

“*Atratus* versus *Megalonyx*”

BY ROBERT RIDGWAY

AN article from me on the present subject would obviously have been more appropriate soon after Mr. Grinnell first questioned the validity of *Pipilo maculatus atratus* (Condor, IV, Jan., 1902, 23); I have been very busy, however, and besides had quite forgotten the matter until it was brought to mind by Mr. Swarth's recent article (Condor, VII, Nov., 1905, 171). That both Mr. Grinnell and Mr. Swarth are in error in concluding that *Pipilo maculatus atratus* is synonymous with *P. m. megalonyx*, I feel quite sure, and will here state my reasons for this conviction.

Because the type of *Pipilo maculatus* Baird came from Fort Tejon, and the breeding black *Pipilo* of that locality is the form which I described as *P. maculatus atratus*, it of course seems logical to assume that both names represent the same form. But it is very unsafe to assume anything in scientific matters. It is by no means an uncommon occurrence (I could cite several instances) for a new species to be first taken at a place far outside its normal range. Whether the occurrence of the Rocky Mountain or plateau form of this species at Fort Tejon, as a winter visitant or straggler, is abnormal or not, I am not able to say; but that the type of *Pipilo megalonyx* is not only a typical example but almost an extreme example of the form re-named by Mr. Swarth *Pipilo maculatus montanus* I have no doubt, having recently re-examined it and carefully compared it with the reasonably good series of *P. m. atratus* and very extensive one of "*P. m. montanus*" in the National Museum collection.

Mr. Swarth's paper is an exceedingly able one and shows most clearly the difference between the two forms and their distribution, and I much regret that my long silence in the matter may have been the cause of his adding another synonym to the literature of North American birds.

Whether *P. m. atratus* is sufficiently distinct from *P. m. falcifer*, however, I am not so sure, since I have not been able to examine a sufficient series of the latter.

Washington, D. C.

Oceanodroma leucorhoa and Its Relatives on the Pacific Coast

BY W. OTTO EMERSON

THE petrels, or "sea-patters," have always been of particular interest to the ornithologist tho relatively little seems to be known as yet concerning the species on our coast and especially their distribution.

The early western explorers gave the name *Oceanodroma leucorhoa* to the white-rumped petrels found by them on this coast; but as this name was first applied to birds of the Atlantic (St. Kilda), and as the specimens examined by me from the Pacific seem to all differ from Atlantic *leucorhoa*, it seems probable that the latter name must be dropped from our western lists.

The first departure came when W. E. Bryant described *O. macrodactyla* from Guadalupe Island (Bull. Cal. Ac. Sc. II, July 1887, p. 450); and as far as is yet known this very distinct species is restricted to that immediate vicinity.