

his Check-list, expressly stated (*op. cit.*, p. vii, 1931) that he followed the line priority doctrine and rejected the first reviser principle; presumably on that basis he adopted *F. albigularis*. Hellmayr and Conover (*op. cit.*, p. 306 footnote, 1949), without mention of the first reviser principle, adopted *rufigularis* on the ground that *albigularis* was of uncertain applicability. The new (1961) International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Art. 24, makes the first reviser principle unequivocally applicable to the situation here involved. This principle tends to maintain stability. Universality of usage makes it desirable that the Code be accepted, even though there are bound to be cases when a zoologist may question the wisdom of a particular rule; invariably there are competing arguments on each side. Here the application of the first reviser principle proves especially helpful, for it solves a conflict of usage without requiring a decision of the more controversial question as to the applicability of *albigularis*. Under the first reviser rule *Falco rufigularis* is indubitably the correct name.—EUGENE EISENMANN, *American Museum of Natural History, New York, New York 10024, 19 July 1965.*

Absence of Brood Patch in Cassin Auklets.—Incubation patches of varying number and location have been described from several alcidids, including the Great Auk, *Pinguinus*, the Razor-bill, *Alca*, the murre, *Uria*, the guillemots, *Cepphus*, the Puffin, *Fratercula*, and the Dovekie, *Plautus*, by Storer (Univ. Calif. Publ. Zool., 52:121, 1952), Kozlova (Zool. Inst. Acad. Sci. USSR, no. 65, 1957), Belopol'skii (Ecology of Sea Colony Birds of the Barents Sea, 1957), and Lockley (Puffins, 1962). Baillie (Condor, 54:121, 1952) and Kozlova have further stated that brood patches are present in all species of the family Alcidae. In the murrees these structures have been described as areas of loose, bare skin by Tuck (Canadian Wildl. Ser., Bull. no. 1, 1960).

Cassin Auklets (*Ptychoramphus aleutica*) were examined for brood patches on the breeding ground on South Farallon Island, California, on 8–15 July 1964. Of 53 adults with no eggs or young, 21 adults on eggs, and 26 adults with young, no auklets had a trace of a bare spot on the neck, breast, belly, flanks, or under the wings. On another visit to the island on 2 June 1965, George E. Chaniot, Larry L. Wolf, and I found nine incubating adults of both sexes. No brood patch was found on any of these birds. Eight of the birds were anesthetized or skinned and were examined for concealed bare areas. No bare spots were found, and no areas of the skin appeared unusually thickened or vascularized. Thoresen (Condor, 66:456, 1964) noted incubating Cassin Auklets holding the egg in various positions under the body. We photographed one auklet holding the egg against the side of the body under one wing. The egg appeared to be held on the top of the webbed foot off the bare ground of the burrow. The skin against which the egg was held on the flanks of the incubating birds between the abdominal, femoral, and axillar feather tracts was covered with fine contour feathers about 5 mm long, although the longer feathers of the dense tracts were absent in this region. This skin also differed from the skin of the abdominal region in lacking a layer of thick down. The absence of down probably permits more heat to pass from the incubating bird to the egg. The body temperature of six birds, measured with a thermometer inserted 10 mm into the cloaca and up the rectum, averaged 41.5°C, and the temperature of the skin beneath the wings and on the flanks averaged 39.7°C.

The absence of a brood patch in Cassin Auklets may be related to the small size of these sea birds. The body surface-volume ratio is larger in small birds, and the presence of a relatively large unfeathered area on the small body might bring on excess loss of heat to the cold ocean. The bare feet of sea birds, on the other hand, are known to have vascular adaptations which conserve body heat, according to Irving (Handbook of Physiology, Adaptation to the Environment, Sect. 4:361, 1964). It is of interest to note that the species of alcidids in which a brood patch has been described, except for the Dovekie, are larger than Cassin Auklets.

The nine incubating Cassin Auklets examined on 2 June 1965 were all in body molt, and seven of the birds had also begun the molt of the 11 primaries. A male with the inner three primaries on each wing in molt had testes 7.9 mm in length, two males with the inner two primaries in molt had testes 9.2 and 14.2 mm, two males with the inner pair of primaries in molt had testes 12.3 and 12.8 mm, and a male with no growing primaries had testes 12.6 mm in length. The males with the five largest testes had sperm and also many sloughed necrotic, immature germ cells in the lumina of the seminiferous tubules and in the epididymis, and these testes were evidently in

an early stage of regression. A female with the inner three pairs of primaries in molt had a large ovarian follicle of 3.4 mm, and another female with two pairs of primaries in molt had no follicles larger than 1.0 mm. Four auklet eggs hatched in an incubator in the next ten days. A female taken with one of the hatching eggs had three primaries in molt, while the three males taken with the other hatching eggs had one, two, and three primaries in molt. The rate and progress of molt later in the season are closely related to the stage of nesting (Payne, Condor, 67: 220, 1965).

The extent of molt in breeding auklets in early June indicates that the annual molt begins in many birds in late May, a few weeks earlier than suggested from a study of museum skins. The period of overlap of the breeding and molt schedules of individual birds extends from late May through August. The body molt observed in some birds in October and November probably represents a partial prenuptial molt which follows within a few weeks of the completion of the postnuptial molt.—ROBERT B. PAYNE, *Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, Berkeley, California, 30 June 1965.*

First Specimen of the Summer Tanager in Utah.—Although there are two published sight records of the Summer Tanager (*Piranga rubra*) in southwestern Utah (Aud. Field Notes, 16:498, 1962; Aud. Field Notes, 18:63, 1964) and several unpublished 1964 sight records at Terry Ranch locality, Beaver Dam Wash, Washington County, Utah (20 May, a singing male observed by Dennis L. Carter and Richard W. Russell; 10 June, two pairs observed by D. L. Carter and Larry Davis; 3 Sept., an immature male or female observed by D. L. Carter and Gary Stiles; 24 Sept., an adult male observed by D. L. Carter, Ted and Ruth Dement), no specimen has been taken, and the species is not listed for Utah by the A.O.U. Check-list, 1957.

On 22 July 1964 the writer visited an area along the Santa Clara River, approximately one mile west of Santa Clara, Washington County, Utah, and observed and studied a female Summer Tanager for about 15 minutes. The habitat was a streamside association of willow (*Salix* sp.) and narrowleaf cottonwood (*Populus angustifolia*). Upon returning to the same area the next morning, another female was observed and a dead female was found which was subsequently preserved as a study skin (D. A. Easterla No. 625) and is deposited in the collection at University of Utah (museum no. 18458). The ova measured 2×2 mm or less, and the subspecies was determined to be *P. rubra cooperi*. From the number of observations, in suitable habitat in southwestern Utah, this species is probably a fairly common breeder.

Acknowledgments are made to Park Naturalist Dennis L. Carter, Arches National Monument, Utah, for supplying the data on sight observations and to William H. Behle, University of Utah, and Mrs. Roxie C. Laybourne, U.S. National Museum, for subspecific determination.—DAVID A. EASTERLA, *Department of Biology, Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville, Missouri, 9 September 1965.*

Occurrence of the Lesser Frigate-bird and Pale-footed Shearwater in Korea.—On 15 August 1965, I purchased an immature, exhibition-mounted Lesser Frigate-bird (*Fregata ariel*) in a small taxidermy shop in Seoul. The owner of the shop, Shin Yong Kye, stated that it had been taken by an unidentified Korean fisherman, on 1 July 1961, at Chongpyong Reservoir, Kappyong-gun, Kyonggi Province, approximately 20 miles northeast of Seoul. Shin, who claimed to have been at the reservoir at the time the specimen was taken, stated that it was captured on a fish hook baited with a live loach (*Misgurnus fossilis*) which was floating on or near the surface of the water. He stated, also, that he personally obtained the specimen from the fisherman shortly after its capture and preserved it. Chongpyong Reservoir is an inland lake approximately 38 miles in circumference on the north fork of the Han River. It lies at an elevation of approximately 170 feet and is approximately 60 miles from the mouth of the main stream of the Han River, which empties into the Yellow Sea on the west coast of the Korean peninsula approximately 30 miles north of Inchon. Although Austin (Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool., 109:321, 1953) lists five specimens and a single "reliable" sight record of the Lesser Frigate-bird in Honshu and Hokkaido, Japan (in July, August, October, and November), and Shaw (Zoologia Sinica, 15:93, 1936) records two specimens taken in Hopei Province in North China (in July and August), as far as