

exilis. Specimens examined (5): Peru, Pisco, Ica Province, AMNH 17043, Huaral, Lima Province, AMNH 151343, 151344, Menocho, La Libertad Province, FMNH 44659, 44661.

C. a. aequatorialis.—The single juvenile of this subspecies is finely vermiculated as in *exilis*, but, whereas that form is gray, this one is buffy, with extensive, rich buff edges and barring on the dorsal feathers, coverts, and tail. Specimen examined (1): Peru, Trujillo, La Libertad Province, AMNH 151353.

The juvenal plumage of the Lesser Nighthawk, as that of the Common Nighthawk (*C. minor*; *vide* A. R. Phillips pers. comm.), appears to be useful taxonomically, possibly more so than the definitive plumage. The juvenal plumage groups described above support the nomenclatural conclusions I had reached for the populations of the United States and northern Central America based on the adults (Dickerman MS). That is, in brief, that *C. a. inferior* of Baja California is inseparable from *C. a. texensis*, that *C. a. micromeris* is a distinctive subspecies restricted to the arid regions of the Yucatán Peninsula, and that the populations of southern México and probably Central America south to Costa Rica should be called *C. a. littoralis*. In South America the presence of two distinctive juvenal plumage groups within the range of the currently recognized nominate subspecies indicates that a revision of those populations may be needed. The incongruous occurrence of juveniles at Riohacha, Colombia that are inseparable from the Guyana specimen, which is assumed to represent true *acutipennis* of Cayenne, in the center of the geographical range of a distinctly different juvenal plumage group, is especially worthy of further analysis.

In view of the small series of juveniles now available, the possibility of color phases should be investigated, particularly in South America. The total of only 19 juveniles examined from the region of México south to Peru and Brazil is obviously inadequate. More collecting is needed.

Received 17 October 1980, accepted 7 January 1981.

A Blue Bunting [*Passerina (Cyanocompsa) parellina*] Record for the United States from Louisiana

STEVEN W. CARDIFF AND J. V. REMSEN, JR.
Museum of Zoology, Louisiana State University,
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70893 USA

On 16 December 1979 the authors (with Linda Hale and David Hunter) saw what they thought was an abnormally rusty female Indigo Bunting (*Passerina cyanea*) in acacia thickets on Hackberry Ridge, 3 km west-southwest of Johnson's Bayou School, Cameron Parish, Louisiana. Cardiff collected the bird the next day (Louisiana State University Museum of Zoology No. 94288; prepared by D. Wiedenfeld; ovary 4 × 3 mm; skull ossified; 16.2 g). After the bird was prepared as a skin, it was recognized by John P. O'Neill as a Blue Bunting [*Passerina (Cyanocompsa) parellina*], a species found from northern México to Nicaragua but heretofore not recorded for the United States. The identification was confirmed by Allan R. Phillips, who also noted that the very fresh and bright plumage, plus the pointed tips of the rectrices, indicated that it was a first-year bird.

Subsequent comparison with series of museum specimens of all three currently recognized subspecies confirmed Phillips' initial impression that the Louisiana bird could be assigned to the northeasternmost subspecies, *P. p. beneplacita*, known from central Tamaulipas to eastern San Luís Potosí, México (Paynter 1970, Subfamily Cardinalinae. Pp. 216–245, in Check-list of birds of the world, vol. 13, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Mus. Comp. Zool.). The bill measurements (from base of culmen, length 9.8 mm, width 6.4 mm, depth 6.9 mm) are below the range of normal variation of *P. p. parellina* (Veracruz, México, to Nicaragua) and *P. p. indigotica* (western México from central Sinaloa southward) and close to the means measured for a sample of 14 female *P. p. beneplacita* (mean length 10.1 mm, width 6.7 mm, depth 7.4 mm). Our specimen also is smaller than and lacks the belly-chest contrast characteristic of the distinct but undescribed Yucatán population (R. W. Dickerman and A. R. Phillips unpubl. data).

Our initial assessment of this record was that the bird was very probably an escaped cage bird. Points in favor of this were: (1) no pattern of extralimital vagrancy was known for the Blue Bunting; (2) both hind toes are slightly swollen in our specimen, possibly a result of time spent in a cage; (3) Blue Buntings are occasionally kept in captivity. Further information, however, invalidated the first two points. First, John Arvin's (in prep., photos) recent observations from Texas indicate that this species does wander extraliminally, at least that it did during the winter of 1979–1980. Second, the toe swelling appears to be

the result of bird pox or some other ailment seen regularly in wild birds (Charles Ely and A. R. Phillips pers. comm.).

Additional points in favor of considering the Louisiana bird to be wild are: (1) the specimen is in extremely fresh, first-year plumage lacking any indication of cage wear; (2) the nails show none of the abnormalities regularly seen in cage birds; (3) the collecting locality is reasonably distant from major population centers from which escaped cage birds are more likely to originate; (4) Hackberry Ridge (less than 16 km from the Texas border) superficially resembles an arid western wash rather than a typical Louisiana coastal "chenier" and has produced records of several southwestern or western species in 1979–1980 [three Lesser Nighthawks (*Chordeiles acutipennis*), three Anna's Hummingbirds (*Calypte anna*), one Black-throated Gray Warbler (*Dendroica nigrescens*)]; (5) it seems highly unlikely that the occurrence of four birds within 3 months of one another in areas of Louisiana and Texas heavily visited by bird-watchers for decades is purely coincidental. A limited, northeastward, extralimital movement of this species in 1979–1980 seems at least as likely, especially because analogous annual movements in this direction are made by White-winged Dove (*Zenaida asiatica*), Groove-billed Ani (*Crotophaga sulcirostris*), and Vermilion Flycatcher (*Pyrocephalus rubinus*), and less regularly by Inca Dove (*Scardafella inca*), Buff-bellied Hummingbird (*Amazilia yucatanensis*), and Great Kiskadee (*Pitangus sulphuratus*).

Although obviously none of these points alone is irrefutable evidence of wildness, we feel that together they make a very strong case against considering the bird to have escaped from captivity.

We thank J. Arvin, R. W. Dickerman, and A. R. Phillips for comments and permission to use unpublished data. We are grateful to E. Eisenmann and B. L. Monroe, Jr. for comments on the manuscript and to K. C. Parkes (Carnegie Museum) and R. A. Paynter, Jr. (Museum of Comparative Zoology) for loan of critical specimens.

Received 17 November 1980, accepted 7 January 1981.

Male Participation in Incubation and Brooding in the Blue Jay

HARRIET LAINE

Department of Biology, City College, 138th Street and Convent Avenue,
New York, New York 10031 USA

Although there is one reported observation of male participation in incubation in the Blue Jay, *Cyanocitta cristata* (Thayer 1901, Bird Lore 3: 50), it is generally believed that only the female incubates and broods in this species (Hardy 1961, Univ. Kansas Sci. Bull. 42: 13; Goodwin 1976, Crows of the world, New York, Cornell Univ. Press, p. 264). Indeed, the lack of male participation in these events is often described as a trait characteristic of corvids in general (Goodwin 1976, p. 47). In the following report I describe male participation in both incubation and brooding in a population of Blue Jays.

These observations are part of a larger ongoing study of the breeding biology of a population of Blue Jays located in Putnam County, New York, about 8 km east of the village of Cold Spring. The population consists of both marked (U.S. Fish and Wildlife serialized bands and plastic color bands) and unmarked individuals that inhabit an oak/birch/beechn forest. My procedure was to begin observations at individual nests at dawn and end between 1200 and 1300, with a 2-h period at each nest. Spot checks of 5–30 min were made during the afternoon hours at some of the nests as well. I used both a 7 × 35 binocular and a 20× spotting telescope to facilitate these observations. The events described below include information from one nest of the 1979 breeding season and four nests of the 1980 breeding season. Except for one of the 1980 season, the nests consisted of banded pairs.

Incubation patterns.—As is typical of the species, incubation in this population lasts about 17 days (range 16–18). I never observed a male sitting on the nest before day 2 or after day 12 except for one case in which the male continued to help with incubation throughout the period. (This male was also the only one to brood.) Essentially, the pattern within this time frame for all nests ($n = 5$) consisted of the male relieving the female at the nest for a period of from 1.5 to 5 min (average 3.8 min), although in one case a male sat for 30 min before the female returned and relieved him. Rarely (five times throughout the incubation period), rather than an actual exchange occurring, a male would simply approach the nest