

A NEW SPARROW FROM SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

By W. E. CLYDE TODD

A FEW years ago, in overhauling the birds of the genus *Aimophila* in the collection of the Carnegie Museum, I discovered that certain specimens of *A. ruficeps* from southern California were appreciably different from others coming from the region of San Francisco Bay (Nicasio, Marin County). The latter agree among themselves, and with a good series from various other localities in the state, from Sutter County on the north to Los Angeles County on the south, which I have examined in this connection. *Ammodromus ruficeps* of Cassin, described in the Proceedings of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia (vi, 1852, p. 184) came from the Calaveras River, near Stockton, California, as we learn from the A. O. U. Check-List of North American Birds (ed. 3, 1910, p. 272). This series from central California agree well with the figure in Cassin's Illustrations of the Birds of California (1854, pl. 20); but in order to make sure of the correct application of the name I forwarded examples of both forms to Dr. Witmer Stone with a request to compare them with the type-specimen in the Philadelphia Academy. He writes as follows (February 15, 1917): "The type of '*Ammodromus*' *ruficeps* is like the Nicasio specimen, i. e., buffy instead of grayish below." It therefore remains to provide the southern California race with a name, and I propose to call it

***Aimophila ruficeps canescens*, subsp. nov.**

Subspecific characters.—Similar to *Aimophila ruficeps ruficeps* (Cassin), but wing and tail longer and under parts less buffy, more grayish in tone. Similar also to *Aimophila ruficeps sororia* Ridgway, but darker above, and darker, more grayish, below.

Type, no. 14,586, collection Carnegie Museum, adult male; San Diego, California; January 23, 1894; A. W. Anthony.

MEASUREMENTS

Aimophila ruficeps ruficeps:

No.	Locality	Wing	Tail	Bill	Tarsus
14589 ¹ ♂	Nicasio, Calif.	58	60	10	19
44518 ² ♂	Nicasio, Calif.	53	58	11.5	19.5
154223 ³ ♂	Berryessa, Calif.	60	65	10.5	21
27323 ⁴ ♂	Dunlap, Calif.	61	67	12	21
26285 ⁴ ♂	Varain, Calif.	59	64	10.5	19.5
29037 ⁴ ♂	Claremont Creek, Calif.	58	61	12	20.5
Eleven males, <i>vide</i> Ridgway		59	63.5	11.5	20

Aimophila ruficeps canescens:

14585 ¹ ♂	San Diego, Calif.	64	70	11	20
14586 ¹ ♂	San Diego, Calif.	64	68	11	19.5
14587 ¹ ♂	San Diego, Calif.	67	67	12	19

Aimophila ruficeps sororia:

71335 ¹ ♂	Sierra de Laguna, L. Calif.	60	63	12	21.5
15941 ² ♂	Triunfo, L. Calif.	63	68	12	20.5
15945 ² ♂	Triunfo, L. Calif.	60	60	12	20.5
15946 ² ♂	Triunfo, L. Calif.	62	63	12	20.5
47922 ³ ♂	El Lanz, L. Calif.	63	64	12.5	21

¹Collection Carnegie Mus.²Collection William Brewster.³Collection U. S. National Mus.⁴Collection Univ. Calif. Mus. Vert. Zool.⁵Collection Mus. Comparative Zool.

Remarks.—Specimens from northern Lower California resemble those from San Diego, and clearly belong to the same form, but as they are more or less worn they are not included in the table of measurements. These specimens are the same ones referred to by Mr. Anthony (Zoe, iv, 1893, 242) as being “practically indistinguishable from southern California examples”, but he seems not to have suspected that the latter were not true *ruficeps*. *A. ruficeps canescens* is really intermediate in its characters between *A. ruficeps ruficeps* and *A. ruficeps sororia*, but is grayer than either, and is evidently as well entitled to recognition as certain other races of birds found in this general region. It doubtless grades into the former in Los Angeles County, California, as indicated by a specimen from Pasadena (Mus. Vert. Zool., no. 35813), but where it meets the range of *A. r. sororia* is an undetermined question.

Specimens examined.—California: San Diego, 3. Lower California: Guadalupe Valley, 1; Sansal del Comanche, 3; Piñon, 1; Todos Santos Island, 2. Total, 10.

My acknowledgments are due to the authorities of the several institutions already specified for the loan of material for comparison, and to Dr. Harry C. Oberholser for his advice.

Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, May 11, 1922.

STATUS OF THE CRESTED JAYS ON THE NORTHWESTERN COAST OF CALIFORNIA

By JOSEPH MAILLIARD

WITH MAP

SINCE the year 1908, when it was found that the crested jay of that part of the Humid Coast Belt lying in Sonoma County, California, was not distinguishable from the Blue-fronted Jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri frontalis*) of the interior mountains and the southern portions of California, the idea of intergradation on the northwest coast of this state between the Steller Jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri stelleri*), of the southern Alaskan and British Columbian coasts, and the Coast Jay (*Cyanocitta stelleri carbonacea*), of the central humid coast belt, has, in my judgment, been open to doubt. It hardly seemed reasonable that there should be such an intergrading toward the north when the Coast Jay is not only cut off abruptly in the central humid coast belt by a strip of non-coniferous association, unattractive to this genus, in northern Marin and southern Sonoma counties, but its distribution also is interrupted by the appearance of the Blue-fronted Jay on the opposite side of this non-coniferous barrier.

In 1902, Dr. Walter K. Fisher published an article upon the status of *Cyanocitta stelleri carbonacea* (Condor, iv, pp. 41-44), in which he gives the distinguishing characteristics of the different members of the genus *Cyanocitta* on the Pacific Coast, illustrated by a map showing their distribution as understood by him at that time. This paper was written not long after the Coast Jay was described by Grinnell (Condor, ii, 1900, p. 127), when much less was known of