

**Nesting Instincts of Swallows.**—As supplementing Mr. Brewster's record of the premature exhibition of the nest-building and procreative instincts of Swallows (see *Auk*, XV, April, 1898, p. 194), I may add some observations made on Tree Swallows (*Tachycineta bicolor*), at Leonia, N. J., during August and September, 1897. The extensive salt marshes in which myriads of these birds roost in July, August, and September, are here crossed by a road over which I passed almost daily and rarely without seeing in the road, one or more flocks of Tree Swallows, varying in size from eight or ten to several hundred birds. Without exception, as far as I observed, and I studied them very closely at short range, these birds were in the immature plumage of birds of the year. By far the larger number seemed to have no special object in alighting in the road, they did not move about as though searching for food, indeed for the most part were practically motionless, but occasionally a pair would copulate, as described by Mr. Brewster, and more often a bird would pick up a bit of dried grass and fly up into the air with it, or sometimes it was carried fifty yards or more and dropped from the air; at others the bird would carry it to the telegraph wires bordering the road and drop it after perching a moment.

Additional evidence of inherited knowledge was apparently given by many Tree Swallows which were often seen hovering about a pile driven in a creek which traversed these meadows. I at first supposed these birds to be feeding on insects which presumably had alighted on the pile, but the number of birds, often a dozen or more were seen about the pile, and the persistency with which they remained there, forced me to conclude that in a wholly unreasoning way they were looking for a nesting site.—FRANK M. CHAPMAN, *American Museum of Natural History, New York City.*

**Notes on Generic Names of Certain Swallows.**—In the raid on nomenclature made a few years ago Dr. L. Stejneger seems to have been peculiarly unfortunate. I have not yet trailed him anywhere without finding that either he did not go far enough in the right direction, or else he went in the wrong direction. The A. O. U. is to be commiserated in unwittingly adopting sundry changes Dr. Stejneger proposed and sought to impose on nomenclature. For example, he undertook to upset the established names *Hirundo* and *Cotile* by substituting *Chelidon* for the former, and *Clivicola* for the latter, after Forster, 1817. It appears from Sharpe's introduction to the Monograph of *Hirundinidae*, p. xxxv, that *Hirundo* Linn. was characterized by Schæffer, Elem. Orn. 1774, with *H. rustica* as type. If Dr. Sharpe's method of determining the type of a genus be not at variance with A. O. U. canons, this operation of Schæffer's throws out Forster's later attempt to transpose *Hirundo* and *Chelidon*, and we may happily revert to the *status quo ante bellum*. Again, Dr. Sharpe, p. xlv, shows that *Riparia* Forster, 1817, has that sort of priority over *Clivicola* Forster, 1817, which results from previous