

A NEW CAROLINA WREN

BY W. EARL GODFREY

In the course of routine identification of Carolina Wrens in the bird collection of The Cleveland Museum of Natural History, the writer has been unable to refer Ohio specimens to *Thryothorus ludovicianus carolinianus* (Wilson) as has recently been done by others. This condition prompted a rather painstaking investigation of several races of the Carolina Wren, the results of which are given below. The unusually confusing individual and seasonal variations characteristic of this species and the consequent necessity for ample study material have been well commented on by Lowery in the introduction to his revision of the Carolina Wrens (Auk, 57: 95-104, 1940). Because its importance can hardly be overstressed, this condition is again emphasized here. Inasmuch as a large proportion of the material examined in the present connection was not seen by Lowery when he prepared his revision of the Carolina Wrens, it is felt that a better understanding of certain of the races of this species is now possible.

For the loan of enlightening material I should like to express my gratitude to the following individuals and institutions: Dr. Josselyn Van Tyne and the Museum of Zoology of the University of Michigan (including the loan of specimens from Dr. Max Peet's collection); Dr. John W. Aldrich and the Fish and Wildlife Service; Dr. Herbert Friedmann and the U. S. National Museum; Dr. Harry C. Oberholser for specimens from his private collection; Mr. Edward S. Thomas and the Ohio State Museum; Mr. Ralph Dury and the Cincinnati Society of Natural History.

It is an especial pleasure to express my thanks to Dr. Harry C. Oberholser for his ready advice on obscure points as well as for other courtesies which were of invaluable aid.

For reasons to be given later in this paper it has been found necessary to describe a new subspecies which may be called

***Thryothorus ludovicianus alamoensis*, subsp. nov.**

BEXAR WREN

Type.—Adult male, No. 152,430, U. S. National Museum collection; San Antonio, Texas; March 18, 1889; Henry P. Attwater.

Subspecific characters.—Readily distinguishable from *T. l. ludovicianus* (Latham) and *T. l. oberholseri* Lowery by its paler and more rufescent (less sooty) upper parts. Differs from *T. l. lomitisensis* Sen-

nett and *T. l. berlandieri* Baird in being more rufescent (less grayish) and of larger average size, except that the culmen is shorter than in *berlandieri*. Most similar to the geographically distant *T. l. carolinianus* (Wilson), but is duller and paler, with the tail averaging more grayish in that the interspaces between the dusky bars are less rufescent.

Measurements.—Male: wing, 60.0–61.5 mm. (average, 60.5); tail, 48.5–52.6 (50.5); exposed culmen, 15.8–17.5 (16.7); tarsus, 21.3–23.5 (22.3). Female: wing, 55.0–59.5 mm. (average, 56.7); tail, 46.0–51.8 (48.7); exposed culmen, 14.8–17.0 (15.9); tarsus, 19.2–21.8 (21.0).

Range.—East-central and south-central United States north to southern Iowa, northern Illinois, and northern Indiana; east to central Indiana, southern Illinois, southeastern Missouri, west-central Arkansas (Glenwood, Amity, and Delight), and east-central Texas (Huntsville); south at least to the mouth of the Nueces River and Fort Clark, Texas; west to Fort Clark and Kendall County, Texas, western Oklahoma, and eastern Kansas.

Specimens examined.—ARKANSAS (Amity, 2; Clinton, 1; Delight, 5; Glenwood, 3; Van Buren, 1); ILLINOIS (Henderson County, 1; Olney, 1; Wabash County, 3); INDIANA (Knox County, 1; Wheatland, 1); MISSOURI (Williamsville, 1); OKLAHOMA (Cherokee Nation, 1; Cleveland County, 1; Kiowa Indian Agency, 1; Mount Scott, 1; Oklahoma City, 1; Ponca Agency, 1; Red Oak, 1; Tulsa, 1); TEXAS (Bernard Creek, 2; Eastland County, 1; Fort Clark, 7; Huntsville, 1; Leon Springs, 3; mouth of the Nueces River, 2; Rice, Navarro County, 1; San Antonio, 8; Victoria, 1; Washington County, 1; West Carancahua Creek, 1). In addition, Dr. Harry C. Oberholser was kind enough to examine seven specimens in the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, which were not seen by the writer, from the following localities: Medina Co., Kendall Co., and Dallas, TEXAS; Brookville, INDIANA; Fort Reno, OKLAHOMA; and Leavenworth, KANSAS.

Comments.—It is rather surprising that Texas representatives of this new race have hitherto been referred to the sooty *T. l. ludovicianus*, since they are similar to birds from farther north (Oklahoma, northwestern Arkansas, etc.) which Lowery referred to *T. l. carolinianus*.

Birds taken in eastern Texas (Jefferson, Orange, Sour Lake, Virginia Point, and Dickinson Bayou) are nearer *ludovicianus* and are referred thereto; but a specimen from Huntsville, although somewhat intermediate, is considerably closer to *alamoensis*. An example from Matagorda is, in color, nearer *ludovicianus* and perhaps indicates

that *ludovicianus* occupies a narrow coastal strip south at least to that point. Specimens from a little farther inland (Bernard Creek, west of Columbia; Victoria) are nearer *alamoensis*, however, and coastal examples from more southern localities (Carancahua Creek and the mouth of the Nueces River) are good examples of *alamoensis*.

A series of seven specimens from Fort Clark, Texas, less than 30 miles east of the type locality of *T. l. oberholseri* Lowery, is interesting. In color of back and pileum they incline toward *oberholseri*, being slightly darker than typical *alamoensis*. Wings, tail, and upper tail-coverts are very grayish, however, and the sides and flanks are, in two specimens, heavily barred with dusky. These tendencies toward *berlandieri* are offset by the large size of these specimens (they are larger than *ludovicianus* from Louisiana) although the culmen is shorter than in *berlandieri*. Possibly a larger series might show these characters to be of greater taxonomic significance; but under the circumstances it seems best to group them with *alamoensis* to which they seem to be most closely allied.

The writer has not seen the Crystal City, Texas, specimen which Lowery (*tom. cit.*: 103) tentatively considered an intergrade between *oberholseri* and *ludovicianus* and which Hellmayr had earlier referred to *lomitensis*. Lowery mentions a "rich brown" coloration as characterizing this specimen and it seems unlikely that intergradation between *ludovicianus* and the even darker and duller *oberholseri* could account for it. The writer calls it *alamoensis*. Likewise, the two specimens from Kendall Co., Texas, described by Lowery (*loc. cit.*) as being confusing because of their paleness, would seem to be extreme examples of this new subspecies.

***Thryothorus ludovicianus ludovicianus* (Latham)**

In the light of material available for the present study it becomes apparent that the range of this race, as postulated by Lowery (*tom. cit.*: 97), is in need of considerable revision. As has already been shown above, specimens from a considerable area of Texas heretofore referred to this subspecies should be placed elsewhere.

Lowery's list of specimens examined contains only three examples from Ohio and none from Kentucky. The Ohio material (Madisonville and Muskingum County) he referred to *T. l. carolinianus*. It so happens that two of three specimens from Madisonville, Ohio, in the U. S. National Museum collection—by strange mischance probably the same specimens used by Lowery as Ohio samples—are most atypical, representing the extreme in individual variation of Ohio material toward paleness and rufescence!

The 61 specimens available in the present connection from Ohio, Kentucky, and Michigan are much too dark and sooty to be *T. l. carolinianus*. In average color they are almost identical with topotypes of *T. l. ludovicianus* from New Orleans, La., and while they are of slightly larger average size than the New Orleans examples, yet the writer is quite unable to find any difference that would seem to justify separating them from *T. l. ludovicianus*.

Eleven specimens from Kentucky (Canton, Foster's, Alexandria, Ghent, Lexington, Middlesboro, Round Hill) are good examples of *ludovicianus*, although two birds from Hickman are, as might be expected, intermediate between *ludovicianus* and *alamoensis*, but apparently are nearer the former. Seven specimens from southeastern Michigan also are clearly referable to *ludovicianus*. The Ohio series of 43 specimens from 24 well-distributed localities presents a better picture of individual variation. In addition to the Madisonville specimens noted above, three specimens in a series of six from Wooster are somewhat aberrant, being rather paler and more rufescent than most Ohio examples, but still averaging duller than specimens of *T. l. carolinianus* from Maryland, District of Columbia, and Virginia. In series, however, Ohio material can not be separated from Louisiana specimens; indeed, certain Ohio specimens are even darker and duller than any of the ten Louisiana specimens with which they were compared. Thus it seems that the *Southern Carolina Wren* actually occupies a broad *northernmost* extremity of the range of the species!

The range of *Thryothorus ludovicianus ludovicianus* would thus seem to be as follows: North to southeastern Michigan, northern Ohio, West Virginia, and southern Virginia; east to eastern Ohio, western West Virginia, and southeast through southern Virginia to the Atlantic coast; south to middle Georgia, middle Alabama, and middle Mississippi, and southern Louisiana; west to eastern Texas, central-eastern and central-southern Arkansas, western Tennessee, western Kentucky, southeastern Indiana, western Ohio, and southeastern Michigan.

***Thryothorus ludovicianus carolinianus* (Wilson)**

A series of twelve specimens in fresh, unworn plumage (October-December) from Maryland, District of Columbia, and Virginia, is readily separable from birds from Louisiana, Ohio, Kentucky, etc., by the lighter, more rufescent upper parts of the former. It would thus appear, then, that *T. l. carolinianus* is a good race, but its range

seems to be restricted to, roughly, southern Pennsylvania, and the lower Hudson and Connecticut valleys south at least to central Virginia.

***Thryothorus ludovicianus oberholseri* Lowery**

The writer has examined only seven specimens from the range postulated for this recently described race. Of these, two juvenal females are useless for comparison. A badly worn and faded adult from Junction is still dark on the rump and a somewhat less worn bird from Kerrville is too dark and dull to be referred to *alamoensis*. Two specimens from Langtry, however, and another in fresh plumage from the mouth of the Devils River are strikingly of dark, dull coloration, thus differing from all other specimens from other parts of Texas seen by me. Withal, *T. l. oberholseri* is apparently completely cut off from geographical contact with *ludovicianus*, which it most closely resembles, by the much paler and more rufescent *T. l. alamoensis*, just as the latter is cut off from *T. l. carolinianus* in Ohio and Kentucky by intervention of the darker *T. l. ludovicianus*.

Cleveland Museum of Natural History
Cleveland, Ohio

A NEW SUBSPECIES OF WEDGE-BILL FROM COLOMBIA

BY JOHN T. ZIMMER

AMONG specimens submitted to me by Brother Nicéforo Maria of the Instituto de La Salle, Bogotá, Colombia, were two examples of the Wedge-bill, *Glyphorhynchus spirurus*, that could not be assigned to any of the forms known at present. Both birds are from northeastern Colombia, although not from the same restricted locality, and, although not exactly alike, they agree in the particulars that distinguish them from the other forms. A "Bogotá" trade-skin is a close match for one of them. Since a name is needed for this form, it is described below.

I am indebted to Brother Nicéforo Maria for his kindness in presenting the type to the American Museum of Natural History and for other generosities.

Names of colors in the following account are capitalized when direct comparison has been made with Ridgway's 'Color Standards and Color Nomenclature.'