

apparently without accompanying text which was not supplied beyond plate 20. I have not seen plate 28 but presume it is like the first twenty plates (kindly lent by the Museum of Comparative Zoology) in having no localities given on it. It is possible, therefore, that Bonaparte obtained his citation of San Pedro, Oaxaca, from Du Bus, himself. Most of the birds described from México by Du Bus were sent to the Brussels Museum by Ghiesbreght and at least two of them (*Euphonia elegantissima* and *Cyanocorax unicolor*) were definitely reported in the Esquisses from "San Pedro, près de Oaxaca." There is every probability, therefore, that the type of *Sylvia taeniata* also came from San Pedro, although which one of the localities of that name in Oaxaca is not certain.

The birds of Chiapas have been identified by authors as *aurantiacus*; those of Vera Cruz are "*olivaceus*." Oaxaca lies between these other two states. Since the type of *taeniata* is too small to be referred to the Vera Cruz form but agrees with *aurantiacus* in measurements, its identity with *aurantiacus* is again indicated.

I suggest, therefore, that *Peucedramus olivaceus aurantiacus* Ridgway, 1896, should bear the name *Peucedramus taeniatus taeniatus* (Du Bus). This still leaves the subspecies "*olivaceus*" without a name. I propose, therefore, the name *Peucedramus taeniatus giraudi* as a new name for *Sylvia olivacea* Giraud (not of Vieillot, ex Levaillant), Descr. Sixteen New Species N. A. Birds: 16, pl. 7, fig. 2, 1841—"Texas" = Las Vegas, Vera Cruz, México. The other subspecies will be known as *Peucedramus taeniatus taeniatus*, *P. t. arizonae*, *P. t. jaliscensis*, and *P. t. micrus*, respectively.—J. T. ZIMMER, *American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.*

Rufous Hummingbird at sea.—On March 28, 1944, while the aircraft carrier on which I was stationed was approximately one hundred miles west of San Diego, California, and approximately seventy miles south of San Nicolas Island, the nearest land, a male Rufous Hummingbird (*Selasphorus rufus*) flew aboard the ship. He remained within a few feet of me for several minutes and was observed perched on an iron railing on the catwalk as well as in flight before he left the ship. The late Dr. Clinton G. Abbott of the San Diego Museum informed me that he knew of no other instance of this species being observed so far at sea and urged that this account be published after the end of hostilities.—GILBERT S. RAYNOR, *Manorville, Long Island, New York.*

Mourning Warbler trapped and banded during a blizzard.—During the first hard snow storm of this last winter in the vicinity of Keuka College, on March 2, 1947, I was watching the birds at a feeding tray of Mr. and Mrs. Edgar Bingham. To my surprise a warbler came to the suet on a tray suspended from the ceiling of the porch about two feet from the window. Mrs. Bingham and I checked the markings while the bird, which appeared in good health, fed. It was olive above and pale yellow below, including the under tail-coverts. There was a dark gray wash on the head which extended under the throat.

By fortunate coincidence, I had arranged to have students of my class in bird study come in to watch a bird bander, Malcolm Leach, of Penn Yan, trap and band birds that afternoon. Not long after the traps had been placed, the warbler came from the willow trees in a near-by ravine into a spruce tree a few feet from the tray, then into a trap on the floor of the porch.

In hand, the bird showed no streaks on the breast and no eye-ring, and the under tail-coverts were half as long as the tail. The darker feathers on the head made us confident it was a Mourning Warbler (*Oporornis philadelphus*).

Mrs. Bingham said she had seen the bird earlier the previous week, and reported

that it came often to feed for several days after it was banded and continued to be very active.—HAZEL R. ELLIS, *Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.*

Confusion of eastern Caprimulgidae.—Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas were the seat of many of the earliest permanent settlements, and information gleaned there came to be embodied in pioneer accounts of American natural history. The people and, to hardly a lesser degree, the naturalists, were confused as to the number and characteristics of the species of Caprimulgidae of the region. One, the Nighthawk, forced itself on their sight but may not have impressed them with its notes, while two, the Chuck-will's-widow and Whip-poor-will, made the woods resound with their calls but were seldom or never seen. The usual consequence was telescoping the three into two, the attributes of which were mixed in various ways.

Gmelin, in what he called the 13th edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus [1 (2): 1028, 1789], based the name *Caprimulgus carolinensis* mainly on the Goat-sucker of Carolina, described and figured by Catesby (*The Natural History of Carolina, etc.*, 1: 8, pl. 8, 1731). This is accepted as the earliest technical designation of the Chuck-will's-widow but both the text and the plate, on which it was founded, evidence the confusion referred to in our first paragraph. In the text, it is said that the bird was that called East India Bat in Virginia; this appears to be correct; witness the quotation from John Clayton in *An Account of Carolina and the Bahama Islands* (Vol. 2 of Catesby's work: 16, 1743), in which he contrasts it with the Whip-poor-will. But Catesby goes on to say of the Goat-Sucker of Carolina: "before rain, the air is full of them . . . Their note is only a screeper; but by their precipitating and swiftly mounting again . . . they make a hollow and surprising noise . . . like that made by the wind blowing into a hollow vessel." These remarks certainly apply to the Nighthawk. In fact, except for the designation East India Bat (defined only at second hand 12 years later), there is nothing in the text distinctive of the Chuck-will's-widow. As to the illustration, it may be passed on the whole as something like a Chuck-will's-widow, but erroneous in that the rictal bristles have no branches and as confused with the Nighthawk by a large white spot being shown on the primaries. The whole presentation, the basis of the accepted scientific name of the Chuck-will's-widow, is certainly less than half satisfactorily identifiable with that bird.

Relying as Catesby did on Clayton's testimony as to what the East India Bat was, we should, nevertheless, note use of that term as a synonym of "musqueto hawk" by John Lawson (*History of Carolina, etc.*: 277, 1714; orig. ed., 1709), which may have been intended for the Nighthawk. Early naturalists erroneously put in the synonymy of *carolinensis* various birds of Middle and South America but only confusion with other North American species is here noted. Wilson (*American Ornithology*, 3: xiv, 1811) wrote of the Nighthawk as the great bat of Virginia; the latter, however, is the Chuck-will's-widow. Nuttall (*Manual, Land Birds*: 617, 1832) gives "weacoalis" of the Delaware Indians as a synonym of the "chuck" but obviously it is another onomatopoe of the Whip-poor-will. John L. Williams (*The Territory of Florida, etc.*: 74, 1837) lists "Muckawis. This bird resembles the Whip-poor-will in everything but his note." In this case also, an obviously sonic, Indian name of the Whip-poor-will is used for the Chuck-will's-widow that was apparently in mind.

To dispose next of the second name of Catesbyan basis, let us consider that of the Nighthawk. By what must be among the shortest indications ever used to establish a name, John Reinhold Forster in 'A Catalogue of the Animals of North America,' etc.: 13, 1771, designated it: "Goatsucker. Lesser. Capr. minor. C. III. 16." The latter cryptogram refers to Catesby's 1743 volume, previously noted, where, consulting the text, we find that it relates almost 100 per cent to the Whip-poor-will. As to