

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

the plate, it represents a Nighthawk, with the addition of strong rictal bristles, which may have been put there for better agreement with the text, where they are twice mentioned. Taking the whole combination, and giving text and plate equal weight, it may be appraised as about 45 per cent Nighthawk. Such is the basis of *minor* Forster, as it was also for the long-used *virginianus* Gmelin, in connection with which Whip-poor-will (Catesby) was openly cited and the statement made that it calls "wiperi-wip." Confusion as to this second species thus was running strong from the beginning.

It was not until Wilson's time (*American Ornithology*, 5: 71, 1812) that anyone got around to giving the Whip-poor-will a technical name of its own—the very appropriate "*vociferus*." In the way of mix-ups, it may be mentioned that in George Edwards's 'A Natural History of Birds' 1: 63, 1743) as in Catesby's work, the figure is of a Nighthawk while the text relates to the Whip-poor-will. Bartram (*Travels Through North and South Carolina*: 293, 1791) refers to the Nighthawk or Whip-poor-will, and Barton (*Fragments of the Natural History of Pennsylvania*: 3, 1799) transposes this to Whip-poor-will or Nighthawk.

Vieillot (*Histoire Naturelle des Oiseaux de l'Amerique Septentrionale*, etc.: 55, 1807), writing of the Whip-poor-will, stated that it was called *payk* and *peesk* by Hudson Bay Indians. On both geographic and sonic grounds these names can apply only to the Nighthawk. On the next page (56) of the same work, then dealing with the Nighthawk, he wrote (in translation), "The name I give to this Engoulevant is derived from the cry it utters when perched—which has been expressed by the word Popetué." From the cadence of this word, one would suspect it of being an analogue of "Whip-poor-will" but other evidence on this point has not yet been forthcoming. Again one wonders whether it may have anything to do with the term "pope" which was recorded early enough for him to have seen it in a French translation (2: 197, 1790) of a work by Thomas Anburey (*Travels Through the Interior Parts of America*, 1923 edition, 2: 132; original ed., London, 1789). There, discussing the "whipper will," Anburey wrote: "it is also known by the name of the *Pope*, by reason of its making a noise resembling that word when it alights upon a tree or fence." "Pope," of course is the "boom" of the nighthawk in flight. Speaking of that bird as the "mosquito hawk," he exemplifies the general popular confusion of our Caprimulgidae by saying: "I . . . am apt to conclude, that the Mosquito hawk and whipper-will are the same bird." Anburey was a British officer on parole in Connecticut at the time, where the name "pope" appears to have been then current. Samuel Peters (*History of Connecticut*: 194, 1781) got the matter a little straighter, saying: "It [the whipperwill] is also called the pope, by reason of its darting with great swiftness from the clouds to the ground, and bawling out Pope!" The sound is made by vibration of the primaries as the wings are stiffly held in V-shape while the bird falls through the air, and by the Nighthawk, not the Whip-poor-will. Thus the confusion of Caprimulgidae in colonial times was not confined to the southeast nor is it now. Each of the three species here considered is called "Whip-poor-will"—the Nighthawk in four states, to my knowledge, and the others throughout their ranges. Each is called bullbat and mosquito hawk and, variously paired, two of them share such names as night bird, night hawk, and nightjar. Evidently their discrimination is too much for the public even at this day.—W. L. McARTHUR, *Chicago, Illinois*.

The correct name for the "Pauraque."—Witmer Stone in a note in *The Auk* in 1929 (46: 389) gives a short history of the name "Pauraque" and its variation "Parauque," indicating a preference for the first spelling, and quoting Major Allan Brooks to the effect that this is an onomatopoeic version, by the Mexicans, of the