

and not homonyms due to the shuffling of names, or to the reclassification of species under other genera than those under which they were originally described. In fact, any other construction never occurred to me prior to Mr. Oberholser's discussion of the case of *Sylvia cærulea* Wilson.

In regard to the action of the Committee on this case, I must confess, with shame, that I did not look up the matter, and did not know that Latham's *Sylvia cærulea* was simply Linnæus's *Motacilla cærulea*, but supposed Latham's *Sylvia cærulea* was bestowed upon a species considered by him as not previously described.

As I had never before known of any attempt to change a name in ornithology on such grounds I was taken quite unawares, and voted for the change without knowing the real facts in the case. Whether or not the original change was an inadvertence on the part of Mr. Ridgway, he has in other cases followed a directly opposite course. In the case of the House Finch the Committee ruled (Tenth Suppl., Auk, July, 1901, 311) that *Fringilla frontalis* Vieillot, 1817, did not render invalid *Fringilla frontalis* Say, 1824, for the reason that Vieillot's *Fringilla frontalis* was simply the reference of a previous *Loxia frontalis* to the genus *Fringilla*. This case is perfectly parallel to that of *Dendroica cærulea* vs. *D. rara*, which has not heretofore been formally challenged, and thus has not come before the Committee for reconsideration.—J. A. ALLEN, *Am. Mus. Nat. Hist., New York City.*

A Late Fall Record for the Cape May Warbler (*Dendroica tigrina*) in Eastern Massachusetts.—Toward dusk of Oct. 9, 1902, at the time when smaller birds are actively moving about, I noticed a few restless warblers in a Norway maple near my home in Ponkapog, Mass. It was impossible for me to determine the species, as they remained near the top of the tree, but one bird was shot, and proved an immature female Cape May Warbler. I am not positive as to the identity of the other birds in this group, but one other bird which I saw was not *Dendroica tigrina*.—FRED. B. MCKECHNIE, *Boston, Mass.*

Late Records for Eastern Massachusetts.—Mr. Louis A. Shaw of Chestnut Hill, Mass., informs me that he shot on the 20th of November, 1902, an adult male Wilson's Warbler (*Wilsonia pusilla*), which he had first noted on the previous day. This is the second record of the capture of this warbler in late autumn in Massachusetts (Hoffmann, Auk, 1900, p. 196). Mr. Shaw also reports seeing Fox Sparrows (*Passerella iliaca*) on December 4, 1902, and a Ruby-crowned Kinglet (*Regulus calendula*) on November 16, 1902.—REGINALD HEBER HOWE, JR., *Concord, Mass.*

A Case of Mistaken Diagnosis.—In August, 1882, while searching in an ancient shell-heap near Northeast Harbor, Mt. Desert Island, Maine, I found what appeared to be the upper mandible of a bird's bill. In the same shell-heap, two years before, I had found part of the tarsus of a

wild turkey (Bull. Nutt. Ornith. Club, Vol. VI, 1881, p. 60). Taking the 'bill' to Mr. Wm. Brewster for identification we found that it resembled most closely the bill of Cabot's Tern, being considerably smaller than the bill of the Royal Tern. It differed, however, from the bills of these and other terns in having a very hard epidermis with a brilliant polish. Feeling considerable doubt as to the identity of the specimen, I showed it to Mr. J. A. Allen, who believed that it was not in his province and suggested that Mr. Walter Faxon might clear up the mystery. Respecting the crustacea, Mr. Faxon, however, promptly replied that it was not a crab's claw. At Mr. Brewster's suggestion I then sent it on to the Smithsonian institution and received the following reply. "Where Mr. Brewster has failed I ought perhaps to be duly cautious in expressing an opinion. Nevertheless a careful examination and comparison of the fragment of a bird's bill you enclose leaves little doubt in my mind as to the bird, which is the Royal Tern (*Sterna regia*). Compare the remnant with the bill of that bird and I think you will agree that in contour the agreement is very close. The cutting edges of the fragment are worn down, and the size otherwise reduced by rubbing, as witness its polish. Due allowance being made for loss of size, and it appears to me that the conclusion expressed above is inevitable . . . I should have added that Mr. — agrees with me." Not satisfied with the identification I let the matter rest and did not, fortunately, rush into print with the interesting note. Two years later, while examining a dogfish, *Squalus americanus*, I was struck with the resemblance of the spine in front of the anterior dorsal fin to my shell-heap bird's bill with its polished epidermis. On comparing them the identity is unquestionable.—CHARLES W. TOWNSEND, M. D., *Boston, Mass.*

RECENT LITERATURE.

Ornithological Magazines. 'The Condor.'—The fourth volume of 'The Condor,'¹ for 1902, consists of about 150 quarto pages of excellent matter relating mainly to Pacific coast ornithology. The January-

¹ The Condor, Bulletin of the Cooper Ornithological Club of California. Published bi-monthly at Santa Clara, Cal., in the interests and as the official organ of the Club. Walter K. Fisher, Editor, Palo Alto, Cal.; Joseph Grinnell, Business Manager, Palo Alto, Cal. Subscription, \$1.00 a year in advance; single copies, 25 cents. Vol. IV, 1902, pp. i-iv, 1-148, with numerous half-tone illustrations.