

***Doricha enicura* in Honduras and Chiapas, Mexico.**—This species seems never to have been found outside of the country of Guatemala. About a year ago, I obtained from Mr. C. F. Underwood, a female which was collected at Montaña La Cruz, Honduras, on July 1, 1936. Recently an immature male has also come from Mr. Underwood, taken at Soluteca, La Paz, Honduras, on April 6, 1937. These two, apparently, constitute the first records for the country of Honduras.

During the summer of 1938, four males were received, secured at Comitán, Chiapas, Mexico, all of them collected between September 13, 1937, and September 20, 1937, inclusive. The occurrence of these birds in Chiapas is apparently a first record for any part of Mexico, unless the authors of the 'Biologia Centrali-Americana' (2: 345, 1897) were incorrect when they came to the conclusion that de Oca "mistook *D. eliza* for the present bird."—ROBERT T. MOORE, *California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California.*

**Persistence in egg-laying by injured Robin.**—At 3.00 p.m., on May 26, 1937, I was crossing a pasture field of the Abel Rynders farm in Cohocton Township, Steuben County, New York, and approached a weed- and brush-grown fence-row that paralleled a macadam road. A medium-sized shrub in this fence-row, which I later identified as witch hobble (*Viburnum alnifolium*) attracted my eye and I leaned over to snap off a branch for later identification. As I did so, a female Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) flew from her nest atop a stump about a foot below my outstretched hand, and two feet above the ground, then suddenly 'nosedived' to a partially dried-up roadside drainage ditch about six feet below the fence-row elevation. She now commenced dragging one wing and fluttering along the ground, apparently simulating a crippled bird. Following her I caught her easily and found the wing injury to be real, and an apparent nerve-paralysis as no bones were broken. In leaving the nest she had struck her wing either on the barbed-wire fence or a snag that projected from the stump at the nest level. Taking the injured bird to a veterinarian the nerve paralysis was confirmed and a careful examination again showed no broken bones. The injured bird was returned to the nesting site and released at 5.30 p.m. The nest contained one egg.

At 1.30 p.m. of the following day, May 27, 1937, I returned to the Robin's nest and found to my surprise that a Robin was on the nest. In order to determine whether it was the injured female or, possibly the male bird, it was necessary to flush the bird. The Robin allowed very close approach this time and did not leave the nest until my outstretched hand was within a foot distant. It then fluttered from the nest and proved to be the injured female with complete inability to fly. It ran agilely along some dead limbs that leaned against the fence and nesting stump, to reach the ground. The nest now contained two eggs! Evidently another egg had been laid since twenty hours ago when the Robin was returned to the nest.

I did not have an opportunity to revisit the nest until 10.30 a.m., June 1, 1937. The Robin was gone and remnants of eggshells were lying at the foot of the nesting stump. A careful search along the fence-row failed to reveal feathers or any trace of what had caused the nest to be broken up.—J. KENNETH TERRES, *Soil Conservation Service, Bath, New York.*

**Robin and Mourning Dove use the same nest.**—Two eggs of a Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) and one of a Mourning Dove (*Zenaidura macroura*) were observed in a typical Robin's nest situated at a height of seven feet in the fork of a sweet-cherry tree near New Castle, Pennsylvania, on May 8, 1933. Two days later several hours were spent observing the nest and the females of each species were found taking

turns at incubation. At no time was evidence of antagonism noted on the part of either bird. But apparently all had not gone well as the remains of one Robin's egg was found on the ground at the base of the tree, so that one egg of each species remained. As one approached the nest, the incubating bird would quietly leave and invariably its place would soon be taken by the female of the other species which in the meantime had remained perched on a limb about fifteen feet away. This exchange was repeated a number of times. Neither male bird was seen near the nest. Unfortunately the nest was destroyed the following day by boys.

In view of the unusual nesting I was greatly surprised when visiting the area the following year on May 12, to see a Robin's nest at precisely the same spot containing two eggs of a Robin and two of a Mourning Dove. As before the birds shared the duties of incubation and this time the eggs were hatched and the young were fed and brooded for eight days. Upon approaching the immediate vicinity when the young were in the nest the female Mourning Dove would run through the adjacent field simulating a broken wing while the female Robin showed alarm by scolding loudly from a limb nearby. Upon my return on the ninth day all four young were dead in the nest. No observations were made the following spring as the tree had since been removed.—EDWARD C. RANEY, *Zoological Laboratory, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.*

**Geographic variation of the Veery.**—In the course of identifying Ohio Veeries the writer recently discovered further evidence supporting the suspicions of Howe (Auk, 17: 20, 1900) and Bangs (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 70: 331, 1930) that the form described by Ridgway from Fort Garland, Colorado, as *Hylocichla fuscescens salicicola*, commonly called the Willow Thrush, might eventually be found to have an unbroken range across the continent, occupying in the east a position north of the range of the well-known Wilson's Thrush, *Hylocichla f. fuscescens*. Recent published statements of the range of the Willow Thrush, including the 1931 edition of the A. O. U. "Check-list," give it as east to Wisconsin "(and apparently also Newfoundland)" thus postulating a discontinuous distribution. Van Tyne (Occ. Papers Mus. Zool., Univ. Michigan, no. 379, p. 29, 1938) has recently found that the breeding form in Michigan is *H. f. salicicola* thus extending the range of the Willow Thrush east of Lake Michigan. Furthermore, the writer found that six specimens collected by himself at Fish Bay on the south shore of Lake Nipissing, Ontario, were also *salicicola*, thereby establishing a further step, which extends the range to the east of Lake Huron.

In the course of his investigations the writer examined, in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, eight topotypical specimens of *H. f. fuliginosa*, described by Howe (Auk, 17: 270-271, 1900) from Codroy, Newfoundland, and is convinced that Bangs was correct in referring these to *H. f. salicicola*. Howe had originally identified these birds as *salicicola* and shortly afterward described them as a new subspecies. Although Newfoundland specimens average somewhat more rufescent than typical *H. f. salicicola*, as do also the Lake Nipissing birds, this character merely indicates a tendency toward intergradation with *H. f. fuscescens* and is not sufficient to warrant recognition of a third subspecies. There is of course a rather wide gap between Lake Nipissing and Newfoundland whence no specimens of the Willow Thrush have yet been reported. Examination of breeding specimens from the northern part of the range of the species in Quebec might supply the connecting link.

The range of *H. f. fuscescens* extends southwestward from Nova Scotia, whence a single specimen has been identified, at least to the west end of Lake Erie and south in