of *S. obscura* examined by Schwartz on day 1 and again on day 5 showed the loss of but a single neossoptile. Early losses of natal downs to abrasion have not been considered significant by other workers.

These data on the number and distribution of neossoptiles are in agreement with the suggestion that *S. obscura* should be included in *Tiaris* and not *Sporophila*. A complete analysis of the relationship of *S. obscura* is in preparation by Schwartz. More information on additional species of *Sporophila* is needed before an exact pattern of neossoptile distribution can be established for this genus. *Tiaris*, on the other hand, seems to be typified by a sparse complement of neossoptiles (sometimes none) frequently confined to the occipital and spinal tracts, but variably present also on the coronal, scapular, and femoral tracts, and wing coverts.

Field studies of the senior author in Trinidad were supported by grants from the Frank M. Chapman Memorial Fund of the American Museum of Natural History, New York. We are grateful to M. Dale Arvey and Luis F. Baptista for providing unpublished data from their notes. We are greatly indebted to Paul Schwartz for contributing his personal knowledge, specimens, and field notes to this study, and particularly for sharing his unpublished data on the relationships of *S. obscura*.—CHARLES T. COLLINS AND MICHAEL H. KEMP, *Dept. of Biology, California State Univ., Long Beach 90840.* *Accepted 25 Feb. 1975.*

Cedar Waxwing feeding from spider web.—On 12 September 1974 at 08:40 C.D.T. we noticed a lone Cedar Waxwing (*Bombycilla cedrorum*) near the top of a dead, leafless tree on the Goose Pond Audubon Refuge, Columbia Co., Wisconsin. The bird landed on a limb, and hopped to another directly in front of a vertically-oriented spider web in which numerous specks, presumably insects, were visible. While perched the bird removed 8 of these specks with 8 pecks. The bird then flew about 2 m to another part of the same tree, perched by another spider web, and removed 2 specks from it. The bird last flew to a perch by a third web, and pecked once into the web. The waxwing never hovered by a web, and we never observed a spider on any web.

Between pecks the waxwing sat with its body's long axis 20° forward of vertical, the head, body, and tail aligned, the wings folded at the sides. When pecking toward the spider web the body rotated forward an additional 25° and the tail was raised 30° putting it slightly above the long axis of the body; then the head was thrust forward 0.5–1 cm. The peck and recoil involved the neck only; the wings were not moved nor were the feet. During each bout the pecks occurred at about 1/sec.

In a search of relevant literature we found no previous accounts of Cedar Waxwings or other passerines feeding from spider webs. McAtee (Roosevelt Wildlife Bull. 4:68, 1926) notes that waxwings very occasionally consume spiders and more frequently feed on tent caterpillars (Lasiocampidae). DuBois (*in* Bent, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 197:91, 1950) observed waxwings seize geometrid caterpillars (Geometridae) that hung from twigs on gossamer thread. These observations suggest that waxwings may be preadapted to searching for prey in insect silk. However, many passerines consume spiders (e.g., Wetmore, U.S. Dept. Agr. Bull. 326:1–133, 1916) or use spider silk for nest construction (e.g., Bent, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 203:1–734, 1953). Therefore one might expect cleptoparasitic web-feeding to be widely used by passerines, especially since such behavior obviates the need to capture prey. The apparent rarity of web-feeding may be due to the difficulty of discovering webs or the difficulty in extracting prey from the web without the bird's becoming entangled itself. However, the ease with which the waxwing picked

out the prey renders the latter explanation unlikely. Another difficulty is the behavior of web-building spiders; these usually do not allow prey to remain long in the web (Savory, The Biology of Spiders, Macmillan Co., N.Y., 1928). Furthermore, orb web-builders spin a new web daily (Savory, op. cit.). It is possible, then, that opportunities for web-feeding are actually rare. We may have seen long-abandoned webs with an unusual abundance of prey available to the opportunistic waxwing.—EDWARD H. BURTT, JR., B. DENNIS SUSTARE, AND JACK P. HAILMAN, *Dept. of Zoology, Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison 53706.* *Accepted 26 Feb. 1975.*

Autumnal breeding in Chinese Spotted Doves.—On 31 October 1973, Paul Marsden, a student at Occidental College, Los Angeles, California, found a juvenile Chinese Spotted Dove (*Streptopelia chinensis*), which was being harassed by a house cat in the backyard of a home near the campus. The bird died, was prepared as a study skin, and deposited in the Moore Laboratory of Zoology, Occidental College (♀, 66262). The basal ¼ of its rectrices and remiges were still ensheathed, suggesting that this dove had either recently fledged or had fallen prematurely out of its nest. A second fall juvenile of this species is in the collection of the Los Angeles County Museum (♀, 18892). This individual was taken on 26 October 1937. It appeared slightly older than the first specimen, only the bases of the remiges being still ensheathed.

As an established feral, exotic bird in southern California, this species has been known to nest "from March at least through May" (Hardy, Wilson Bull. 85:506–512, 1973). Assuming that the observations reported herein are the result of breeding by feral parents and that these are not isolated incidents, the known outside breeding dates can be expanded to include the period between March and November in southern California where mild temperatures prevail. Fall breeding is known to occur in other avian species in California (Orians, Auk 77:379–398, 1960) and should be expected of the Chinese Spotted Dove as well. In many parts of its range of Thailand, Ceylon, Burma, and Java, the Chinese Spotted Dove breeds throughout the year (Herbert, J. Siam Soc. Nat. Hist. Suppl. 6:334, 1926; Deignan, U.S. Natl. Mus. Bull. 186:154, 1945; Wait, Manual of the Birds of Ceylon, Dulau and Co., London, 1925; Smythies, The Birds of Burma, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1953; Voous, Ibis 92:283, 1950).

Circumannual breeding may have contributed to the success of this exotic in becoming established in southern California. On the Hawaiian Islands where feral populations of this dove also occur, nesting is known from February to October, but the species is also thought to nest throughout the year (Schwartz and Schwartz, The Game Birds in Hawaii, Board of Commissioners of Agriculture and Forestry, Honolulu, 1949).

I thank James Northern for the use of specimens under his care at the Los Angeles County Museum.—LUIS F. BAPTISTA, *Moore Laboratory of Zoology, Occidental College, Los Angeles, CA 90041.* *Accepted 25 Feb. 1975.*