

NEW GENERIC NAMES, WITH SOME
NOTES ON OTHERS.

By GREGORY M. MATHEWS.

*The Numbers on the left are those of my "Reference List"
of 1912.*

318. PARASULA, gen. nov. +

Differs from *Sula* Brisson in its much larger size and different number of tail-feathers; from *Morus* Vieillot in the different number of tail-feathers.

Type, *Sula dactylatra bedouti* Mathews.

320. HEMISULA, gen. nov. +

Differs from *Sula* Brisson in the number of tail-feathers and its proportionately shorter tail.

Type, *Sula leucogaster rogersi* Mathews.

NOTE.—All the Gannets have been lately, and without much reason, included in the genus *Sula*. The differences in size, coloration, structural proportions, and number of tail-feathers have all been ignored in favour of the view that, as the birds bore a family resemblance, they *must* be referred to one genus. If genera with any pretence to affinity be recognized, then *Sula* must be subdivided. The nomenclatural problems are too complex to be detailed here, but will be fully discussed in my *Birds of Australia*. The species *Pelecanus bassanus* Linné and *Sula dactylatra* Lesson (*cyanops* Auct.) agree somewhat in size and coloration, but the former has twelve tail-feathers: the latter eighteen. The species *Pelecanus piscator* Linné and *Pelecanus leucogaster* Boddaert agree somewhat in size, but the former has sixteen tail-feathers, the latter fourteen: the last-named disagrees entirely in coloration from the other three. In structural proportions these all differ notably. It must be admitted by every reasoning ornithologist, that the difference between twelve and eighteen tail-feathers must be considered of generic import when it

is realized that the former occurs in the North Atlantic and in the South Pacific, where it lives side by side with the latter. In the same manner the difference in coloration between *P. leucogaster* Boddaert and the others in itself would justify generic separation, when it is remembered that all the other genera and species have a uniform style of coloration which is quite different and one which is practically unchanged in the same species with a North Atlantic, South Atlantic, and South Pacific distribution.

323. *SCÆOPHÆTHON*, gen. nov.

Differs from *Phæthon* Linné in its longer wing, stronger legs and feet, shorter tail, though as powerful in the bill.

Type, *Phæthon rubricauda westralis* Mathews.

325. *LEPTOPHÆTHON*, gen. nov.

Differs from *Phæthon* Linné in its much smaller size throughout, though having a comparatively longer tail.

Type, *Phæthon lepturus dorotheae* Mathews.

NOTE.—The Tropic Birds have been referred to the one genus *Phæthon*, though here again generic rank is due to the differences observed. *Phæthon* and *Scæophæthon* agree somewhat in size, but the latter has discarded the plumage of the former, which is seen in the juvenile, in favour of a uniform white one; it has also developed in size. *Leptophæthon*, on the other hand, has also achieved the beautiful adult-plumage of *Scæophæthon*, but is sadly diminished in size. However the evolution has proceeded, the birds are now sufficiently distinct to warrant generic separation.

367. *NOTOFALCO*, gen. nov.

Differs from *Rhynchodon* Nitzsch in its much longer wings, longer tail, and weaker feet.

Type, *Falco subniger* Gray.

490. PSEPHOTELLUS, gen. nov. +

Differs from *Neonanodes* Mathews in its much longer differently-shaped tail.

Type, *Platycercus pulcherrimus* Gould.

528. MICROPODARGUS, gen. nov. +

Differs from *Podargus* in its much smaller size throughout and in a comparatively stronger bill,

Type, *Podargus marmoratus* Gould.

695. LEWINORNIS, gen. nov. +

Differs from *Pachycephala* Vigors and Horsfield in its weaker bill, shorter wing and tail, and weaker feet.

Type, *Sylvia rufiventris* Latham.

704. MUSCITREA and HYLOTERPE.

In the Handlist of Birds both these genera occur, but a footnote at the latter place notes that the monotype of *Muscitrea* is synonymous with a species of *Hyloterpe*. As an Australian bird was included in the latter genus, investigation was necessary to settle which name was to be used. I herewith give my results.

Muscitrea was introduced by Blyth (Journ. As. Soc. Bengal, Vol. XVI., p. 121, Feb. 1847) for the new species *cinerea* alone. This is considered to be the same species as Blyth had previously described (same Journal, Vol. XII., p. 180, 1843) under the name *Tephrodornis grisola*. The species would thus have to be known as *Muscitrea grisola* (Blyth). *T. grisola* Blyth has however been placed in the genus *Hyloterpe* Cabanis. Some recent systematists, myself included, have placed this species in *Pachycephala*, but there is no excuse for such location. *Hyloterpe* is accepted as of Cabanis 1847. It appeared in Wiegman's Arch. für Nat. 1847, p. 321, but priority is easily dispensed with as Cabanis's article is dated "Berlin im November, 1847." However, at that place it is doubly a *nomen nudum*. Firstly, it is

proposed for "*Hylacharis* Muller 1835," and species cited *H. philomela* Muller. In the Tijdschr. Nat. Ges. Phys. Amster., Vol. II., p. 331, 1835, Muller does include *Hylocharis*, but the species-name attached is "*lusciniæ*" and it is a *nomen nudum*, and there is no indication that it is a new generic introduction, but probably simply a misuse of *Hylocharis* Boie. The earliest legitimate introduction of *Hylocharis* seems to be that of Bonaparte who, in the Consp. Gen. Av., Vol. I., p. 329, 1850, uses it as of Cabanis 1847, and catalogues two species: *H. philomela* Boie (= *id.*, Temm., Mus. Berol = *id.* Cabanis) and *H. orpheus* Verreaux (*Pachycephala orpheus* Jard., Contr. Orn. 1849, Vol. VII., *cum* fig.). The former is still a *nomen nudum*, and therefore the latter becomes type by monotypy.

The conclusion would read—

Muscitrea Blyth 1847
would replace—

Hylocharis Bonaparte 1850.

The type of the former would be, by monotypy—

M. cinerea Blyth 1847 = *Tephrodornis grisola* Blyth;
and of the latter by monotypy—

Pachycephala orpheus Jardine.

729. SETOSURA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Leucocirca* Swainson in its broader, longer bill, though the wing is much shorter and the legs and feet are much weaker, the metatarsus especially being much shorter.

Type, *Rhipidura setosa melvillensis* Mathews.

767. PARAGRAUCALUS, gen. nov.

Differs from *Coracina* Vieillot in its weaker bill, shorter tail, and weaker feet.

Type, *Ceblepyris lineatus* Swainson.

768. METAGRAUCALUS, gen. nov.

Differs from *Edolisoma* Jacquinot et Pucheran in its stronger bill, stronger legs and feet, different wing-formation, and entirely different coloration.

Type, *Gracaulus tenuirostris* Jardine.

772. KARUA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Lalage* Boie in its smaller bill and different wing-formation: in *Lalage* the first primary is short, less than half the second which is little shorter than the third, which is longest; in *Karua* the first primary is proportionately much longer, more than half the second, which is considerably shorter than the third, which is longest.

Type, *Campephaga leucomela* Vigors and Horsfield.

969. NESOMALURUS, gen. nov.

Differs from *Hallornis* Mathews in its longer bill and stronger feet, from *Ryania* Mathews in its stouter bill and longer tail, and from *Malurus* Vieillot and *Leggeornis* Mathews in lacking erectile ear-coverts; the fourth primary of the wing is longest.

Type, *Malurus edouardi* Campbell.

1015. CONIGRAVEA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Caleyia* Mathews in its longer bill, longer wing and tail, and different wing-formation: the third primary longest and the second primary equal to the sixth.

Type, *Colluricincla parvula conigravi* Mathews.

1016. CALEYA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Pinarolestes* Sharpe in its less compressed bill, longer wing and stronger feet, and different wing-formation; the 5th primary longest and the 2nd equal to the tenth.

Type, *Colluricincla rufogaster* Gould.

1109. AUSTRODICÆUM, gen. nov.

Differs from *Dicæum* Cuvier in its much shorter, stouter bill, much longer wing, much stronger legs and feet, and proportionately shorter tail.

Type, *Motacilla hirundinacea* Shaw and Nodder.

1203. Ptilotina, gen. nov.

Differs from *Meliphaga* Lewin (Type, *M. lewini* Swainson) in its stouter bill and feet, though shorter wing and much shorter tail; from *Microptilotis* Mathews in its stouter, comparatively shorter bill though longer wing and stouter feet.

Type, *Ptilotis analoga mixta* Mathews.

1226. NESOPTILOtis, gen. nov.

Differs from *Ptilotula* Mathews in its much longer wing and tail and much stronger feet, though the bill is as small as in that genus.

Type, *Ptilotis flavigula* Gould.

1255. BROADBENTIA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Ptilotula* Mathews in its much longer bill, stronger feet and longer wing though as short a tail: from *Nesoptilotis* Mathews in its shorter tail, though the wing is of the same length, and its much longer bill.

Type, *Ptilotis flava addenda* Mathews.

1360. HETEROMUNIA, gen. nov.

Differs from *Lonchura* Sykes in its larger, more conical bill, longer wing, comparatively shorter tail and stronger feet.

Type, *Amadina pectoralis* Gould.

1401. METALLOPSAR, gen. nov.

Differs from *Lamprocorax* Bonaparte in its weaker bill, shorter wing, more slender legs and feet and longer wedge-shaped tail with two central feathers much projecting.

Type, *Calornis purpurascens* Gray.

In investigating the preceding, I noted the following preoccupied names, and as I consider the genera valid, herewith propose substitutes—

Platygnathus Hartlaub, in Wiegman's Arch. für Nat. 1852, p. 132, is untenable on account of its prior usage by Dejean (Catal. Col., 2nd ed., 1834), Laporte (in Brulle H.N., Anim. artic., Vol. II., p. 404, 1840), and Agassiz (Poiss. F.V.G.R., p. 60, 1844).

I would substitute—

SUBMYIAGRA, with *P. vanicorensis* Quoy et Gaimard, Voy. "l'Astrol.," 1830, as type.

Microlestes Meyer, Zeitschr. ges. Ornith., Vol. I., p. 197, 1884, cannot be used on account of the prior introduction of the name by Schmidt-Goebel (Helfer's Samml., Vol. I., p. 41, 1846), Pleininger (in Wurttt. Jahr. Ber. 1847), and Brown (Index Pal., p. 725, 1848).

I therefore introduce ARFAKORNIS with *Microlestes arfakianus* Meyer as type.

It is well known that the code of the American Ornithologists' Union differs from the International Code, in that the latter would compel the usage of "one letterism" in differentiating valid generic names, whereas the former does not. With that quaint but well-known American idea of progressivism, the American Ornithologists' Union have subscribed to the International Commission's Opinions while not observing the Code. It would now appear they do not wish to accept that Code, but hope to amend it to agree with their own: during the interval they still adhere to their own Rules. It is now quite speculative as to the result, but the trend is in favour of the Americans. I profess to follow the International Code in its entirety and am accepting the Opinions as now rendered: these all suggest that "one letterism" will be abolished.



Mathews, Gregory Macalister. 1913. "New generic names, with some notes on others." *Austral avian record; a scientific journal devoted primarily to the study of the Australian avifauna* 2, 55–62.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/108185>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/244171>

Holding Institution

Smithsonian Libraries and Archives

Sponsored by

Biodiversity Heritage Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The BHL considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection.

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>.