

GENERAL NOTES

Small Pine Grosbeaks collected in Tompkins County, New York (Plate 5).—Whether or not the A. O. U. Committee on Classification and Nomenclature believes the so-called Lesser Pine Grosbeak, *Pinicola enucleator eschatosus* Oberholser, to be worthy of recognition (the race is mentioned in a footnote in the 1931 A. O. U. Check-List but not in any of the recently published Supplements thereto); and whether or not the *breeding* range of this small, supposedly eastern North American race is fully understood, I feel that I should comment on five Pine Grosbeak specimens from the Cornell University collection which I have recently handled and identified. Three of these, two adult males and an adult (?) female (C. U. Nos. 18643-5) I collected at one shot on the Will Davis farm near Freeville, Tompkins Co., New York, on February 25, 1940. The other two, an immature male and a female (C. U. Nos. 12509-10), William M. Longhurst collected near Caroline, Tompkins Co., New York on February 11, 1942. All five skins were well prepared and are in excellent condition.

The two Longhurst specimens are so small in every way that they instantly stand out from the five (see Plate 5). They measure as follows: the young male, wing, 109 mm., tail, 90; the female, wing, 109, tail, 87. The female, which was not fat, weighed 58.5 grams. The male apparently was not weighed.

As for the three birds which I collected, the two adult males measured: wing, 116, 111.5; tail, 92, 92; and weighed 62.4 and 63.9 grams, respectively. The female was very large by comparison, weighing 72.4 grams (8.5 grams heavier than the heavier of the males) and measuring: wing, 115; tail, 96. In color the two males differed somewhat *inter se*, the longer-winged one being scarlet or orange-red, the other somewhat rosy or pinkish red.

What shall these five birds be called? The large female is almost certainly a Canadian Pine Grosbeak, *P. e. leucura* (Müller); but the other four do not appear to belong to that race, and in our search for the correct name for them we naturally turn first to *eschatosus*, a form evidently believed by its describer to be endemic to Newfoundland (see Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, 27: 51, March 20, 1914). The eight Newfoundland birds examined by Oberholser in connection with his study indubitably were small, the males measuring: wing, 109-116 (average, 113.5); tail, 91-93 (average, 90.7); the females: wing, 104-106 (average 105.3); tail 84-92 (average, 86.9); but Josselyn Van Tyne (Auk, 51: 529-530, 1934) has clearly shown that in Michigan and Ohio a small-sized Pine Grosbeak, which he has identified as *eschatosus*, is a "more common winter visitant" than *leucura*; Ludlow Griscom (Proc. New England Zoological Club, 14: 12, February 12, 1934) believes that "a small subspecies [which he calls *eschatosus*] with a shorter and narrower bill . . . breeds from central Labrador and Newfoundland south to the Gulf of St. Lawrence region, and more locally throughout the maritime provinces of Canada to the mountains of northern Maine and New Hampshire"; and my own investigations have convinced me (1) that careful collecting will reveal the presence of small individuals among the flocks of Pine Grosbeaks which wander southward into the northeastern United States in winter and (2) that these birds should bear the name *eschatosus*.

Of the 24 specimens which Van Tyne examined in the flesh, five male *leucura* weighed 70-83 grams, while nine male *eschatosus* weighed only 52-61 grams; and three female *leucura* weighed 70-81 grams while seven female *eschatosus* weighed 54-61.2 grams. My Freeville, New York female and the Longhurst immature male, referred to above, thus were clearly within the weight-range indicated for

leucura and *eschatosus*, respectively; and my two male birds, while slightly heavier than any *eschatosus* weighed by Van Tyne, were obviously not nearly heavy enough for *leucura*.

To Robert B. Lea, who took the photographs upon which the illustrations are based, and to Dwain W. Warner, who carefully checked the measurements of the five specimens, I hereby extend my thanks.—GEORGE MIKSCHE SUTTON, *Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan*.

The specific name of the Olive Warbler.—Through some curious oversight, it appears to have escaped observation for over a hundred years that *Sylvia olivacea* Giraud, 1841, is precoccupied by *Sylvia olivacea* Vieillot, 1817 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. Nat.*, nouv. éd., 11: 105—*ex* Levaillant, *Ois. Afr.*, 3: pl. 125, fig. 2). There is no escape from the necessity of finding a new name for Giraud's bird.

Vieillot cited two different birds under the name *Sylvia olivacea* on the same page of the *Nouveau Dictionnaire*. The first of these is *Motacilla olivacea* Gmelin [*Syst. Nat.*, 1 (2): 964, 1788] although credited to Latham (*Ind. Orn.*, 2: 532, 1790) who first assigned it to the genus *Sylvia*. I am unable to identify this bird, ostensibly from Ceylon, and I can find no authority who has ever succeeded in doing so. In fact, except for a few authors of very early date, I can find no reference to it. In view of the scanty basis for Gmelin's name—a wretched drawing and a few lines of discussion in Peter Brown's *Illustrations of Zoology*: 33, pl. 14, 1776—it may be as well to leave it unidentified. In such uncertainty it will preoccupy the specific name *olivacea* only in the genus *Motacilla* where no conflict is evident.

This is not true of Vieillot's second *Sylvia olivacea*, based on Levaillant. This appears to be the African species more recently called *Cameroptera brachyura* (Dr. James P. Chapin kindly informs me) by certain authors who were possibly confused by the two usages of *Sylvia olivacea* on the same page of Vieillot and inclined to adopt line priority (for which there is now no justification under the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature). It appears certain that this second *Sylvia olivacea* of Vieillot is quite valid but in any case it precludes the usage of the same name by Giraud.

The next available name for Giraud's species is *Sylvia taeniata* Du Bus [*Bull. Acad. Roy. Sci. Lettr.* . . . Belg., 14 (2): 104, 1847—"le Mexique'"] and the species in question must, therefore, be known as *Peucedramus taeniatus*. There is no question as to the specific assignment of the name. The problem arises only in respect to the subspecific assignment.

The type (an obvious male) is still extant in the Royal Natural History Museum of Belgium, in Brussels. Through the kindness of Dr. R. Verheyen of that institution and of Captain Jean Delacour who undertook to compare the type with examples of the different subspecies (except the smallest of them, *micrus*), it is possible to suggest the restricted application of the name *taeniatus*.

In measurements (wing, 72 mm.; tail, 51), the type is smaller than "*olivaceus*" and *arizonae* and larger than *micrus*, agreeing with the minimum of *jaliscensis* and the average of *aurantiacus*. It is an old mounted bird and greatly faded, and in its present condition agrees best, according to Captain Delacour, with *jaliscensis*. If allowance is made, however, for considerable fading that must have taken place during the last century, I believe that assignment to *aurantiacus* is more strongly indicated.

Bonaparte (*Consp. Avium*, 1: 309, 1850) cites "*Sylvicola taeniata Dubus* . . . Esq. *Orn. figura, ex Mexico m. S. Pedro, Oxaca*" [sic]. According to Sherborn (*Index Anim.*), the figure of this bird appeared on plate 28. This was published about 1850,