

et des Pigeons." Eight years later Denys ('Histoire naturelle,' 1672: 333) was to accuse the mink and weasel of making war against the hens and pigeons (*aux poulles, aux pigeons*).

The English were little behind the French. The Council of the Virginia Company ('Records,' 3: 532, 1933) sent a letter, dated December 5, 1621, to the Governor and Council in Virginia stating that "Pidgeons" and other commodities were being forwarded, "the preservation & encrease whereof we recomend vnto you."

Lucy Downing ('Winthrop Papers,' Mass. Hist. Soc., 4: 343, 1944) wrote to Governor John Winthrop in Massachusetts, about 1642: "I hope some piggions are come to your hands and more had bin sent if I had had a larger thinge to put them in, but if you pleas to return the cage it shall be filld agayne." At Westover, Virginia, William Byrd ('Secret Diary,' 1941: 505) was raising pigeons. On March 24, 1712, his people raised the "pigeon house" to place pillars beneath it.

An entry in the journal of Diron D'Artaguette, made at New Orleans on September 11, 1722, mentions that men were being employed to build a pigeon house (Mereness, 'Travels in the American Colonies,' 1916: 23).

The French had pigeons in the Great Lakes region at the beginning of the eighteenth century. Detroit was founded by Cadillac in 1702. The inventory of his estate in 1711 contains the item: "Also a dove-cot raised on four wooden posts six feet high, ten square . . ." (Mich. Hist. Colls., 33: 519, 664, 1904). This dovecote was valued at 400 livres in 1720. In 1712 Dubuisson (Mich. Hist. Colls., 33: 538, 1904) complained that the Indians at Detroit subjected him to a thousand insults, one of which was the killing of pigeons.

Pigeons were raised in considerable quantities at Fort de Chartres (Kaskaskia), Illinois. Morgan (Ill. Hist. Colls., 16: 481, 1921) wrote from this post in 1768: "I have a pigeon House built in the Shape of Parson Smith's Folly & full as large—I it contains more than two hundred couple—there had been at one Time upwards of five hundred Couple in it as the House was vacant a long While before I removed here & no care taken of them they are greatly diminished . . ." Regarding this fort De Peyster (Wis. Hist. Colls., 11: 136, 1888) reported in 1779 that there were "a few Swivels mounted in Pidgeen Houses."

While in Florida in 1773, William Bartram ('Travels in Georgia and Florida,' Trans. Amer. Phil. Soc., 33, 2: 150, 167, 1943) wrote that the chicken snake climbs the dovecotes and destroys the eggs and young of the pigeons.—A. W. SCHORGER, *Department of Wildlife Management, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin*.

The Nomenclature of Certain Bulbuls (*Pycnonotus*): a Reconsideration.—The Marquess M. Hachisuka, in 'Contributions to the Birds of Hainan' (Orn. Soc. Japan, Suppl. Publ. No. 15, October 30, 1939) named "*Otocompsa jocosa hainanensis*" (p. 74) and "*Molpastes cafer insularis*" (p. 75), each based upon a single specimen in the Momiya Collection from "Nauchan, Hainan." Since no other example of either of these familiar door-yard species has ever been reported from Hainan, I felt bound to assume, in my revisions of *Pycnonotus jocosus* (Journ. Wash. Acad. Sci., 38: 279–281, 1948) and of *Pycnonotus aurigaster* (*ibid.*, 39: 274–277, 1949), that Hachisuka's types were escaped cage birds, representative of some well-known continental race.

I have recently learned that "Nauchan, Hainan" is an imaginary locality, and that the types came, in fact, from Naochow (an island in the French territory of Kwangchowan, off the southern coast of Kwangtung), where the two species are common. In the light of this new knowledge, I wrote to the Marquess Hachisuka for further details, which are now at hand. Since data for the type specimens at the

original descriptions are insufficient, or even faulty, it seems well here to record the true data, derived from Hachisuka's reexamination of the two specimens, which are still extant in Tokyo as part of the Momiyama Collection.

The type of "*Molpastes cafer insularis*" carries three labels. The oldest, written in Japanese by Zensaku Katsumata, the collector, gives the locality as "Nahachau" (collector's pronunciation), and the date as January 1, 1907 (according to the Japanese calendar); the second, written by Owston, gives the locality as "Nauchau, Hainan" (with the final "u" resembling "n"), the date as January 1, 1906, and a serial number "64-06.0007"; the third label is that of Momiyama.

The type of "*Otocompsa jocosa hainanensis*" carries but two labels (Katsumata's has been lost). The older one, written by Owston, gives the locality as "Nauchau, Hainan," the date as January 5, 1906, and a serial number "63-06.0008"; the newer label is that of Momiyama.

The serial numbers indicate that the two must have been collected in the same year, and it is reasonable to assume that Katsumata, writing by the Japanese calendar, was correct in giving the year as 1907, especially since seven Naochow specimens of "*insularis*" and eight of "*hainanensis*" in the American Museum of Natural History, acquired by Rothschild from Owston, and kindly sent me by Dr. Ernst Mayr, are all dated as taken between January 1 and January 5, 1907, inclusive. Moreover, the type of *Aethopyga seheriae owstoni* Rothschild, similarly obtained from Owston, was collected on Naochow on January 6, 1907. According to Hachisuka, Katsumata worked in Hainan from March, 1902, to the end of 1906, visiting Naochow only at the beginning of 1907, on his way back to Japan.

"*Otocompsa jocosa hainanensis*," which should now be known as *Pycnonotus jocosus hainanensis*, seems in fact to be separable from *P. j. monticola*, with which I tentatively synonymized it in my revision, if not by most of the characters relied upon by Hachisuka, at least by having the smoky-buff suffusion, that tinges the flanks and lower abdomen of *monticola*, spreading over the upper abdomen, breast, and lower throat as well. Moreover, birds of *hainanensis* type are not restricted to Naochow but seem to range southward into northern Annam. This requires that the range given by me for *P. j. monticola* be limited to Sikkim, Bhutan, Assam, northern Burma and the Shan States, and western Yunnan; the range of *P. j. hainanensis*, on the other hand, will be Naochow Island, western Kwangtung, eastern Tongking, northern Annam, and probably western Kwangsi and southeasternmost Yunnan.

"*Molpastes cafer insularis*," which should hereafter be known as *Pycnonotus aurigaster resurrectus*, new name (see below), similarly proves to be distinct from *P. a. chrysorrhoides*, with which I tentatively synonymized it, if not by all the characters assumed for it by Hachisuka, at least by the fact that the entire under parts are suffused with smoky buff, instead of being a more or less uniform sullied gray. Here I must restrict the range given by me for *P. a. chrysorrhoides* to Fukien, eastern Kwangtung, and Hongkong, while that of *P. a. resurrectus* will include Naochow Island, western Kwangtung, eastern Tongking, northernmost Annam, and probably western Kwangsi and southeasternmost Yunnan.

The Marquess Hachisuka has brought to my attention that, when *Molpastes* is submerged into the genus *Pycnonotus*, his name *insularis* becomes preoccupied, and has invited me to supply new names where necessary.

For *Molpastes cafer insularis* Hachisuka (Orn. Soc. Japan, Suppl. Publ. No. 15: 75, 1939 [Naochow Island, Kwangchowan]), not *Pycnonotus plumosus insularis* Chasen and Boden Kloss, 1929, I now propose

Pycnonotus aurigaster resurrectus, new name.

When *Andropadus* is reduced to a subgenus of *Pycnonotus* (see Delacour, *Zoologica*, 28: 17-28, 1943), the name of the Bornean bird becomes preoccupied within the genus. Therefore, for *Pycnonotus plumosus insularis* Chasen and Boden Kloss (*Journ. für Orn., Ergänzungs.*, 2: 115, 1929 [Banggai Island, North Borneo]), not *Andropadus insularis* Hartlaub, 1861, I propose

Pycnonotus plumosus hachisukae, new name.

This is perhaps as suitable a place as any other to point out that when, following Delacour (*loc. cit. supra*), the "genus" *Stelgidocichla* is reduced to a synonym of *Andropadus*, which in turn becomes a mere subgenus of *Pycnonotus*, at least one other bulbul, this time African, requires renaming. For *Stelgidocichla latirostris pallida* Mearns (*Smiths. Misc. Coll.*, 61: 5, 1914 [Mount Gargues, Kenya Colony]), not *Pycnonotus layardi pallidus* Roberts, 1912, I here propose, in honor of John George Williams, of the Coryndon Museum, Nairobi,

Pycnonotus latirostris williamsi, new name.

H. G. DEIGNAN, *Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C.*

Observations on Remating in the American Robin, *Turdus migratorius*—

In suburban Baltimore, from 1942 through 1950, I color-banded both members of 15 pairs of Robins. At the end of 1951 the record of returns and rematings showed the following: 1) Both members of eight pairs returned in the year following their first known mating; there was one remating; 2) Both members of one of the pairs returned in two successive years; these birds never remated; 3) In the seven instances in which only one member of a pair was found in the following year, five times this was the female and twice the male.

One Robin remating out of 8 possibilities (12 per cent) compares with 8 out of 30 (27 per cent) in the Song Sparrow, *Melospiza melodia*, reported by Nice (*Trans. Linn. Soc. New York*, 6: 182, 1943), and 11 out of 26 (42 per cent) in the House Wren, *Troglodytes aëdon*, reported by Kendeigh (*Ill. Biol. Monog.*, 18 (3): 56, 1941).

The Remating.—The remating occurred in 1950. It seems attributable to the faithfulness of both birds to their territory, and their almost simultaneous arrival in spring.

The male had been banded in the spring of 1947 and returned to the same territory through 1950. During that time I located nine of his nests and, although he had three mates during the four years, all nine nests were built within a radius of 40 yards. The female was banded in the spring of 1949 and on through 1951 has been equally true to the same territory. In 1950 the female returned on April 2; I first saw the male April 4, but believe he could have arrived April 3.

Failures to Remate.—Of the seven failures to remate, two are definitely attributable to circumstances just the reverse of those set forth above; one bird (both times the male) was unfaithful to territory, and the members of the pairs returned on widely different dates.

In 1951 Male No. 1 returned to his 1950 territory on February 13, but for some reason moved on March 12 to new ground appreciably to the north. On March 8 Male No. 2 returned to his 1950 territory, which was about 125 yards northeast of Male 1's old area, and expanded it a bit east and south to include part of the 1950 territory of Male No. 3. On April 6 Male 3 returned and, presumably because of opposition now on his 1950 territory, moved into the one that Male 1 had vacated. On April 7 the 1950 mate of Male 1 returned precisely to territory and paired with