

western Ecuador, Venezuela, and Trinidad. A search in the Zoological Record revealed no records south or east of this area.

On January 22, 1954, I collected a Prothonotary Warbler of undeterminable sex in the mangroves bordering the mouth of the Corentyne River, Nickerie District, Surinam. The specimen, bearing my field number 1600, is now in the American Museum of Natural History, New York. This record extends the known winter range of this species considerably to the east.—F. HAVERSCHMIDT, *P. O. Box 644, Paramaribo, Surinam.*

**Ruptured Heart in the Cardinal (*Richmondena cardinalis*).**—On May 26, 1953, Dr. Arthur A. Allen brought an adult male Cardinal to me for preparation. Its death was attended by rather interesting circumstances. Another male had contested its territory and intermittent fighting had taken place for about a day when the presumed resident male was discovered under some brush. The bird was apparently exhausted and was taken into the house where it soon recovered and seemed quite normal. Upon its release the intruder again appeared and fighting was resumed. Later the resident bird was again found under some brush and in its former condition, but this time it did not recover and soon died.

An examination of the skinned body disclosed no apparent external injuries. The skull and brain were undamaged and no body bruises were found. The abdominal viscera appeared quite normal and the testes, as was expected, were enlarged. The chest cavity, however, contained a large mass of clotted blood. Careful examination revealed that the ventricular area of the heart was ruptured with a transverse wound about seven millimeters in length. The lips of the wound were projected outward indicating that the force responsible for the injury came from the inside. Walkinshaw (*Auk*, 62: 141, 1945) mentions the death of a Field Sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*) caused by a ruptured aorta. Presumably the aorta was inherently weak and finally burst due to high blood pressure initiated by severe fright. A similar condition seems to have been responsible for the Cardinal's death.—WILLIAM C. DILGER, *Department of Conservation, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.*

**The Generic Name of the Spectacled Eider.**—The Spectacled Eider was first made known to science by Brandt in 1847 (*Fuligulam Fischeri Novam Avium Speciem*, p. 18, pl. 1) under the name *Fuligula (Lampronetta) Fischeri*. The name *Lampronetta*, although introduced by Brandt in a subgeneric sense, is thus the earliest generic name for this duck.

G. R. Gray (*Proc. Zool. Soc. London*, 23: 212, "1855" = 1856) published the first description of the female Spectacled Eider. At the end of his paper appears the following sentence: "As M. Brandt's subgeneric name of *Lampronetta* is so near *Lampronessa* of Wagler, it may be thought advisable to change it to *Arctonetta*." In this manner was introduced the generic name now universally used for the Spectacled Eider. Wagler's name *Lampronessa*, to which Gray referred, appeared in 1832 (*Isis*, col. 282, 1832) and is a pure synonym of *Aix* Boie, 1828. Although Brandt's name *Lampronetta* may be "near" the earlier *Lampronessa*, the two names must be considered distinct from the viewpoint of zoological nomenclature. According to our modern rules, Gray's action in substituting his *Arctonetta* for *Lampronetta* was unnecessary.

It would thus appear that we are faced with the regrettable fact that an unfamiliar name must be reinstated to take the place of one we have been using, although wrongly so, for nearly a century. There is an alternative, and, I believe, a better solution. The segregation of the Spectacled Eider as a monotypic genus seems to

be based entirely on the feathering of the face and base of the bill. This difference, when contrasted with the overwhelming similarity of *fisheri* to the members of the genus *Somateria*, fades into insignificance. The genus *Somateria*, as presently understood, contains two species, *mollissima* and *spectabilis*, which are spectacularly different from one another in the structure and feathering of the facial region. Males of *mollissima* and *fisheri* are virtually identical in the color pattern of the body, while *spectabilis* has much more black in its plumage. The latter species also shows a greater development of the falcate tertials than does either *mollissima* or *fisheri*. The females and downy young of all three of these eiders are closely similar to one another in all respects except the feathering of the facial region, which reflects to a lesser degree the differences exhibited by the males. Judging from the literature, there seem to be no trenchant differences in reproductive habits or behavior between *fisheri* on the one hand and *mollissima* on the other. If we are to consider as congeneric such superficially diverse ducks as the Mallard, Gadwall, and Green-winged Teal, there is certainly no justification for the continued recognition of a monotypic genus for the Spectacled Eider. I therefore heartily endorse the recommendation of Delacour and Mayr (*Wilson Bull.*, 57: 33, 1945) that the Spectacled Eider be known henceforth as *Somateria fisheri* (Brandt).—KENNETH C. PARKES, *Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania*.

**Some Comments on Vaurie's Revision of the Muscipapini.**—Dr. Charles Vaurie's excellent monograph ("A Generic Revision of Flycatchers of the Tribe Muscipapini," 1953, *Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., Bull.*, 100: 445-538) has already been reviewed in 'The Auk' (1953, 70: 379-380), and it is not this writer's intention to write an additional review *in extenso*. Rather I would like to point out certain small aspects of the problem of the relationships and resulting classification of the group wherein I differ from Vaurie. These comments are offered partly because I am working on an Indian handlist involving many of the species listed.

One of the main difficulties in a revision of this kind is the end product, after all the pros and cons have been considered, of setting the generic limits within the group. Dr. Vaurie is to be congratulated for his study of the external morphology, his consideration of the value of various characters, whether morphological or behavioral, and his promising attempt to create order and to point to areas of closer relationship in this difficult aggregation of species.

In connection with his useful discussion of comparative habits, I wish that Dr. Vaurie had specified his sources of information. Many of the Muscipapini are rare and have been observed infrequently and by few observers. It is difficult, therefore, to be arbitrary about the habits of some of the species. For example, Dr. Vaurie (without citing his source) states on page 473 and again on page 512 that *Muscicapella hodgsoni*, which differs from other flycatchers in having a needle-like bill, in addition to being very small, behaves like "a leaf-warbler or *Regulus*" and it "is said to be gregarious and to flutter on bushes and in the lower trees searching for and taking insects from the leaves and twigs more often than it snaps them from the air." Dr. Vaurie goes on to say, "the habits of *Niltava*, discussed under that genus, vary, but its species do not behave like a leaf-warbler or a *Regulus*, as *hodgsoni* seems to do. *As a result of its habits* [italics are mine], *hodgsoni* has become very small and has developed a much longer tarsus and a very narrow and slender bill which, needle-like, is not hooked at the tip."

In spite of this avowed extraordinary difference, Dr. Vaurie has seen fit to throw *hodgsoni* into the genus *Niltava* although he feels that behavioral differences are important. I seriously question a statement such as the one I have italicized about