not strictly flycatchers who sit quietly on a branch and catch flying prey, but they search for their food actively clinging to vines and searching through the undergrowth.

Ogilvie-Grant (1915, Ibis, Suppl., p. 161) has also placed *M. papuana* in this genus. This species is intermediate between *Microeca* and *Tregellasia* in the structure of its feet and in its wing formula, but it is better included in *Microeca*, principally on the basis of its bill.

The juvenal plumage in this genus is quite unlike that of *Microeca*. It is not spotted, but uniform brown, darker above and paler below. The middle of the upper throat is particularly pale and there is sometimes a faint streaking (light shaft-streaks) on the crown. The upper wing-coverts are brown as the back, but wing and tail-feathers are olive. The first-year plumage, which is acquired through an incomplete molt, retains the primary-coverts and some of the greater upper wing-coverts in addition to wing and tail-feathers.

Nestlings are similar to such of *Pachycephala*, but are dull brown, not rufous brown.

POECILODRYAS ASSEMBLAGE

There are eight species of birds on New Guinea which are usually included in the genus *Poecilodryas*. For these eight species Mathews uses seven genera: *Poecilodryas* (*hypoleuca*), *Leucophantes* (*brachyura*), *Peneoenanthe* (= *Quoyornis*) (*pulverulenta*), *Papualestes* (*cyana*), *Peneothello* (*sigillata*, *bimaculata*), *Gennaeodryas* (*placens*) and *Plesiodryas* (*albonotata*). Such an arrangement of monotypic genera is very unsatisfactory because it makes the use of specific names superfluous and is, furthermore, a severe handicap of the taxonomist's memory. On the other hand, *Poecilodryas* (*sensu lato*) is admittedly a heterogeneous assemblage.

Lacking anatomical evidence (which most likely would not be of any help anyhow) there are three sources of evidence toward a generic classification: (1) structure of bill, feet, etc., and proportions; (2)

color pattern of the adults; (3) color of the nestling plumage. On the basis of such evidence I would like to suggest the following subdivision of the *Poecilodryas* assemblage.

POECILODRYAS Gould

TYPE.—*Poecilodryas superciliosa* Gould.

A medium-sized bird with long tail (77–82%) and medium-sized tarsus (25.0–25.6%). The bill is strong, but flat, with a well-defined ridge on the culmen and a hook on the tip. The rictal bristles are long and strong. The wing is rounded 4 = 5 = 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 > 9 > 2. The first primary is very long (about 60% of the second). The color pattern is characteristic: under parts whitish, upper parts dark; a broad white wing-bar and white tips of the tail-feathers; lores and supercilium are white.

The juvenal plumage is plain brown, wing and tail being similar to that of the adults.

The following New Guinea species also seem to belong to this genus:

Poecilodryas brachyura Sclater

Very similar to *superciliosa* in general size, proportions and color pattern. Differs by not having any white on the tail, by having yellow feet and by the much shorter tail. The tail is about 60–63% of the wing and the tarsus 24.5–25.5%. There is no doubt that this species is congeneric with *superciliosa* and that *Leucophantes* Sclater is a synonym of *Poecilodryas*.

Poecilodryas hypoleuca Gray

General color pattern and proportion very similar to those of *superciliosa*. The tail is about 71–72% of the wing and the tarsus 24–25%. There is a little white on the tip of the outermost tail-feather and two large triangular black spots on the sides of the breast. The wing formula is 4 = 5 = 6 > 7 > 3 > 8 > 9 = 2 and the first primary is 54% of the second.

No specimens in complete juvenal plumage seem to be known of either *brachyura* or *hypoleuca*, but several specimens in partly immature plumage permit a reconstruction of the juvenal plumage which seems to agree with that of *superciliosa*, possibly with more white on the lower abdomen.

We now come to three species which might be included in *Poecilodryas*, partly because their plumages are not completely known and partly to avoid putting them in monotypic genera.

Poecilodryas pulverulenta (Bonaparte)

A medium-sized bird with medium proportions (tail 71–76.5%; tarsus 24.5–26% of wing). Wing formula: 4 = 5 = 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 = 2. First and second primaries long; first primary is 60% of the second. The general coloration is dark above and whitish below, no superciliary marks or white wing-bars, but with the base of the tail white. The species is remarkable for its *Pachycephala*-like compressed and small bill and the weakly developed rictal bristles. The juvenal plumage is described by Mathews (Birds Austr., VIII, p. 275). It differs from that of *Poecilodryas* by the greater amount of white on the abdomen and the rather spotted or streaky appearance of the brown of the upper parts. The species is a mangrove-dweller and likes to feed on the ground.

Poecilodryas placens

A very large bird, with a short tail (60–61%) and a short tarsus (23.5–24.0%). Wing formula: 4 = 5 > 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 > 2. The first primary is rather long, the second rather short, the first primary is 57% of the second. The bill is a typical *Poecilodryas* bill, but the coloration differs strikingly from the other species of *Poecilodryas* by the presence of olive above and yellow below. There are no white marks on wing or tail. The juvenal plumage is unknown. This species is, apart from its coloration, a typical *Poecilodryas*.

Poecilodryas albonotata

A very large species, with a medium sized tail (70–73.5%) and a rather short tarsus (22–23.5%). The bill is very large but not really out of proportion with the generally large size. The wing formula: 4 > 5 > 3 > 6 > 7 > 2 > 8; both first and second primaries are rather long, the first being 54% of the second. The coloration

fits fairly well into the genus *Poecilodryas*, except for a large black shield on the throat. The tail is uniform, but the typical *Poecilodryas* pattern is indicated on the outside of the wing and there is a white bar across the inner webs of the wing-feathers. The juvenal plumage is uniform pale cinnamon, except for the two white throat patches which are already present in this plumage. The species really possesses no character which would exclude it from *Poecilodryas*.

PENEOTHELLO MATHEWS

TYPE.—*Poecilodryas? sigillata* De Vis, 1920, Birds of Australia, VIII, p. 185.

Peneothello sigillatus

A fairly large species, with a medium-sized tail (69–73%) and a very long tarsus (30–32.5%). The bill is comparatively small, laterally compressed and not broadened at the base as in the typical species of the genus *Poecilodryas*. The rictal bristles are comparatively short and weak. The wing is rounded: 4 = 5 = 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 > 9 > 10 = 2. The second primary is about as long as the secondaries, the first primary is about 57–62% of the second. The coloration differs remarkably from the typical *Poecilodryas* style. It is all black with some white on the inner secondaries and (in *quadrimaculatus*) on the sides of the breast. The juvenal plumage is of a dark rufous brown with pale buffy tawny shaft-streaks. Upper wing-coverts, wing- and tail-feathers have pale tips. This streaky juvenal is rather different from the more or less uniform brownish plumage of juvenal *Poecilodryas*.

Peneothello cyanus

A fairly large species, with a rather short tail (66–69%) and a fairly long tarsus (26–27%). Bill as in *sigillatus*. The coloration is a more or less uniform dark gray-blue. The wing is not quite as rounded as in *sigillatus:* 4 = 5 = 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 = 2 > 9. The second primary is somewhat longer than in *sigillatus*, the first 56–59% of the second. The juvenal plumage is exactly as in *sigillatus*, only darker, and the shaft-streaks narrower.

Peneothello cryptoleucus Hartert

A medium-sized species, with a medium-sized tail (73.5–74.5%) and a very long tarsus (31–33.5%). The wing is round: 4 = 5 > 6 > 3 > 7 > 8 > 9 > 2, the first primary being 55–58% of the second. The coloration is uniform (pale gray below, blue-gray above), with a hidden white area on the inner webs of the inner primaries. The juvenal plumage is unknown, but remainders of it in a first-year bird suggest that it is very much as that of *cyanus*.

The three species just mentioned, although showing some minor variation of proportions, differ from *Poecilodryas* in the coloration of the juvenal plumage, in general color pattern, in the small, laterally compressed bill, in the long tarsus, and other features (shape of first primary and of the tail-feathers). It seems justified to recognize for these species the genus *Peneothello* Mathews, of which *Papualestes* Mathews is a synonym. *Peneothello cryptoleucus* is a perfect link as far as the proportions go, between *cyanus* and *sigillatus*.

This leaves one species to be discussed, *Peneothello bimaculatus*. This species does not fit at all into *Poecilodryas*, but it also differs in several important aspects from *Peneothello* (tarsus, juvenal plumage). Until more is known about nest, eggs and habits of this species, the creation of a monotypic genus for this species should be avoided.

Peneothello bimaculatus

A fairly large species, with an extraordinarily short tail (57–58% of the wing) and a rather short tarsus (25–26%). The bill is about halfway between *Poecilodryas* and *Peneothello*, neither compressed nor depressed. The wing formula is 4 = 5 = 6 > 3 = 7 > 8 > 9 = 2, the first primary being 58% of the second. The general coloration is black with white on the upper tail-coverts, sides of breast and lower abdomen. No white on wing or tail. The juvenal plumage appears to be unknown. A specimen in the first-year plumage (Hompua, Huon Peninsula, April 8, 1929, R. H. Beck, ♂) shows a coloration totally different from that of any *Poecilodryas*, *Peneothello* (or *Saxicola*). It is sooty black all over, without white on the sides of the

breast, just with some white tips on crissum and under tail-coverts. There is no brown in the plumage, except for a brownish wash on some of the greater upper wing-coverts. The coloration of this first-year bird suggests that the juvenal plumage is largely sooty black or sooty brown.

MONACHELLA

This monotypic genus is very aberrant in structure and color characters, but is probably, of all the Papuan genera, most closely related to *Microeca*. It agrees with that genus in the short tail (61–64% of the wing), in the weak foot and short tarsus (17–18.5% of the wing), and in the more or less spotted juvenal plumage (see Ibis, 1915, Suppl., p. 166). The wing formula is $4 > 3 = 5 > 6 > 2 > 7 > 8$ (pointed wing), and the first primary is about 38% of the second, the second primary being very long.

PARADISAEIDAE

NOTES ON *PHONYGAMMUS KERAUDRENII JAMESI* SHARPE

There is much confusion in the literature concerning the characters and range of this form. It is exceedingly close to typical *keraudrenii*, but differs by larger size and longer ear-tufts (Mayr and Rand, 1937, Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., LXXIII, p. 194). The tail-wing index is large as in *keraudrenii;* it is 76.3, 76.8, 77.7, 79.3, 80.5, 81.2, av. 78.6, in a series of six adult males from the Aru Islands and south New Guinea. Wing length, ♂ ad. 165, 166, 168, 169, 169, 169, against 156, 156, 157, 159, 159, 160, 161, 164 in *keraudrenii*.

RANGE.—Aru Islands; southern New Guinea from the Mimika River in the west, eastward at least to Hall Sound.

ON THE CORRECT NAME OF THE WEST NEW GUINEA KING BIRD OF PARADISE (*CICINNURUS REGIUS*)

When Ogilvie-Grant found in 1915 that *Cicinnurus regius* showed some geographical variation (Ibis, Suppl., p. 16) he took great pains to point out that Linnaeus' name should be applied to the Aru Island race, but he ignored that there were two additional names available which unquestionably refer to the western New Guinea race and antedate *claudii* Grant.

The older of these names is *Paradisaea Rex* Scopoli, 1788, Del. Faun. et Flor. Insubr., pt. 2, p. 88. Scopoli's name is exclusively based on Sonnerat's description (1776, Voy. Nouv. Guinée, p. 156, Pl. 95). It is now known that Sonnerat never reached New Guinea, but was anchored at Gebe, approximately 100 km. from New Guinea. There native traders brought him the bird specimens which were subsequently described in his narrative. It is obvious that the *Cicinnurus regius* which he obtained at Gebe must have come from Batanta, Salawati or the Vogelkop and I, therefore, restrict the type locality of *rex* Scopoli to the Sorong district, western New Guinea.

Even if the name *rex* were rejected as being too similar to *regius* another unused name would have to replace *claudii: Cicinnurus spinturnix* Lesson (1835, Ois. Parad., p. 182, Pls. XVI–XVIII). This name is based on a male and a female collected at Dorei (= Manokwari) by the Coquille Expedition. I, therefore, restrict the type locality of *spinturnix* to Manokwari, Vogelkop.