

her egg upon the ground. The Vireos deserted, and the Redstarts liking the nest lined it up with the usual material chosen in this locality and retained the nest as their own. The nest, I think, was the property of a pair of Yellow-throated Vireos (*Vireo flavifrons*) which I had often observed about. The nest and eggs are now in the collection of Mr. Brewster. — FRANCIS J. BIRTWELL, *Dorchester, Mass.*

*Certhia familiaris americana*, not *Certhia f. fusca*! — Dr. Coues has recently sought (Auk, April, 1897, XIV, 216) to resurrect the name *Certhia fusca* Barton (Fragments Nat. Hist. Penn., 1799, 11) and to establish it as the proper designation for the common Brown Creeper of eastern North America. His proposition unfortunately found favor with the A.O.U. Committee, and in the Ninth Supplement to the Check-List (Auk, Jan., 1899, XVI, 126) Barton's name supersedes the long-current *americana*. But *Certhia fusca* Barton, 1799, is preoccupied by *Certhia fusca* Gmelin, 1788 (Syst. Nat. I, 472) and therefore untenable. The next available name is apparently *Certhia americana* Bonaparte (Geog. & Comp. List, 1838, 11), so that the American Brown Creeper must be called, as heretofore, *Certhia familiaris americana*. — HARRY C. OBERHOLSER, *Washington, D. C.*

**The Second Reference for *Anorthura hiemalis pacifica*.** — In the Ninth Supplement to the A. O. U. Check-List (Auk, Jan., 1899, XVI, 125) the authority for the combination *Anorthura hiemalis pacifica* is given as Oberholser, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., Nov. 19, 1898, XXI, 421. This is not correct. The proper citation seems to be Ridgway, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., June 30, 1883, VI, 94. — HARRY C. OBERHOLSER, *Washington, D. C.*

***Piranga rubra* and *Carpodacus mexicanus frontalis* Preoccupied?** — The change of *Dendroica cærulea* to *Dendroica rara* (Ridgway, Auk, Jan., 1897, XIV, 97), which was promptly accepted by the A. O. U. Committee, involves an interpretation of Canon XXXIII of the A. O. U. Code of Nomenclature to which little if any attention seems to have been called. It appears advisable at the present time to raise this question, inasmuch as it affects the validity of some other current names; and this the more as in regard to it there seems to be neither unanimity of opinion nor uniformity of practice. Briefly stated, it is this: in considering the tenability of specific names, so far as preoccupation is concerned, shall any account be taken of homonyms which are mere combinations, *i. e.*, not original descriptions? To illustrate: *Motacilla cærulea* of Linnæus, 1766, was called *Sylvia cærulea* by Latham in 1790, — evidently a simple transfer of Linnæus's species to another genus. Now, does this *Sylvia cærulea* of Latham, 1790, preclude the use of *Sylvia cærulea* Wilson, 1810, for another and widely different species, the former being now a *Poliophtila*, the latter a *Dendroica*? Canon XXXIII is apparently quite explicit