

Status of *Dendroica cerulea* in eastern Maryland.—The centers of Baltimore and Washington are only about forty miles apart, yet the status of the Cerulean Warbler at these two stations seems to be quite different.

In 1922, Miss Cooke (Auk, 39: 570-572) listed all the known reliable records from the Washington region. There were seven records from Maryland and the District of Columbia and a few from adjacent Virginia. I am aware of but two published records from the region since that time: May 4, 1926 (Ball, Auk, 44: 259) and a male collected May 17, 1931 (Ball, Auk, 49: 362). When it is recalled that the District area has been under the constant scrutiny of some of our best field ornithologists for nearly a century, it becomes apparent that the Cerulean Warbler must be a distinctly rare bird in that region.

The Baltimore area, in contrast, was worked by a mere handful of men in the 'eighties and 'nineties of the last century and then lay fallow until about ten years ago, since when it has been worked somewhat by three or four men. Yet even rather desultory observation indicates that the Cerulean Warbler is of fairly regular occurrence in spring, as the following records show: one seen May 6, 1934, by H. C. Seibert; several seen May 12, 1934, by I. E. Hampe; two noted May 5, 1935, by Seibert; two May 16, 1937, by Kolb; one May 2, 1939, by Kolb (earliest date for both Baltimore and Washington); one May 5, 1940, by Kolb and Seibert; three May 7, 1940, by Seibert (one collected); one May 13, 1940, by Hampe; several records in 1941 and 1942 (see beyond).

East of its main, transalleghean range this bird is known to breed locally. Three instances are known in eastern Maryland; each of the three localities is only about five miles from the other two. The first of these was reported by Pleasants (Auk, 10: 372, 1893) from Towson, Md., where a male was found singing on July 7, 1893, and two immatures and the adult male were collected the following week. The second was recounted at length by Kirkwood (Auk, 18: 137-142, 1901). He watched a singing male in Dulaney Valley throughout the summer of 1899, and the next year watched a pair and found their nest. Forty-one years later, on July 1, 1941, at Cromwell Bridge, I watched a male for three-quarters of an hour make successive feeding trips, collecting food from oaks along a railroad embankment and carrying it a short distance across a wooded ravine. Search through the heavy woodland failed to reveal the nest itself, but the behavior was so clear-cut that there can be but little doubt that breeding was in progress. During 1942 almost weekly trips were taken to this same region and, although many birds were noted throughout the season, the actual nest again eluded us.

However, the study during the past season has made the status of the birds here somewhat clearer. The first record was of two males, one collected on May 9. On May 23, a small bird foraging among the lower branches of a sycamore proved on collection to be a female Cerulean Warbler, the first of that sex we had noted. From May 30 until July 20, every visit to the area revealed one or more singing males. On the morning of June 24, at least five different males were singing along a half-mile stretch of river-bottom. The whole summer's observations brought the conclusion that this is a definite breeding population, not a sporadic occurrence of an isolated pair or two. That it is also a colony of long standing is suggested by the two records of nearly half a century ago, already cited.

The habitat studied is similar to that described as a favorite of the species in the Mississippi Valley, a dense, wet, river-bottom jungle dominated by sycamore (*Platanus*) and ash (*Fraxinus*), the higher branches of the former tree being the

especial niche of the Cerulean Warbler, except during migration. In the same niche, but generally ranging lower and more often visible, occurs the Parula Warbler (*Compsothlypis americana*). As has often been remarked, the songs of the two associated species are similar, but with a little practice it was found that they could easily be distinguished; this was established by repeated tests where the vocalist was later identified by sight. It was quite apparent that after migration only a person well acquainted with the songs of both birds would be likely to detect the presence of the former, for the Cerulean is seldom visible and never at all conspicuous.

Once the song was learned, checking on the birds was easy, for the males were persistent singers. One was noted to sing at intervals of one-half minute to two minutes for nearly an hour early one June morning. While most of the singing was done in the morning, good song was also heard on a hot afternoon when most other birds were silent. Nevertheless, singing rapidly decreased in July and the last heard was on July 20, after which the species was neither seen nor heard, though observation in the area continued until the middle of August. Apparently the fall migration is early. The latest date we have is August 19, 1900, the last time Kirkwood saw his birds.

Baltimore bird students have speculated considerably about several inconsistencies existing between the local avifaunas of Baltimore and Washington; the Cerulean Warbler is a major example. In spring we might suppose that our Ceruleans would come from the southwest, since the species belongs chiefly to the Mississippi Valley, and if they crossed the mountains as several such species are now known regularly to do, they might be expected to fan out northeastward across the relatively unobstructed piedmont or follow the northeast-trending ridges. It seems strange that some of the birds should, instead of such a course, adopt one due eastward; yet that is the only route by which they might avoid the Washington region, which lies immediately on our southwest flank, and where the species is apparently quite rare. This, as Dr. Lincoln has suggested (in litt.), may eventually be found to be the case. Cerulean Warblers are well known in western Maryland but we have at present only slight information from the intervening territory.

We do not know what significance our isolated breeding group has. It does not seem to be a pioneering community of a species extending its range, for it apparently has not spread over a period of many years, although there is much territory available which is seemingly as suitable as that which it now occupies. Nor does it seem to be a relict community, for we have found no evidence that the species was formerly any more abundant in the East than it now is. At present it seems to have no *raison d'être*, either ecological or historical.—HAVEN KOLB, *The Natural History Society of Maryland, Baltimore*.

Notes on the status of the Red Crossbill in Utah.—In his monograph on the Red Crossbill (*Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist.*, 41: 131–132, 1937) Griscom calls attention to the fact that relatively little is known regarding the status of this species in Utah, and that practically nothing is known relative to the breeding habits within the state. Woodbury (*Condor*, 41: 162, 1939) has more recently reviewed the literature on this subject and recorded some data from the University of Utah and Brigham Young University collections. Other scattered references to the species have been made within the past few years. In his recent paper on the birds of the Uinta Basin (*Ann. Carnegie Mus.*, 28: 464–466, 1942), Twomey records seeing both