

FROM FIELD AND STUDY

The Japan Stork.—My friend Mr. T. Kimura of Stanford University has kindly loaned me three interesting photographs showing the nest, adult, and young of the Japan stork,



THE JAPAN STORK, IZUSHI, JAPAN

Ciconia boyciana Swinhoe. These photographs were taken in June, 1904, at Izushi in the west central portion of the main island of Japan. The accompanying reproduction of one of the photographs shows the old bird and one young standing, and apparently one young lying in the nest. Another photograph, however, reveals four young in a sitting posture, together with the adult. Mr. Kimura informs me that the tortoise and stork are venerated in Japan as emblems of long life, and figures of them are used in the ceremony of marriage. A note on the back of the photograph, in the Japanese language, informs the reader that the storks recently returned to this locality after an absence of many years, having been formerly fairly common in the general region. This nest is viewed by many people every day. The coming of the stork is regarded as a happy omen pointing to the supremacy of Japan in the final outcome of the present war. The Japanese believe that the cannonading and noise of fighting have driven the storks out of their wonted homes to seek refuge in the flowery kingdom. I am indebted to Dr. Leonhard Stejneger for the identification of the birds. Dr. Stejneger writes that this species is closely allied to the white stork of Europe, but is larger; and while the former has a red bill with a black spot in front of the eye, the Japanese species has a black bill with a red spot of naked skin. The Japanese name

is Ko-dzuru. (See also: Stejneger, Proc. U. S. Nat. Museum, 1887, pp. 285-286.)—WALTER K. FISHER.

The Flycatcher from the Santa Barbara Islands.—In *The Auk* for July, 1897, pp. 300-303, Mr. H. C. Oberholser described an alleged new species of flycatcher from the Santa Barbara group of islands, calling it *Empidonax insulicola*. His material consisted of five specimens, two from Santa Rosa island, two from Santa Cruz island, and one from Santa Catalina island. Of these, one specimen is remarked upon as differing somewhat from the rest, thus interrupting the uniformity of the "series"! In his further remarks the author calls attention to the fact that among a lot of mainland examples of *Empidonax difficilis* are at least two which show close approach to "*insulicola*" in characters. He also recognizes "a considerable range of variation" in the mainland series "not satisfactorily attributable to geographical causes." It is this latter observation that I wish to concur with, and emphasize. In fact, I feel convinced that "*insulicola*" itself was based upon individual variants of *difficilis*!

In June, 1897, I secured an *Empidonax* on San Clemente island. The two skins obtained were submitted to Mr. Oberholser, who marked them *insulicola*, and these were so recorded in my paper. (Rep. Bds. Santa Barbara Ids., Aug. 1897, p. 15.) Also Mr. Oberholser has recorded the same birds in the Proceedings of the U. S. National Museum (Vol. XXII, 1900, p. 230), remarking that they were "substantially identical with those from the other islands." I now have these two skins before me, and another from the Mailliard collection, taken on Santa Cruz island in April 1898. I also have at hand a series of 50 mainland skins of *Empidonax difficilis*, including 9 from Sitka, Alaska, and several from Arizona. I am impressed with the great amount of variation shown, in intensities of dorsal brownness, pectoral brownish suffusion, and abdominal yellowness, all of which appears to me to be entirely independent of locality. I have carefully

compared the three island skins above mentioned with the mainland series, and find several counterparts from Palo Alto and Pasadena, which I am absolutely and unqualifiedly unable to distinguish from them. A conscientious study of Mr. Oberholser's description leads me to conclude that he was not fortunate in having a sufficient series of mainland *breeding* birds for comparison.

As to bionimic reasoning, this flycatcher is migratory everywhere, north of Mexico at least; it is not known to occur on any of the Santa Barbara islands, except as a summer visitant; hence it is not a resident species there. Therefore we should not expect it to fall under the dominance of local environment, at least to such an extent as resident species like the jays, shrikes, song sparrows and wrens. As far as we now know, there is no reason for recognizing "*Empidonax insulicola*" as distinct from *E. difficilis*; therefore I propose that the former name be deposed from our lists.—JOSEPH GRINNELL.

Bohemian Waxwings in Utah.—Range of Cliff Swallows.—The long awaited Part III, of Ridgway's Birds of North and Middle America came recently to delight my heart, and though a formidable pile of examination papers entered a silent protest, I took time to cut the leaves and "run through" the volume. In the course of my hasty examination, I failed to find any Utah record of one of our winter birds, and in another case, I discovered that the range given, can be considerably extended in two directions. The species apparently not reported for Utah is the Bohemian waxwing (*Ampelis garrulus*). To my personal knowledge these birds have wintered in this part of Utah (central) for the past seven winters (counting the present) with one exception, that of 1900-1901. They may have been in the state during the winter named, but I did not happen to see them. These birds come about the middle of December and remain till the last week of March and first week in April. I have in preparation an article for THE CONDOR on the habits of these birds, so will not say more now.

The range of the cliff swallow (*Petrochelidon lunifrons lunifrons*), as given by Ridgway is, "mid. and s. Utah." On July 10, 1903, I found these birds nesting well over toward the eastern side of Wasatch County. They were making use of a mass of yellow sandstone that had been weathered into an arch. In my notes, under the date named, is a rough drawing of this arch and the dimensions given are, "twenty feet across the top, while the inside of the span, where the nests are suspended, is a little more than ten feet in length and about the same number of feet in width, while it is just high enough to admit of my standing erect." Appearances seemed to indicate that a goodly number of nests had been destroyed not long before our visit to the place, and not more than two dozen of the birds were seen by us. Two nests were in use; others were in course of construction. In three instances new nests were being built on the foundations of old nests, and in a single instance the builder was *repairing* a nest that had the appearance of having been in use the year before. We also found these swallows (during the same trip, July 10-30, 1903) between Lake Fork and Ft. Duchesne, and between the Fort and Vernal, the county seat of Uinta County, thus extending the bounds of their eastern range to within about thirty miles of the Colorado line. On May 10, 1903, and May 12, 1904, I found these swallows nesting in the cliffs at Echo, in Summit County—about twenty miles west of the southwest corner of Wyoming. I am inclined to think that these birds nest throughout Utah, in suitable localities.—S. H. GOODWIN, *Provo City, Utah*.

Status of the Townsend Warbler in California.—*Dendroica townsendi* occurs in California in two roles, as a regular winter visitant and as a rather late spring migrant.^a I have personally met with it in both capacities and have secured considerable series of skins. From the Santa Cruz District ^b (Black Mt., King Mt., Woodside, Pescadero Creek, and vicinity of Monterey) my specimens indicate dates from October 13 through January. In the vicinity of Pasadena specimens were taken from April 22 to May 13, of various years. These two sets of skins, namely, mid-winter visitants from the Santa Cruz District, and late spring migrants from Pasadena, present slight but significant average differences from one another. The characters consist in the larger bill, shorter wing and tail, and more rounded wing of the former, as contrasted with the smaller bill, longer wing and tail, and more pointed wing of the latter. Such differences, we have learned from a study of bird races in general, are apparently correlated with lengths of the respective migratory journeys. For while both sets of birds certainly summer north of California, one goes no farther south in winter than central California, and the other set of individuals traverses the entire length of the state and farther, possibly providing the records from southern Mexico and Guatemala. Unfortunately I have no opportunity to examine breeding birds from the north. But I believe these two sets of individuals represent in reality two geographical races, breeding in separate faunal areas, the short-winged birds nesting in the humid Sitkan District, of the coast of south-eastern Alaska and British Columbia, the long-winged birds

^a Less in evidence during the southward movement in the fall. ^b See Map 2 in Pacific Coast Avifauna No. 3.