

swamp, and Mr. R. L. Fricke, of the Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, a member of the school staff, captured it with a butterfly net.

The owl was kept alive at the camp of the Nature School, at Lake Terra Alta, for several days, but died soon after being taken to Pittsburgh and was mounted for the Carnegie Museum.—A. B. Brooks, *Oglebay Park, Wheeling, W. Va.*

Chuck-will's-widow again in Ohio.—A Chuck-will's-widow (*Antrostomus carolinensis*) was taken near the western limits of the city of Dayton, Montgomery County, Ohio, on May 1, 1933. It was shot by a man who stated it was flying about during daylight over his chicken yard. I examined and measured the bird which was a female. This is the second recorded occurrence of the species in Ohio and this locality is at least fifty miles north of the spot where the first specimen was secured by E. S. Thomas in May, 1932. (Auk XLIX, October, 1932, p. 479.)—BENEDICT J. BLINCOE, *Dayton, Ohio.*

An Old Specimen of Hybrid Flicker from Central Arkansas.—In the Museum of Natural History, University of Iowa, there is a hybrid Flicker, a cross between *Colaptes auratus* and *C. cafer*, taken near Palarm, Faulkner County, Arkansas, March 26, 1882. It is a male, No. 13392, and was collected by D. H. Talbot and skinned by W. B. Parker.

The basal portions of the feathers forming the red "mustache" marks are black. The webs of the rectrices, primaries and secondaries are dull yellow, while the shafts are orange-rufous (of Ridgway).

Baerg (Ark. Station Bull., 258, 1931, p. 87) records but one occurrence of *Colaptes cafer collaris* for Arkansas.—PHILIP A. DUMONT, *Museum of Natural History, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.*

Nesting of the Rough-winged Swallow in Montana.—The statement is sometimes made, on excellent authority, that Rough-winged Swallows (*Stelgidopteryx ruficollis serripennis*) do not excavate their own nest burrows, as for example by A. A. Allen (Bird-Lore, XXXV, p. 122). In the valleys of northwestern Montana, however, Rough-winged Swallows regularly excavate their own burrows, as already mentioned by Saunders (Distributional List Birds of Montana, p. 141), locating them in banks along streams, railroads, and highways. I have observed them digging burrows in banks of clay, of sand, and of gravel.

In this locality the nests are situated in the banks from one to fifty feet above the streams or roads; the burrows generally extend upward at a slight angle a distance of ten to twenty-four inches, ending in a shallow depression where a nest of dry grass and rootlets is constructed.

In the vicinity of Fortine I have been able to determine the stage of nesting, at some time during the season, shown by thirty-four nests of the Rough-winged Swallow. As no definite nesting records for this species in Montana have been published, I give below the range of dates, for different stages of nesting, which these records show. Nest under construction:

May 8, 1931, to June 15, 1929. Eggs (seven nests): June 14, 1928, to July 6, 1923. Young in nest: June 8, 1921, to July 9, 1928. Nine other nests, young left the nest by: July 22, 1931, to July 29, 1930.—WINTON WEYDEMEYER, *Fortine, Montana*.

The Starling as a Mimic.—Dr. Charles W. Townsend ("The Auk," Vol. XLI, 1924, pp. 541-552) says (p. 544), "I am inclined to think that individual Starlings vary greatly in their powers of mimicry." My experience accords with his surmise, indeed it does more: it affords a superlative instance of its truth.

After February 15, 1915, when I first observed the Starling in Lexington, Mass., the bird became progressively commoner in the town until, say in 1925, it was abundantly represented there. During the nine years following its first appearance, I was in the field a good deal, meeting the bird daily in the latter part of the period, and in all this time I heard a Starling utter the note of *only one other bird*. This was the whistle of the Cowbird—the upward-sweeping whistle followed by two short notes on a lower pitch—which may be suggested by the syllables, *wee, too-too*. This note I heard in several of the years, perhaps half a dozen times in all. I was aware that the Starling whistled and sang like a Wood Pewee, a Bluebird or what not; I was on the watch for instances of mimicry; and, guarding against error, I never assumed, as we used to do in the old days, that the song of the Bluebird meant that the Bluebird was here; that the whistle of the Wood Pewee was as good as the bird in the hand. In spite of the evidence in the literature, piling up as the years went by, that the bird was a mimic, the Starling was no mimic, except of the Cowbird, to me.

Then, in Cohasset, Mass., late in December, 1924, from a group of Starlings which had been "clatt'rin' in tall trees" came, one right after another, the song of the Phoebe, the whistle and the scatter call of the Bobwhite, the *wee-chew, wee-chew* of the Flicker, the song, nearly perfect, of the Meadowlark, the sharp call-note and some Vireo-like phrases of the Purple Finch, the Wood Pewee's peaceful whistle, the rolling *too-wheedle* of the Blue Jay, the two-note whistle of the Chickadee, a note unmistakably that of the Goldfinch, and the Red-winged Blackbird's cluck and the gurgling part of its song. In ten minutes, thirteen notes of ten different birds, given by a flock of Starlings—perhaps by one Starling; an accumulation of audible evidence to convince the stubbornest juror.

Some of these notes no Starling could have heard for weeks, or months—and no more could we—yet the power to reproduce them was there. It seems almost incontrovertible not to "suppose the self-same Power" that enabled us to recognize these notes, made it possible for the Starling to call them up out of the past.—WINSOR M. TYLER, *112 Pinckney St., Boston, Mass.*

The Names of Two Genera of Timaline Birds.—Oberholser (Smiths. Misc. Coll. Quarterly Issue, vol. 48, pt. 1, May 13, 1905, p. 65) proposed