

FROM FIELD AND STUDY

Another Unrecorded Specimen of *Neochloe brevipennis*.—When describing the vireo *Neochloe brevipennis browni* from near Chilpancingo, Guerrero, México, Miller and Ray (Condor, 46, 1944:41-45) listed all six recorded specimens then known of the nominate race. Stresemann (Condor, 49, 1947:210) brought to light a seventh, "collected at the Hacienda de Fuxpango, Orizaba, Vera Cruz, Mexico. Neither date nor collector is indicated on the label, which bears a mysterious original number (No. 275). Possibly the bird is one of Matteo Botteri's specimens . . ."

Dr. Stresemann's supposition is almost certainly correct, inasmuch as Botteri's Orizaba specimen in the United States National Museum bears collector's number 271 (see Baird, Rev. Am. Birds, 1866:372). Moreover, so far as I know, Botteri and Sumichrast were the only men who ever collected birds at Fuxpango, spelled Tuxpango by Sumichrast, who writes (Mem. Bost. Soc. Nat. Hist., 1, 1869:547): "This exceedingly rare bird has only been found, so far as I am aware, at Orizaba, by M. Botteri. In the course of many years he was able to procure but a very few specimens."

An eighth specimen of *brevipennis*, and apparently the first since Chapman's three at Jalapa in 1897, was collected by me in dense scrubby second growth a mile south of Jalapa, Veracruz, at about 4500 feet on May 4, 1939. It is a breeding male in somewhat worn plumage, with wing 59.5 mm., tail 57, culmen about 10, iris white, and legs and feet slate-black. It is now in the Museum of Comparative Zoology. The bird was retrieved about twenty-five feet up in a tangled mass of vines and had been eating insects and the seeds of an unidentified berry.

On April 20, 1939, I had closely watched a singing *Neochloe* working slowly through low but rather thick bushes at the edge of a stream between semi-wooded knolls perhaps two miles from where the specimen of May 4 was shot. During about five hours spent at these two stations near Jalapa, the vireos were in sight only a very few minutes, although hundreds of times I heard the song, which is similar to that of the White-eyed Vireo (*Vireo griseus*), though shorter and with less volume and emphasis. My field notes state that it consists of from three to five notes, least often five, most often three, with the stress falling on the third, except when five are given, in which case the fourth is loudest. A very common bird around Jalapa having a somewhat similar song is *Catharus aurantiirostris*, but the thrush's song is longer, more varied, higher pitched and more tinkling than that of the vireo.—FREDERICK W. LOETSCHER, JR., *Department of Biology, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky, November 22, 1951.*

Recent Bird Records from Southern Nevada.—Several recent observations have been made in southern Nevada which add to the distributional information recently published by Linsdale (Condor, 53, 1951:228-249).

Aix sponsa. Wood Duck. On October 26, 1951, an immature female was found crushed on U. S. Highway 91-93 near Dry Lake, 25 miles northeast of Las Vegas, Clark County, Nevada. One wing was all that could be saved from this specimen, a new record for southern Nevada.

Aythya marila. Greater Scaup Duck. An immature male was examined in the bag of a hunter shooting on the Virgin River near Riverside, about ten miles southwest of Bunkerville, Clark County, Nevada, on November 4, 1951.

Eupoda montana. Mountain Plover. On November 1, 1951, a single bird was flushed from the creosote bush—Mohave yucca vegetation at the 3100 foot level on the west slope of the Charleston Mountains, 12 miles southeast of Pahrump, Nye County, Nevada. This seems to be a first record for southern Nevada. There is an earlier record by Monson (Condor, 51, 1949:263) from the Needles area, California.—GORDON W. GULLION, *Nevada Fish and Game Commission, Boulder City, Nevada, December 23, 1951.*

Carolina Wren and Catbird in Southern New Mexico.—The appearance of a bird far out of its usual range must be recorded only with caution and upon positive identification. With regard for both of these injunctions I submit observations on two wanderers: Carolina Wren (*Thryothorus ludovicianus*) and Catbird (*Dumetella carolinensis*).

A Carolina Wren appeared on May 8, 1951, in the vicinity of my home at Roswell, New Mexico. Its call, an arresting and clear *wheedle, wheedle, wheedle*, announced a stranger in the neighborhood. It went from leafy elm to leafy elm, repeating the call. When it stopped on a wire in an alley, I was

in excellent position with binoculars. Except for a dubious early record (Bailey, Birds of New Mexico, 1928, p. 538), the species apparently has not been found in New Mexico heretofore.

A Catbird appeared in Roswell on June 6, 1951. I saw it well at a distance of twelve feet. I believe this is the first time a Catbird has been recorded in southern New Mexico (see Bailey, *op. cit.*, p. 554).—VESTER MONTGOMERY, *Roswell, New Mexico, February 1, 1952.*

The Validity of the Fossil Crane *Grus nannodes*.—Recently, while making a comparative osteological study of the crane genera *Grus*, *Balearica*, and *Anthropoides*, some attention was directed toward fossil representatives. Wetmore and Martin (Condor, 32, 1930:62-63) described a fragmentary carpometacarpus from the Pliocene deposits of Sherman County, Kansas, as *Grus nannodes*. The setting up of a new species for this bone, to distinguish the bird from the Recent species *G. canadensis*, as now construed, was entirely on the basis of size; the fossil appeared to be very small. No differences in conformation were noted by the authors; indeed, in the absence of the entire proximal end, the bone would seem to have little "character" remaining.

I examined the type specimen (Univ. Kansas Mus. Vert. Paleo. No. 3757) and compared it with a series of 17 carpometacarpi of Recent Little Brown Cranes, *Grus canadensis canadensis*. Confirming the statement of Wetmore and Martin (*loc. cit.*), I found no qualitative features of diagnostic value. The larger series of Recent material now at hand permits more detailed statistical treatment, as given in table 1. Small differences in certain measurements of the fossil, between those in the table and in the original description, are seemingly the result of slight variations in the method of measuring.

The handling of single specimens in a statistical analysis poses certain problems; the standard deviation is not known and the usual procedure is impossible. One may, however, assume that the coefficient of variation of the same linear measurement made in the same way on two related species will be nearly the same, if each sample is homogeneous. In the present instance, the coefficient of variation for a measurement in *G. c. canadensis* may be used for the same measurement in *G. nannodes*, and thus the probable standard deviation may be obtained from the known relationship existing between coefficients of variation and standard deviations. These interpolated data are included in table 1.

Table 1

Measurements of *Grus nannodes* and *Grus canadensis canadensis* (in millimeters)

	Length from proximal end intermetacarpal space to distal end of bone		Width just proximal to intermetacarpal space	Greatest distal width	Depth, middle of metacarpal two	Width, middle of metacarpal two
	anconal side	palmar side				
<i>G. nannodes</i> (type)	60.8	56.2	7.0	11.1	5.7	4.8
Theoretical range						
($M \pm 2 \sigma$)	52.6-69.0	49.0-63.4	6.2-7.8	10.0-12.2	5.2-6.2	4.3-5.3
($M \pm 3 \sigma$)	48.6-73.0	45.4-67.0	5.9-8.1	9.5-12.7	5.0-6.4	4.0-5.6
Assumed standard deviation	4.08	3.61	0.38	0.53	0.24	0.25
<i>G. c. canadensis</i> (17 specimens)						
Mean	72.4	67.9	8.2	13.7	6.5	5.6
Observed range	65.0-81.3	60.5-74.8	7.6-9.1	12.5-14.2	6.0-6.8	5.0-6.1
Calculated range						
($M \pm 2 \sigma$)	62.5-82.3	59.2-76.6	7.3-9.1	12.4-15.0	6.0-7.0	5.0-6.2
($M \pm 3 \sigma$)	57.8-87.0	54.8-81.0	6.9-9.5	11.8-15.6	5.7-7.3	4.7-6.5
Standard deviation	4.86	4.36	0.44	0.65	0.27	0.29
Coefficient of variation	6.71	6.42	5.36	4.74	4.15	5.17