present specimen is therefore believed to be the first record of the Ancient Murrelet in Ohio.—DELMAR HANDLEY, *Federal Aid Project 61-R, Ohio Division of Wildlife, Castalia, Ohio.*

Black-throated Oriole (*Icterus gularis*) Nesting in Texas.—On June 5, 1951, the writer and his son Samuel, Jr. found two nests of *Icterus gularis* in southwestern Cameron County, Texas. Both nests were in a thickly wooded tract of two or three acres in size, in an area otherwise extensively planted to cotton; the location was one half-mile north of the Rio Grande, near the village of Santa Maria. We were informed by C. T. Gill and L. Irby Davis, both authorities on the birdlife of southern Texas, that this appears to be the first observed nesting of *I. gularis* in Texas.

Both of the nests were suspended from the terminal twigs of drooping branches of the Texas ebony tree (*Pithecolobium flexicaule*). They were about 100 feet apart and near the center of the thicket. The first nest found was of dried and yellowed grasses and may have been constructed the previous year. It was about 25 feet above the ground and hung over a small clearing in the thicket. The other was about 20 feet up and also hung over a little clearing. The second nest was under construction when found and was made, outwardly at least, of green grass. In the tree with the old oriole nest were two occupied nests of the White-winged Dove (*Zenaida asiatica*) and one of the Derby Flycatcher (*Pitangus sulphuratus*). The dove nests contained eggs; the flycatcher's, young. The tree with the new nest of the oriole held also a nest of the Verdin (*Auriparus flaviceps*) and unidentified dove nests. Mr. Gill kept the new oriole nest under observation until the eggs hatched, and on July 7 made several photographs of the parent birds at the nest (see plate 5). He reports that, as well as he could determine, only one young was reared.—SAMUEL A. GRIMES, *4627 Peachtree Circle, Jacksonville, Florida.*

Eastern Mourning Dove in the Dominican Republic—A Correction.—In 'The Auk' (vol. 58 (2): 260–261, 1941) I recorded an Eastern Mourning Dove (*Zenaidura macroura carolinensis*) carrying Fish and Wildlife Service band No. A-441887 banded at Gulfport, Florida, on March 30, 1932, by Mrs. Daisie M. Morrison, and recovered at Santiago, Dominican Republic, about July 25, 1934. The original letter of advice from Senor Pedro Escobosa referred to the bird as "una gaviota," the Spanish name for gulls and terns. Since, however, Mrs. Morrison stated that "my record shows A-441887 a Mourning Dove" the identification of the bander was accepted as correct.

The recovery was reported also, at a later date, by Senor Francisco Hernandez, of Sanchez, Dominican Republic, who has been most helpful in other cases involving recovery of banded birds in that country. He insisted that the bird was actually a "gaviota" [gull] and upon further investigation it develops that Mrs. Morrison used bands No. A-441878 and A-441884 on Laughing Gulls (*Larus atricilla*) on April 3, 1932, and April 4, 1932, respectively. There is a very strong probability that the bird recovered at Santiago was actually the Laughing Gull that carried band A-441884 and that the error resulted from misreading a 4 for a 7. The status of the Eastern Mourning Dove as a bird of the Dominican Republic should be at least held in abeyance pending further confirmation. I am indebted to Mr. Allen J. Duvall of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and to Dr. Abelardo Moreno of the University of Havana for bringing this matter to my attention.—FREDERICK C. LINCOLN, *U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D. C.*

Geographical Variation in the Blue-throated Hummingbird (*Lampornis clemenciae*).—In 1918 Oberholser (Condor, 20: 181–182) described a northern race of the Blue-throated Hummingbird under the name *Cyanolaemus* [= *Lampornis*]

clemenciae bessophilus, specifying the Chiricahua Mountains of Arizona as type locality. He assigned specimens from New Mexico and even west Texas (Chisos Mountains) to this subspecies, describing the Texas specimens as showing "a tendency toward" *L. c. clemenciae* but as "decidedly referable to" *bessophilus*. (He included no Texas specimens among the 10 males and 2 females whose measurements he tabulated.)

In 1929, James L. Peters and I (Van Tyne, Auk, 46: 205) identified 6 newly-collected adult males from the Chisos Mountains as *L. c. clemenciae* rather than *bessophilus*, and this area was included in the range of *L. c. clemenciae* in the fourth edition of the A.O.U. Check-List (1931) and in Peters' "Check-list of Birds of the World" (Vol. 5, 1945). But in 1942, W. E. Clyde Todd (Annals Carnegie Museum, 29: 334) reported disagreement: "Three adult males from these mountains [the Chisos] are to my eye indistinguishable from Arizona birds."

Since I felt a certain responsibility, because of my 1929 report, for clearing up this problem, I recently re-examined the case. Thanks to the Max M. Peet Collection (University of Michigan) and to generous loans of specimens from E. R. Blake of Chicago Natural History Museum, James L. Peters of the Museum of Comparative Zoology, W. E. Clyde Todd of the Carnegie Museum, and George M. Sutton, I was able to assemble a much larger series than had been previously available. Most importantly, this assemblage included an adequate series of the southern form (*L. c. clemenciae*), unmixed with any possible wintering individuals from farther north. After eliminating unduly worn and damaged specimens, I had 17 adult males and 8 adult females of *L. c. clemenciae* (from the states of México, Michoacán, San Luis Potosí, Nuevo León, and Durango). Of *L. c. bessophilus* from Arizona I had 37 adult males and 25 adult females, all in good plumage.

A careful study of this series led me to a definition of *bessophilus* somewhat different from that given by the original describer: "Similar to *Cyanolaemus clemenciae clemenciae*, but bill shorter; male with upper parts duller, particularly on the rump, which is more washed with grayish; lower surface decidedly paler; and throat duller. Female duller above and paler below than the female of *Cyanolaemus clemenciae clemenciae*" (Oberholser, *op. cit.*, p. 181).

I found the bill in this species quite variable in length, even in adults, but the range of variation in *L. c. bessophilus* seemed to be precisely the same as in *L. c. clemenciae*. (The bill in *bessophilus* did appear to be, on the average, the more slender, especially as viewed from the side.) Secondly, I could discover no geographical difference in throat coloration of males. Except for these two points, my findings agreed with Oberholser's description.

The two subspecies are best distinguished by the following characters: In *L. c. bessophilus* both sexes have the upper parts duller—that is, paler and more brownish—than in *L. c. clemenciae*, especially on the posterior part of the back and on the rump. The lower surface in *bessophilus* is more variable, but it averages paler, particularly in the female. Further, the chin and throat are browner in the female of *bessophilus*, and, in fact, the females of the two subspecies are more readily distinguished than the males.

In addition to the two series from Mexico and Arizona on which I established the above distinctions, I had assembled 14 adult specimens (10 males and 4 females) from the Chisos Mountains, including the 3 adult males which Todd (1942: 334) assigned to *bessophilus*. I found on comparison that all 14 specimens clearly belonged with the series of *Lampornis c. clemenciae*. I believe, therefore, that the statements of the ranges of the two forms of the Blue-throated Hummingbird are

correct as they now stand in the 1931 A.O.U. Check-List and in Peters' "Check-list of Birds of the World."—JOSSELYN VAN TYNE, *University of Michigan Museum of Zoology, Ann Arbor.*

Forehead Color of the Pileated Woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*).—Once an error has appeared in a description of a bird or a particular plumage of a bird, it tends to be repeated in succeeding publications. A writer well informed about a particular species may have corrected the error in his own publication, and students looking for detailed information about a species are often bewildered by these apparent contradictions. Such a situation prevails in the published descriptions of the forehead color of Pileated Woodpeckers.

Among woodpeckers in general, several situations are to be found as regards the resemblance of juveniles to adults. In many genera, the young resemble the male more than they do the female; or at least, both sexes of the young have the bright markings, red or yellow, of the male parent, though not always in the same location. Young Red-headed Woodpeckers differ from their parents in the color of the entire head. The situation in the Pileated Woodpecker seems to be unique in the family. Not only can juvenile Pileateds be recognized as to sex by their forehead and moustache color, but this difference is apparent as early as nine or ten days after hatching, when the color of the developing feathers can be seen through the skin. Even before the eyes have opened, it is possible to recognize the red forehead and moustache of the male, the dark forehead and black moustache of the female. Juvenile male Pileateds do *not* resemble the female parent, in spite of numerous published descriptions stating that they do. This point was made by my late husband (Auk, 61: 380, 1944), but the error is still being made in print.

There is another point in regard to the forehead color of Pileated Woodpeckers which needs clarification—the actual color of the forehead in juvenile and adult females. For while the juvenile female resembles the adult female in general appearance as stated above, the color of the forehead undergoes a distinct change in the post-juvenal molt and continues to change somewhat with succeeding post-nuptial molts. It is this fact, apparently, which has led to some of the conflicting descriptions in literature. Let us examine several of these descriptions:

Ridgway (U. S. Natl. Mus. Bull., 50: 156, 1914) describes the adult female thus: "Forehead and anterior half (more or less) of crown grayish brown or olive." Of the young female he says (p. 158): "Forehead and most of crown grayish brown, the latter with a paler terminal spot on each feather."

A. C. Bent's description of the young female (U. S. Natl. Mus. Bull., 174: 168, 1939) is similar: "the forehead and most of the crown are grayish brown, which invades the red posterior portion of the crown."

However, E. H. Eaton (N. Y. State Mus. Mem., 12: 152, 1914) says: "Female and young have only the rear portion of the head red, the frontlet and the moustaches being blackish." I point out in passing that this is in error in regard to the young male.

T. S. Roberts ('Birds of Minnesota,' Minneapolis, Univ. Minn. Press, 1932: 620) agrees with this, at least as to the description of the female. In his key to woodpeckers, he lists the Pileated Woodpecker female as having "Anterior half of crown black or blackish."

W. E. Clyde Todd ('Birds of Western Pennsylvania,' Pittsburgh, Univ. Pittsburgh Press, 1940: 321) describes the female as having the top of the head scarlet, "with the forepart brown."