

### “*Atratus* versus *Megalonyx*”

BY ROBERT RIDGWAY

AN article from me on the present subject would obviously have been more appropriate soon after Mr. Grinnell first questioned the validity of *Pipilo maculatus atratus* (Condor, IV, Jan., 1902, 23); I have been very busy, however, and besides had quite forgotten the matter until it was brought to mind by Mr. Swarth's recent article (Condor, VII, Nov., 1905, 171). That both Mr. Grinnell and Mr. Swarth are in error in concluding that *Pipilo maculatus atratus* is synonymous with *P. m. megalonyx*, I feel quite sure, and will here state my reasons for this conviction.

Because the type of *Pipilo maculatus* Baird came from Fort Tejon, and the breeding black *Pipilo* of that locality is the form which I described as *P. maculatus atratus*, it of course seems logical to assume that both names represent the same form. But it is very unsafe to assume anything in scientific matters. It is by no means an uncommon occurrence (I could cite several instances) for a new species to be first taken at a place far outside its normal range. Whether the occurrence of the Rocky Mountain or plateau form of this species at Fort Tejon, as a winter visitant or straggler, is abnormal or not, I am not able to say; but that the type of *Pipilo megalonyx* is not only a typical example but almost an extreme example of the form re-named by Mr. Swarth *Pipilo maculatus montanus* I have no doubt, having recently re-examined it and carefully compared it with the reasonably good series of *P. m. atratus* and very extensive one of "*P. m. montanus*" in the National Museum collection.

Mr. Swarth's paper is an exceedingly able one and shows most clearly the difference between the two forms and their distribution, and I much regret that my long silence in the matter may have been the cause of his adding another synonym to the literature of North American birds.

Whether *P. m. atratus* is sufficiently distinct from *P. m. falcifer*, however, I am not so sure, since I have not been able to examine a sufficient series of the latter.

Washington, D. C.

### Oceanodroma leucorhoa and Its Relatives on the Pacific Coast

BY W. OTTO EMERSON

THE petrels, or "sea-patters," have always been of particular interest to the ornithologist tho relatively little seems to be known as yet concerning the species on our coast and especially their distribution.

The early western explorers gave the name *Oceanodroma leucorhoa* to the white-rumped petrels found by them on this coast; but as this name was first applied to birds of the Atlantic (St. Kilda), and as the specimens examined by me from the Pacific seem to all differ from Atlantic *leucorhoa*, it seems probable that the latter name must be dropped from our western lists.

The first departure came when W. E. Bryant described *O. macrodactyla* from Guadalupe Island (Bull. Cal. Ac. Sc. II, July 1887, p. 450); and as far as is yet known this very distinct species is restricted to that immediate vicinity.

Next, A. W. Anthony described from the waters adjacent to Lower California, *O. kaedingi* (Auk XV, Jan. 1898, p. 37). In reviewing the material before me (27 skins) referable to this species, I find the average measurements to be less than those given by Anthony. His type measured (millimeters reduced to inches): wing 5.72, tail 3.26, fork of tail 0.41, tarsus 0.81. My series averages: wing 5.54, tail 2.84, fork of tail 0.46, tarsus 0.72. The size of *kaedingi* is thus very much less than in any of the other forms of the *leucorhoa* group. In color, *kaedingi* is much the darker, being dark sooty brown over the whole body, while the head is dark plumbeous. The rectrices are sooty thruout, or else but very slightly paler at the base. However, the tip of the inner web of outer tail-feather is often paler, forming a noticeable spot in 83% of my specimens. I have found this character in no other case, excepting one Atlantic skin (No. 94,554 U. S. N. M.), and in that one only on one outer rectrix. The tail in *kaedingi* is less deeply forked than in the more northern Pacific Coast forms, and the head is dark plumbeous, not ashy. This petrel ranges from the vicinity of Guadalupe Island north along the coast of southern California. It would seem from the material before me, that there remain two forms from the Pacific Coast worthy of recognition by name, as follows:

#### *Oceanodroma beali* new species.

SPECIFIC CHARACTERS—Similar to *O. leucorhoa*, but of uniformly smaller size.

TYPE—♂ adult, No. 1440 Coll. J. Grinnell; Sitka Bay, Alaska; August 5, 1896. ♀ adult, No. 1438 Coll. J. G. (same place and date).

MEASUREMENTS—♂, wing 5.90, tail 3.10, forking of tail 0.80, tarsus 0.87. ♀, wing 5.75, tail 3.10, forking of tail 0.70, tarsus 0.90.

COLORATION—Sooty brown, darkest above; head, lower throat and back washed with plumbeous; forehead and chin smoke gray; greater and median wing-coverts light smoke gray; upper tail-coverts white with black shafts; lateral lower tail-coverts edged with white; rectrices black with white at base.

RANGE—North Pacific Ocean, south to Prince of Wales Island. Breeds on Aleutian and Copper Islands and on islets in Sitka Bay, Alaska.

NOTE—I take pleasure in naming this far northern petrel in honor of one who is doing so much of value in working out the economic standing of our Pacific Coast birds: Prof. F. E. L. Beal, of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

#### *Oceanodroma beldingi* new species.

SPECIFIC CHARACTERS—Similar to *O. beali*, but decidedly grayer, and averaging notably smaller in length of wing and tail.

TYPE—No. 53, Coll. Herman T. Bohlman; Netarts Bay, coast of Oregon; June 6, 1901.

MEASUREMENTS—Average of 5 specimens: wing 5.65, tail 3.22, forking of tail 0.67, tarsus 0.78.

COLORATION—Uniform sooty brown, washed with a bluish slate-gray on head, throat, chest and back, the gray most pronounced on head and chest; forehead, chin and upper throat decidedly ashy; greater and median wing-coverts edged with ashy; upper tail coverts white with black shafts; lateral lower coverts edged with whitish; rectrices black with white at base.

RANGE—North Pacific Coast, from Vancouver Island to northern California. Breeds on coast of Oregon (Wm. Finley), and Mendocino County, California (W. H. Dall).

NOTE—I name this handsome new petrel in honor of our veteran California ornithologist, and Honorary member of the Cooper Ornithological Club, Mr. Lyman Belding.

	Wing	Tail	Forking of Tail	Tarsus
<i>O. leucorhoa</i>	average 6.34	3.44	.70	.91
Atlantic Coast	largest 6.35	3.35	.90	.90
27 skins	smallest 5.85	3.20	.75	.90
<i>O. beali</i>	average 5.91	3.67	.72	.84
Alaskan Coast	largest 5.80	3.05	.46	.70
27 skins	smallest 5.60	2.95	.65	.80
<i>O. kaedingi</i>	average 5.54	2.84	.46	.72
Guadalupe Island	largest 5.80	3.05	.46	.70
27 skins	smallest 5.45	2.45	.40	.75

Two petrels from off the coast of San Mateo County, south of San Francisco, are referable to *O. kaedingi* and may possibly be the same form as was found

breeding on the Farallone Islands by Mr. Loomis, July 7, 1896, tho I did not happen to find it there on my visits in 1885-87. The above two specimens measure respectively: ♂, wing 6.00, tail 3.25, forking of tail, 0.55, tarsus 0.95; ♀, wing 6.10, tail 3.25, forking of tail 0.58, tarsus 0.90. Not having access to any other material from California, I cannot at present say anything in regard to the relation of the Farallone birds to either *kaedingi* or *beldingi*.

I wish to thank Mr. Robert Ridgway for the opportunity of examining the fine series of Atlantic Coast *leucorhoa* in the U. S. National Museum. I am also indebted to the Carnegie Museum for the loan of the series of *kaedingi* from the Anthony collection. To Messrs. Grinnell, Mailliard and Bohlman, I am under obligation for similar kindnesses rendered.

*Haywards, Cal.*

### Methods of Filing Reprints

RICHARD C. MCGREGOR

SOONER or later in the development of a private scientific library, reprints become so numerous that much time is expended in looking for particular papers unless some simple system is employed in filing them. I propose to describe one or two methods of filing such papers in the hope that others will give us some ideas on the subject. The essential conditions to be fulfilled are that any given title shall be readily accessible and that the papers shall be preserved from injury.

In the early stages of a library's growth papers may be classed by authors or by regions and each set kept in a heavy Manila paper envelope. Author's name and list of contained titles should be written on one corner of the envelope. This is practically the same system as that fostered by literary supply companies who manufacture light wooden boxes, size of a book, open on one side, in which pamphlets are kept. The boxes stand on one end like so many books; titles of the contained papers are written on the back.

Neither of the above systems are satisfactory. The papers are subject to misplacement and may even be lost, and they become worn and soiled in handling.

There remain, however, two methods, both of which have been found excellent and each has its followers. I will describe each of these briefly.

First: Cut heavy Manila paper in two or three sizes to fit folio, octavo, etc., when folded once. Now furnish each pamphlet with one of these covers and give it a number in the corner. The title and author may also be written on the cover. The covered pamphlets are now to be set on end in deep drawers or in boxes of suitable sizes. With a card index of authors, any paper desired may be easily found. Papers kept in this way might be arranged alphabetically by authors and the card index done away with. This method is a very good one and commends itself on account of its cheapness and the fact that papers may be added one or many at a time.

Second: Have papers of a similar size bound together in book form whenever enough accumulate to make a conveniently sized volume. Papers may be