

such mishaps need not be confined to aviary birds. As these deformities could be discovered only by dissection, many others must go undetected, and injuries of this type may be commoner than might at first be supposed.—P. J. K. BURTON, *Bird Section, British Museum (Natural History), London, England*. Accepted 12 Oct. 71.

Palm Warbler in Guerrero and comments on Audubon's Warbler in Costa Rica.—Outside of the Yucatan Peninsula and its adjacent islands, the Palm Warbler (*Dendroica palmarum*) is known in Mexico only as a vagrant to Baja California (Moore, in Miller et al., *Pacific Coast Avifauna* 33: 255, 1957) and Oaxaca (Lowery and Monroe, in Check-list of birds of the world, vol. 14 [R. A. Paynter, Jr., Ed.], Cambridge, Massachusetts, Mus. Comp. Zool., 1968, p. 32). An additional occurrence is of a female (DMNH 8133) taken at Iguala, Guerrero, on 28 November 1948, by the late W. W. Brown. The specimen, apparently an immature, lacks all but traces of yellow on the venter (exclusive of the crissum) and is therefore assigned to the nominate race.

The only specimens of Audubon's Warbler (*Dendroica coronata auduboni*) reported south of Honduras are those detailed from Costa Rica by Slud (Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., 128: 323, 1964). F. C. Lincoln supplied the records to Slud from files of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. According to Chandler S. Robbins (pers. comm.), there are two cards in those files listing dates and Costa Rican localities for A.O.U. species number 656 (Audubon's Warbler), each stamped that the data were taken from the catalog of the United States National Museum, and each with Lincoln's penciled notation, "*Dendroica auduboni*." The data on the cards are as follows: San Jose, Costa Rica, 22 August and 22 September 1864; Barranca, Costa Rica, 15 and 30 March; 20, 29, and 30 September; and 4 October 1865.

I have searched the United States National Museum vainly for Costa Rican specimens of Audubon's Warbler or any of the related Myrtle Warbler (*D. c. coronata*) with the above data. My examination of appropriate catalog volumes also has been negative, as no reference is made to either of the above forms in the listing of Costa Rican material taken in 1864 and 1865. From these findings I surmise that some clerical error was made in transcribing data for the Fish and Wildlife files, but the exact determination of what transpired is not a simple matter.

The United States National Museum catalog volumes containing the 1864 and 1865 Costa Rican specimens show many blanks in the identification of specimens, and no single species is listed with all eight of the above dates and localities. Among warblers there is one species listed for two of them, that being the following *Dendroica blackburniae* (= *fusca*) collected by F. Carmiol: USNM 35223, ♀ San Jose, 22 August 1864 (exchanged cf. catalog); USNM 41294, ♂ Barranca, 29 September 1865 (in collection in 1971).

On the basis of these two specimens, one is tempted to assume that all of the purported *D. c. auduboni* from Costa Rica are actually *D. fusca*. However, there are no other *D. fusca* in the United States National Museum collection with the data supplied by Lincoln, so that assumption may not be correct. In fact, in the absence of additional *D. fusca* material some may be tempted to believe that the records do indeed refer to *D. c. auduboni* and that the specimens have all been lost or exchanged. There are a number of reasons for not accepting this premise, including the fact Ridgway and other earlier workers do not cite the purported

D. c. auduboni material from Costa Rica. In addition, *D. c. auduboni* would not be expected in Costa Rica before October, whereas one of the dates listed by Lincoln is 22 August and four others are in September. On the other hand, *D. fusca* occurs in Costa Rica from mid-August into April and is rather widespread and numerous there (Slud, 1964: 324). Regardless of whether or not Lincoln's records can be specifically allocated to other species, it seems clear that they cannot be applied with any confidence to *D. c. auduboni*. There are two sight records of Audubon's Warbler in Costa Rica (Slud, 1964: 323), and while they may be valid, specimen confirmation is still awaited.

I am grateful to several people for help in investigating the *D. c. auduboni* matter, including R. C. Banks, C. S. Robbins, C. H. Rogers, and P. Slud, and to K. C. Parkes for pointing out the significance of the *D. palmarum* record.—JOHN P. HUBBARD, *Delaware Museum of Natural History, Greenville, Delaware 19807*. Accepted 6 Dec. 71.

Field Sparrow uses abandoned nest for August brood.—On 22 July 1971 while conducting an ecological study of the Field Sparrow (*Spizella pusilla*) in an open pine stand in eastern Texas, I located what was apparently an abandoned nest of this species. Although the nest was in a relatively unworn condition, it showed no signs of being in use. I concluded from its general appearance and condition that it probably had already been used this season, rather than having been just recently built. I rechecked the nest on 3 August, almost 2 weeks later, and it still showed no evidence of being in use. It contained a small number of pine needles that had fallen from branches above, but otherwise appeared in much the same condition as before.

On 23 August my attention was attracted once again to the nest, this time by a pair of Field Sparrows, one of which I had recently color-banded. To my surprise I found this pair of sparrows were feeding three young approximately 2 days old in the nest. The first egg must have been laid, therefore, within a few days of 6 August.

The nest was 2 m above the ground in a young loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*) 2.3 m tall. The nest measurements were: 89 mm exterior diameter, 52 mm interior diameter, 46 mm interior depth, 66 mm overall depth. It weighed 5.2 g. The exterior of the nest was composed of thick-stemmed grasses, and the inside contained fine rootlets and was lined with black horsehair.

The reuse of nests is common in many large birds such as storks and eagles (Welty, *The life of birds*, Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders, 1962, p. 275), but apparently is rare among passerines. Walkinshaw (Wilson Bull., 48: 94, 1936; Bird-Banding, 10: 107, 149, 1939; Bird-Banding, 16: 1, 1945) in his extensive studies on the Field Sparrow does not mention any instances of nest reuse. A possibility exists that no young were reared successfully in this nest prior to August, and that the initial attempt (or attempts) to raise a brood met with failure. However, judging by the fact the slightly worn nest was apparently not in use for a 2-week interval toward the end of the breeding season, I believe it likely that a successful nesting occurred before the August clutch was laid. It may be that this unusual behavior was in some way associated with the relatively late nesting of the pair observed.

I am grateful to Charles D. Fisher for his criticisms and comments.—PIERRE N. ALLAIRE, *Department of Biology, Stephen F. Austin State University, Nacogdoches, Texas 75961*. Accepted 22 Nov. 71.