

meadow, it raced down a rather steep incline between well defined banks overgrown with mountain laurel and densely shaded by trees of various kinds. As we approached the pond we heard a Water-Thrush chirping sharply. A moment later it appeared at the edge of a thicket with something in its bill which looked like a large grub but which did not prevent it from continuing to utter its metallic note, at short, regular intervals. It was soon joined by its mate, the male, I thought. He, also, chirped but less anxiously and frequently than the other. Both birds now began fitting close about us, enabling us to make sure that they were Louisiana, and not Northern, Water-Thrushes. They came, indeed, so very near and into lights so favorable for revealing their characteristic color and markings that we were left in no doubt whatever as to their identity. After watching them for several minutes we advanced and almost immediately discovered their nest, which was within twenty feet of where we first saw them. It contained six young, well feathered and almost large enough to fly although they kept their eyes tight shut while we were looking at them, perhaps in the hope that by so doing they might escape notice. They crowded the nest to its utmost capacity and the coloring of their upper parts — a rich, deep, seal brown — closely matched that of the mud-soaked leaves which formed its outer surface. It was the largest nest of a Water-Thrush that I have ever examined. The crown of a man's hat would not have held half its total bulk. Its situation, also, was somewhat unusual for it was placed on the side of a shallow pit which had been dug at the base of a bank to obtain earth for the construction of the dam. The rear wall of this excavation was vertical — or even overhanging — at the top at several points, but the birds had selected a place where it merely sloped steeply downward and outward and had here built their nest on a slight projection or knob scarce a foot above the level ground beneath, and wholly unsheltered above, either from observation or from the weather. I did not return to the spot that summer but I have since revisited it almost every year, about the same season, without obtaining evidence, however, that the birds have again nested there or, indeed, anywhere in the immediate neighborhood.

Mr. Walter Faxon, to whom I mentioned the above described experience not long after it had occurred, wrote me on October 14, 1902, as follows: "If you record the Southern Water-Thrush's nest (as I hope you will) you might take the occasion also to mention that I found a male [of this species] still in song on the 8th of June, 1901, at Richmond Pond, on the line between the townships of Richmond and Pittsfield." Doubtless this bird is distributed well over the southern half of Berkshire County.— WILLIAM BREWSTER, *Cambridge, Mass.*

Concerning *Thryomanes bewicki cryptus* in Colorado.— Merritt Cary, in 'The Auk' for April, 1909, p. 185, records *Thryomanes bewicki cryptus* from Shell Rock Cañon, in the northwest corner of Baca County, although the specimen was not secured, and was merely supposed to belong to this form,

rather than to *bairdi*, which has long been known from the State. The last week in April, 1909, I secured two specimens of wrens at Irwin's Ranch, Las Animas County, about twelve miles due west of Shell Rock Cañon, and exactly the same sort of country (rocks, cedars, and piñons), which have been compared by Mr. W. L. Sclater with specimens in the Colorado College Collection, and he informs me they are undoubtedly *bairdi*. This being the case, it seems more than likely that the bird seen by Cary was also *bairdi*, and that *cryptus* should be eliminated from the Colorado list until more positive evidence is obtained.—EDWARD R. WARREN, *Colorado Springs, Colo.*

A Correction.—In my paper on Colorado birds in 'The Auk' for April, 1909 (p. 184), *Thryomanes bewicki cryptus* was definitely listed as a new record for the State, on the strength of a field identification made in Baca County. Through an unaccountable oversight the form *cryptus* was not queried, and hence the record appeared as definite, instead of tentative. Since Mr. H. C. Oberholser now considers all of the western Texas Bewick wrens to be *eremophilus* (= "*bairdi*"), the record should stand as *Thryomanes bewickii eremophilus*.¹

In the same paper a specimen of *Catherpes* from Baca County was listed as *C. m. conspersus*. Upon examination Mr. Oberholser calls this specimen *C. m. polioptilus*.¹ The statement made that Gaume's Ranch, Baca County, is the most eastern locality for Colorado is erroneous, since Mr. E. R. Warren² has already recorded the Cañon Wren from Cheyenne Wells, near the Kansas line.

The above errors were due to the writer's absence from Washington in the field.—MERRITT CARY, *U. S. Biological Survey, Washington, D. C.*

Bicknell's Thrush (*Hylocichla alicia bicknelli*) in **Cumberland County, Maine.**—Having recently had occasion to examine some Gray-cheeked Thrushes, all of the specimens contained in the collections of the Portland Society of Natural History and of the writer were brought together. This revealed the fact that a specimen in the Natural History Society's collection is a Bicknell's Thrush. It is a young female, taken in Cumberland County, Maine, September 30, 1878. Although the specimen is so characteristic that no doubt existed as to its identity, it was submitted to Dr. Charles W. Richmond for verification.

There appears to be no previous record of a specimen taken in Maine, yet it has been reported, in each instance without capture of a specimen, from the following localities: Franklin, 1906 (D. W. Sweet, *Journ. Orn. Soc.*, VII, p. 81); Oxford, 1899 (A. P. Larrabee, verbal); Piscataquis, 1898 (F. H. Allen, *Auk*, XV, p. 60).—ARTHUR H. NORTON, *Portland, Me.*

[¹The proper name of this form is *bairdi* (*cf.* *Auk*, XXV, July, 1908, p. 385). Neither "*eremophilus*" nor "*polioptilus*" are recognized in the A. O. U. Check-List (*cf.* *Auk*, t. c., p. 397).—EDD.]

²Condor, IX, 1907, p. 111.