"Catalogue descriptif des oiseaux du Musée de Caen appartenant à la famille des Trochilidés ou Oiseaux-Mouches" as originally published in the Bulletin de la Société Linnéenne de Normandie, ser. III, tom. III (for 1878–79, dated 1879 on title page), pp. 149–321, and ser. III, tom. IV (for 1879–80, dated 1880 on title page), pp. 8–325 (pp. 324–325 misnumbered 224–225, an error undetected in bibliographies consulted). The work in this form is not cited in The Zoological Record. Details are from a copy borrowed from the John Crerar Library of Chicago.

To add to the confusion, the same article was published twice more, with slight changes, first as pp. 59–534 of vol. I (all published) of the Annuaire du Musée d'Histoire Naturelle de Caen, in 1880 (see The Zoological Record for 1880, and Ibis, 4th ser., 5: 477, 1881), and again, with separate title page, at Paris, by Savy and Desrolles, in 1881. The text of the last, according to Zimmer (Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zool. Ser., 16: 210, 1926), is paged 1–489. Zimmer attributed the first proposal of *Melanotrochilus* to that version, which he dated tentatively as "1880?," but 1881 was given by Taschenberg *(loc. cit.)*, the British Museum *(loc. cit.)*, and other sources. Finally, Dr. Alexander Wetmore has called to my attention that the diagnosis of *Melanotrochilus* was reprinted yet another time, in the Journal für Ornithologie, 1881, pp. 85-86, where it is attributed to "E. Deslongchamps, Guide de Naturaliste, no. 1, Jan., 1880, p. 8."

As correctly indicated by Neave, the name should appear as *Melanotrochilus* Eudes-Deslongchamps, Bull. Soc. Linn. Normandie, ser. 3, vol. 3, p. 314, 1879. Statement of this fact in the ornithological literature may help to avert further error.—ROBERT M. MENGEL, *Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.*

The Skeleton and Systematic Position of *Gampsonyx*.—The little Neotropical hawk *Gampsonyx swainsonii* was placed with the kites in the family Accipitridae until Peters (Check-list of Birds of the World, 1: 281, 1931) and later Hellmayr and Conover (Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zool. Ser., 13: pt. 1, no. 4, 288, 1949) transferred it to the Falconidae.

Recently Plotnik (Revista Invest. Agricolas, 10: 313, 1956) pointed out that the external morphology of *Gampsonyx* resembles that of the kites, and Vesta Stresemann (Auk, 76: 360, 1959) reported that it has the accipitrid type of wing molt.

Thanks to the kindness of John Hamlet, of Birds of Prey, Ocala, Florida, and Dr. Charles H. Wharton, of Georgia State College, Atlanta, I have been able to study a skeleton of *Gampsonyx swainsonii leonae* from Barranquilla, Colombia.

The principal skeletal differences between the Acciptridae and the Falconidae are as follows (Cf. Friedmann, Bull. U.S. Nat. Mus., no. 50, pt. 11, p. 62, 1950; Brodkorb, in Blair, *et al.*, Vertebrates of the United States, pp. 415, 426, 1957; Brodkorb, Bull. Florida State Mus., vol. 4, p. 274, 1959):

Accipitridae:	Falcondidae:
1. Lacrimals free, with double superciliary plate;	1. Lacrimals fused to frontals, without superciliary plate.
2. Palate indirectly desmognathous, with vomer not expanded;	2. Directly desmognathous, with vomer expanded to meet maxillo-palatines.
3. Mandible without foramen;	3. Mandibular foramen present.
4. Thoracic vertebrae free;	4. Thoracics ankylosed.

Accipitridae:	Falcondidae:
5. Sternum without internal spine;	5. Spina sterni interna present.
6. Coracoid with procoracoid perforate;	6. Procoracoid perforate or not.
7. Tibiotarus with 2 openings under supratendinal bridge;	7. Supratendinal bridge with 3 openings.

In all these characters *Gampsonyx* agrees perfectly with the Accipitridae and differs from the Falconidae. Therefore the skeletal system proves that this genus is a member of the Accipitridae, as already suggested on the basis of its external morphology and wing molt.—Pierce Brodkorb, *Department of Biology, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.*

The Duration of Postnuptial Metabolic Refractoriness in the White-crowned Sparrow.—It is well known that gonadal activation and simulated premigratory fat deposition can be experimentally induced in many species of migratory passerines by treatment with long daily photoperiods. These responses are followed by a period of insensitivity during which the gonads regress, the fat deposits are depleted, and additional photostimulation will not elicit a second or additional response. This *refractory period* occurs also under natural conditions during the postnuptial phase, lasting for several months (Miller, 1948, J. Exp. Zool., 109: 1; 1954, Condor, 56: 13; Farner and Mewaldt, 1955, Condor, 57: 112; Wolfson, 1958, J. Exp. Zool., 139: 349; Shank, Auk, 1959, 76: 44). The refractory period is accordingly not merely a laboratory artifact, although it can be detected only by experimental means. For the sake of clarity, we will distinguish between *gonadal* refractoriness and *metabolic* refractoriness, the latter designating the insensitivity of the fat-deposition mechanisms to artificial photostimulation.

It has been shown that gonadal refractoriness involves insensitivity of the hypothalamo-hypophyseal system to photostimulation (Miller, 1949, Science, 109: 546; Benoit, Assenmacher, and Walter, 1950, Comptes Rendus Soc. Biol., 144: 573). Because of the physiological similarity and apparent temporal coincidence of the gonadal and metabolic refractory periods, it has been generally assumed that they share a common functional basis. Recently, however, Shank (1959, Auk, 76: 44) has presented data which suggest that metabolic refractoriness in the White-throated Sparrow *(Zonotrichia albicollis)* lasts considerably longer than gonadal refractoriness. It thus appears that there may be quantitative differences between these types of refractoriness which might provide an experimental wedge for exploring the basis of the phenomena. It is our purpose in this note to present data which strongly support the suggestion advanced by Shank.

Figure 1 shows the variation in mean body weight of groups of White-crowned Sparrows *(Zonotrichia leucophrys gambelii)* which were exposed to artificially prolonged daily photoperiods beginning on the dates shown in the figure. These birds were captured near Pullman, Washington, during the autumn migration and were caged out-of-doors, exposed to natural photoperiods, until the beginning of the experimental treatment. On the successive dates indicated, each group was transferred to an indoor isolation room and exposed to a 15-hour daily photoperiod. The group transferred on 3 December was exceptional in that the birds were exposed to 20 hours of light per day. We do not regard this disparity in photoperiod as significant in the interpretation of the results. Unpublished data from our laboratories agree with those of Winn (1950, doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University) that daily photoperiods in excess of about 14 hours are