

Principal known nesting areas of Swainson's Warbler in the Pocomoke are (1) near Willards, Maryland, and Selbyville, Delaware, 0.25 miles south of the Delaware line; (2) five miles south of Pocomoke City near the Virginia line. These areas are almost identical in character, and lie on the upland side of the swamp, about a half mile east of the river.

The preferred nesting habitat is the sweet pepperbush (*Clethra alnifolia*) thicket, which is constantly boggy or inundated, where the swamp is in a stage of secondary succession after being cut over to the extent that only second growth forest remains.

The dominant species of the forest community are sweet gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), black gum (*Nyssa biflora*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), magnolia (*Magnolia virginiana*), water oak (*Quercus nigra*), and horse sugar (*Symplocos tinctoria*). Cypress (*Taxodium distichum*) while forming the dominant type along the river, is of secondary importance in the sweet pepperbush swamp. Principal understory plants in addition to *Clethra*, are *Vaccinium* sp., *Smilax* sp., *Woodwardia virginiana*, *Itea virginica*, and *Ilex glabra*.

In drier portions of the swamp, near the Delaware line, a heavy undergrowth of laurel (*Kalmia*) is found in which an occasional Swainson's Warbler is heard singing; near the Virginia line, an extensive Southern White Cedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*) stand adjacent to the pepperbush habitat was devoid of this species. This warbler may breed in other localities not yet located.

Robert Stewart and the writer noted the first spring arrival in the Pocomoke Swamp on April 21 (1948). Departure data are incomplete. I have a record for August 30, 1948, but none for September. However, the bird probably lingers a few weeks later. Austin H. Clark (*Raven*, 10; 1, 1939) observed two in a *Baccharis* thicket on Tangier Island, Virginia, in the middle of Chesapeake Bay, just over the Maryland-Virginia line, and almost at the mouth of Pocomoke Sound, September 17-19, 1939. These were probably Pocomoke birds migrating.

It is the latest warbler to arrive on the nesting ground, and is the latest nester. On May 30, 1949, all of the resident warblers were feeding young except this species. The writer observed newly hatched young on June 13, 1948.

In a survey of the 2 known breeding areas in the Pocomoke on May 30, 1949, 6 singing males were observed in the lower (southern) area, and 2 near the Delaware line (a single singing male noted in the Delaware extension of the swamp was also noted on this date). These 2 small breeding populations are only a sample of the potential carrying capacity of the swamp, as the entire Pocomoke has many areas of the same type of ecological communities favorable to this species that have not been investigated during the breeding season by ornithologists.—BROOKE MEANLEY, 4513 College Avenue, College Park, Maryland.

THE APPETITE OF A BLACK AND WHITE WARBLER

On Sept. 19, 1949, at about 2:00 P.M., a neighbor, noticing a female Black and White Warbler (*Mniotilta varia*) on the porch with her head under her wing, brought the bird in and warmed her in her hands. The bird would take nothing but a little water, and was not able to fly, but by mid-morning the next day she started to hop over the floor. At 5:00 P.M. on the 20th she came into our hands, and after her fast of at least 27 hours at once took mealworms from us. She was fearless, hopping indifferently over the floor, the furniture, or us.

Insects were the only food she would accept, although we offered her tiny pieces of canned dog food (the staple nourishment of our hand-raised Meadowlark, [*Sturnella magna*]) rolled into larvae-like shapes. Different kinds of berries were also refused. A grasshopper 2 inches long was ignored, as well as a full-grown cricket, small ants, a yellow and black striped beetle, and a red mite. Most of the insects caught by sweeping the grass were eagerly taken, even squashed and battered specimens at the bottom of the net. Small moths, leaf-hoppers and tree-hoppers, a small stink bug, a black beetle 0.05 inch long, small crickets, and grasshoppers up to an inch long suited her.

Presented with a sizable grasshopper, she seized it by the head, pinched and shook it vigorously until the body was shaken loose. She ate the head, then picked up the insect by a hind leg and shook until the body fell off. She discarded that leg and got rid of the second in the same manner, sometimes she would also get rid of the small legs. She then took hold of the wings and shook them loose and, finally, with an effort, swallowed the body. With smaller grasshoppers she often ate the body with the wings and some of the legs.

On Sept. 27 and 28 we measured and counted all the food items. In one day she ate 11 grasshoppers measuring from 0.6 to 1.0 inches, 1 meal beetle, and 21 mealworms, averaging an inch. Only once during this day did she seem fed to repletion and cease her tireless hopping back and forth in her cage. (She was not trying to get out, for she much preferred her cage with its many perches to any other place on the porch.) In 5 hours she deposited 50 droppings. Twice during the other test day she was thoroughly filled; at 10:45 A.M. after 13 grasshoppers she preened herself and ignored food for a time. After 16 more she even napped a bit at 5:20 P.M. Her total was 32 grasshoppers, averaging 0.9 inches (23 mm.); each day she had eaten over 2 feet of insects.

On Oct. 17 we gave the Meadowlark only grasshoppers, although he was able to find some scattered puppy meal in his cage; he ate 32, ranging from 0.5 to 1.2 inches, averaging 0.9 inches, and he ate the legs in every case. The Meadowlark weighed 105 grams, nearly 10 times the probable weight of the Black and White Warbler. (Dr. J. Van Tyne gave me 4 weights of fall females of this species; they ranged from 10.5 to 11.5 grams, averaging 11.0.) Three feeding tests in early November showed that he ate about 18% of his weight (of dog food, puppy meal, and insects), whereas the Warbler probably ate about 80% of her weight each day—some 9 grams of grasshoppers. As a rule, the smaller the bird, the more proportionally it eats. Moreover, the Warbler was very active, the Meadowlark inactive. When we consider the small size of most of the insects taken in nature by Warblers, it is no wonder that these little birds must be ever on the move seeking nourishment.—MARGARET AND CONSTANCE NICE, 5725 Harper Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois.

ON THE NAMING OF BIRDS

Recently we have read a good deal about the common or English names of birds. Some writers emphasize the need of giving each species an English name invented—where necessary—according to certain “simple and logical guiding principles” (Eisenmann and Poor, 1946, *Wilson Bull.*, 58: 210–215). Others contend that English names are of minor importance; that those already existing, even where manifestly unsatisfactory, are good enough for the slight purposes they serve; and that we can do no better than to agree to conserve those already in use (Griscom, 1947, *Wilson Bull.*, 59: 131–138).

First, why must we have English names? Are not the Latinized binomials or trinomials all we need in studying birds? There seems to be a widespread belief that vernacular names are easier to remember than Latinized names, that their use makes bird study simpler and more attractive to amateurs. My own experience is that in some instances the English name, in others the Latin binomial, sticks the more tenaciously in my mind. Although Blackburnian Warbler is admittedly a not particularly appropriate name, I still find it easier to remember than *Dendroica fusca*—doubtless because a bird so glowing as the adult male can not properly be called ‘fuscous’, whereas the 2 words that compose the proper name ‘Blackburn’ are suggestive of the warbler’s vivid plumage. But I find that *Terenotriccus erythurus* comes more readily to mind than the book-name Fulvous-throated Flycatcher, because the ruddy tail which gives its specific name to this little bird of tropical America is far more prominent than its fulvous throat. Each man’s memory forms its own associations, and no two of us remember in precisely the same way. But if the Latin names were not changed with such disconcerting frequency that they are far less stable than the English names, I should say that the latter