able to Pennant (Arctic Zoology, 2: 496, 1785). As the last author cites the term from Carolina, it is apparent that he derived it from Lawson's 'History of Carolina.' There were various editions of this work, the first of which, in 1709, was entitled "A New Voyage to Carolina." Gurdon Trumbull (Names and Portraits of Birds: 119, 1888) states that "Lawson nowhere mentions the term 'flusterers' alone" and quotes Lawson's account as follows: "Black Flusterers; some call these Old Wives; they are as black as ink, the cocks have white faces, they always remain in the midst of rivers, and feed upon drift grass, carnels or sea-nettles; they are the fattest fowl I ever saw, and sometimes so heavy with flesh that they cannot rise out of the water; they make an odd sort of noise when they fly. What meat they are, I could never learn. Some call these the great bald Coot."

Making only slight allowance, it is obvious that these birds were Surf Scoters (*Melanitta perspicillata*), and it is probable that of the three vernacular names given, "old wives" involves confusion of the Old-squaw, well known under that term. It may be added that the names "ball coot" (Jefferson, Notes on the State of Virginia: 118, 1782) and "bald coot" (Morse, American Geography: 59, 1789) probably were merely abbreviated from Lawson's work. Not all of Lawson's birds are recognizable, but the accounts of all that are identifiable should be properly incorporated in modern works.—W. L. McAtee, *Chicago, Illinois.*

Dates for Volume 1 of Bonaparte's 'Conspectus Generum Avium.'—In the lists of "Donations to Library" given in Volume 5 (1850–1851) of the Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, I find that certain parts of Volume 1 of the 'Conspectus Generum Avium' are acknowledged as received from the author on dates somewhat in advance of those currently accepted. Dates which are tentatively accepted by Zimmer (Catalogue of the Ayer Library, 1926) for Volume 1 are as follows:

"Part 1," pp. 1–272, before June 24, 1850
"Part 2," pp. 273–543, before February 3, 1851

The Proceedings dates are:

pp. 1–160, June 18, 1850
pp. 161–"234" [232], July 16, 1850
pp. 233–344, October 15, 1850
pp. 353–400 October 15, 1850

Concordance of the earliest "noticed" dates as cited by the Proceedings and Zimmer result as follows:

"Part 1," pp. 1–160, before June 18, 1850; pp. 161–272, before June 24, 1850
"Part 2," pp. 273–400, before October 15, 1850; pp. 401–543, before February 3, 1851

Considering the slowness of transportation in 1850, the actual dates of issue must have been some weeks earlier, although possibly somewhat later than those which appear on the various signatures. At any rate, Zimmer's supposition that "Part 2" actually was published before the end of 1850 is thus verified in part. This is certainly true for pages 273 to 400, inclusive.—A. J. van Rossem, *Los Angeles, California.*

Corrections and additions to the published records of Siamese Birds.—Riley (U. S. Nat. Mus., Bull. 172: 73, 1938) lists a specimen of *Polyplectron germaini* Elliot from "Huey Yang, Kao Luang, Nakon Sritamarat." Despite the assertions of Beebe (Monograph of the Pheasants, 4: 74, 1922) and Delacour and Jabouille (Oiseaux de l'Indochine Française, 1: 242, 1931) that the species inhabits southern

Siam, no one before Riley has definitely recorded it from any Siamese locality, much less from a place south of the Isthmus of Kra and thus in the Malaysian Subregion. P. R. Lowe (Ibis: 480–482, 1925) has shown that Beebe mistook for *P. germaini* the bird later named *P. b. bailyi* Lowe; Delacour and Jabouille seem to have based their statement on Beebe.

The specimen, U. S. N. M. No. 330131, was, in fact, taken by H. M. Smith on October 7, 1930, along the stream Huai Yang, on the frontier mountain Khao Luang, southwest of Prachuap Khirikhan, S. W. Siam. Smith's visit to the Malaysian Khao Luang west of Nakhon Si Thammarat took place in July, 1928. It should be noted that Khao Luang ("Great Mountain") is popularly or even semiofficially applied to the most prominent peak in any given district, and the term should never be used on a label without reference to the province or nearest important town.

The bird in question is inseparable from other females of *Polyplectron bicalcaratum bicalcaratum* (Linnaeus), which is the peacock-pheasant long known to occur in southwestern Siam. Until proof is adduced for its presence. *Polyplectron germaini* must be removed from the list of Siamese birds.

The Lesser Sand-Plover, *Charadrius mongolus*, has been known from the coasts of Siam since 1896; the numerous specimens, probably for the most part in winter dress, have been about equally divided in print between *C. m. mongolus* and *C. m. atrifrons*, presumably on a supposed difference in length of tarsus.

A series of six birds taken by me between April 22 and May 6, 1937, on the sandy flats between Chanthaburi and Tha Chalaep, southeastern Siam, run from complete winter plumage to complete nuptial dress. Of the six, three are in sufficiently advanced summer dress to be unhesitatingly identified as *Charadrius mongolus schäferi* de Schauensee (Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 89: 340, 1937); the three others almost certainly belong here as well.

Sixteen Siamese specimens recorded by Riley as *C. m. atrifrons* (U. S. Nat. Mus., Bull. 172: 87, 1938), and one other as *C. m. mongolus* (*tom. cit.*: 88) are birds in winter dress and thus not certainly identifiable to subspecies; all, however, have the dark upper parts of *mongolus* and *schäferi*, and since *mongolus* is not certainly known anywhere west of British North Borneo (*see* Chasen, Handlist Malaysian Birds: 33, footnote, 1935), it is highly probable that all of these should also be called *schäferi*. It is likely that *schäferi*, although not previously recorded from its winter quarters, will prove to be the only form regularly wintering in Siam and the western portions of Malaysia.

Search through the literature has brought to my attention the curious fact that there is still no definite record, based on specimens, for the occurrence of the Whimbrel, *Numenius phaeopus*, on the coasts of Siam. Robinson and Boden Kloss (Ibis: 12, 1911) list the species as "numerous along the coasts of the [Malay] Peninsula throughout the winter months," but give no indication that they have seen specimens from the Siamese portion; Robinson and Chasen (Birds of the Malay Peninsula, 4: 142, 1936) simply paraphrase the same vague statement. Gyldenstolpe (Kungl. Svenska Vet.-Akad. Handl., 50: 69, 1913) asserts that it "occurred in great numbers among the wading-birds which had their winter-quarters along the coasts of the Gulf of Siam" (= the mudflats south of Pak Nam at the mouth of the Chao Phaya River), but lists no specimen collected by him; the same author later (Ibis: 758, 1920) says that *Numenius phaeopus variegatus* is "found in small numbers along the coast during the winter-time."

The species is nowhere mentioned as having been taken by Herbert, Williamson, Aagaard, Abbott, Smith, de Schauensee, or other collectors in Siam. It is therefore

worthy of note that I found the Whimbrel in small numbers on the sandy flats between Chanthaburi and Tha Chalaep, southeastern Siam, in May, 1937, and succeeded in collecting four specimens. Of these, three (taken on May 4 and 6) are good examples of *Numenius phaeopus variegatus* (Scopoli); the fourth, taken on May 4, is an equally good example of *Numenius phaeopus phaeopus* (Linnaeus).

The collection of an adult female of Macklot's Sunbird, *Chalcostetha calcostetha calcostetha* (U. S. N. M. No. 337143), in a mangrove swamp between Chanthaburi and Tha Chalaep, on May 1, 1937, makes an interesting addition to the small number of characteristically Malaysian species now known to have discontinuous distribution on the two sides of the Gulf of Siam, and goes far to lend credibility to Tirant's early record for the bird in Cochinchine, whence it has apparently not been reported in the modern period.—H. G. DEIGNAN, *U. S. National Museum, Washington, D. C.* [Published with the permission of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.].

Avian leukosis and the Great Black-backed Gull.—In company with John Phillips, son of the late great duck authority, I was canoeing in Wellfleet (Massachusetts) Bay last December 11 when, rounding a spit of sand, we flushed up from it a veritable umbrella covering of gulls. However, one Great Black-backed Gull remained behind where it had toddled to the water. It swam very weakly when we approached it in the canoe; and, though its plumage appeared in excellent condition (which later closer scrutiny verified), it obviously was ill.

I stepped from the canoe into the shallow water, dropped over its head a piece of sacking to protect my fingers from its bill, and put the whole contrivance, gull and sacking, in the bottom of the canoe. To my surprise the gull offered no resistance. When we had reached the mainland I tied it by a string to a large stone while carrying the canoe across the beach to the car. Still the gull made no attempt to fly, although it did try to get to its feet, but unsuccessfully, as if its capture had drained away the little strength it had.

Returning to the house where I was visiting, I caged the gull and offered it a little bread and some boiled herring which it refused. By gently moving the gull with my hand I could see that its legs and feet were greenish blue instead of faintly pink; also that it was very thin, with its keel-bone sharply showing. Otherwise it seemed in good condition. Its plumage, as I have said, was excellent—firm, closely laid, a shining-pastel shade if such a combination is imaginable. It showed no signs of being 'oiled' as I had feared. Its eye was bright enough.

The day I found the gull was Monday. Wednesday I had to leave for New York. Because I did not care to kill the bird or set it free again to die, and because I could find no one willing to care for it, I put it in a large cardboard box and took it by car to Boston, by train to New York, and so on Thursday by train again to Cornwall, Connecticut, a trip of roughly four hundred miles.

Early Friday morning, the day following my return to Cornwall, I found the gull lying on its back in its cage, its feet stretched rigid in the air. It was not dead, however, and so I gently righted it. On Saturday I sought the advice of a neighbor, Mrs. Lee Garnett Day, who, I had been told, had successfully experimented with vitamin deficiency in animals, especially in birds. The gist of Mrs. Day's diagnosis and recommendations is as follows:

"The sea-gull appeared to have a partial paralysis of the legs which caused it to rest its weight on its elbows. In addition to this it suffered from malnutrition and constantly regurgitated its food. These symptoms seemed to indicate the possibility of a form of Avian Leukosis as well as Coccidiosis.