

of the observation. To the last, his behavior seemed free of excitement, and it was soon indicated that probably he had communicated no alarm to the female: she hopped quickly to the entrance and thrust her head well in, then jerked backward so suddenly and violently that she lost her grip and fell away from the tree. Returning immediately, she began constantly to thrust her head in and out of the hole and continued to do so for at least half an hour, at first as often as 30 times a minute. Evidently there was little life remaining in the snake, for gradually the bird left her head in the cavity for longer stretches, finally for 10 seconds at a time. However, even after 30 minutes, when it was necessary to discontinue observation, she was still alternately scrutinizing the contents of the hole and then looking at the woods around her, as though in considerable nervousness. (Probably neither woodpecker ever was aware of my presence.)

Repeated visits to the tree during the days that followed disclosed no Pileated Woodpeckers near it; the nest, if there was one, apparently failed when the snake gained entrance to it. No informative traces could be found on the surrounding ground, but dense vegetation may have hidden the snake's body, even if the woodpeckers removed it and dropped it nearby.

Throughout incubation and early life of nestlings, one member of the pair of Pileated Woodpeckers is virtually always at the nest (Hoyt, *op. cit.*, 251-253), and this was true of the birds observed by Kilham (*op. cit.*). If the behavior described herein is typical and the reaction to a snake entering or attempting to enter the nest is to attack and sometimes overcome it, then nest relief must greatly reduce the risks from this group of predators. In the light of the present observations, it is the more interesting that Kilham should have seen a five-foot black snake making its departure after five days spent harmlessly so near a cavity containing small young.—VAL NOLAN, JR., *Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, August 12, 1959.*

A North American sight record of the Redwing.—On February 21, 1959, at ca. 10:00 a.m., Messrs. S. Stepinoff, S. Ozard, T. Peszel, J. Kirk, and I discovered a Redwing, *Turdus musicus* (*Turdus iliacus* of some authorities), at the West Impoundment of the Jamaica Bay Wildlife Sanctuary, Ruler's Bar Hassock, Queens County, New York. The Redwing is a Palaearctic thrush not previously reported on the North American mainland, though recorded several times in Greenland (1957. A.O.U. Check-list, 5th ed., p. 430). The bird was observed at distances varying from 20 to 100 feet by means of 10 × 50 binoculars and a 20 × spotting telescope. The individual was extremely wary, repeatedly taking flight when efforts at closer approach were made; such molestations having been ceased however, the Redwing was observed to feed on the berries of several shrubs in the area of the sanctuary parking-field. Upon his arrival, Mr. H. Johnson, manager of the sanctuary, was shown the bird. Johnson recalled having seen it in the locality on the previous day, though he had not identified it. During the next two days a large number of observers gathered at the sanctuary, including several familiar with the species in Britain and Europe. The Redwing was last seen on February 24, 1959.

By way of description, I observed the following features on February 21:

Head, wings, back and tail were of a neutral brown-gray color, somewhat broken with light gray on the secondaries and coverts. The face-pattern, consisting of striking white moustachial and superciliary stripes, was unusually bright. The underparts were white, with black streaking on the breast, the flanks and wing-linings possessing the reddish coloration characteristic of the species. The bill was yellow with a black tip, or perhaps a black tip to the upper mandible alone.

Inquiry has failed to locate any cage-bird dealer or zoological collection in the city

dealing in or possessing individuals of this species. Unfortunately, the number of aviculturalists and zoological supply houses in the neighborhood of the metropolis is legion. It is well to note however, that the behavior of the Redwing seemed characteristic of a wild bird, rather than of one accustomed to the proximity of humans.—CHARLES F. J. YOUNG, *Photographic Service Division, New York Public Library, New York 18, N.Y., April 23, 1959.*

Notes on pairing and nest-building of mismatched vireos.—A study on species relationships in the genus *Vireo* (Hamilton, 1958. *Wilson Bull.*, 70:307-346) analyzes the relationship between the Solitary and Yellow-throated Vireos (*V. solitarius* and *V. flavifrons*). The following notes may be of value to the study of interspecific relationships of these species.

On May 19, 1958, a Yellow-throated Vireo, with something in its bill, flew into a tall post oak in my front yard. The following day I located its nest in the oak on a slender branch which made a downward arc from a larger branch, 25 feet from the ground and 12 feet out from the trunk of the tree.

A vireo was present, working in the nest. This bird had no yellow at the throat or eyes, although wing-bars and a light eye-ring were evident. Careful study of the bird on succeeding visits, and reference to the discussion of vireo plumages in Bent (1950. *U.S. Nat. Mus. Bull.*, 197) and Dwight (1900. *Ann. New York Acad. Sci.*, 13:239), confirmed an early speculation that this bird, a female, was a Solitary Vireo, perhaps of the subspecies known as the Mountain Vireo (*Vireo solitarius alticola*). [Southern Pines, 20 miles west of Fayetteville, is the easternmost known nesting area of the Solitary Vireo in this state (1948. *The Chat*, 12:53).] The bird had a dark head and back, white eye-ring and wing-bars, complete absence of yellow at the throat, but a strong yellow wash at the sides. The throat, breast, and belly were white. On one visit, during a light drizzle, the back appeared slaty-brown. In addition, there was a creamy yellow wash at the crissum (which Dwight stated was limited to juvenal plumage).

The Yellow-throated Vireo, the male of this pair, was in song and present at the nest area most of the time although it was never seen working in or about the nest. Bent (*op. cit.*) records that both sexes of *flavifrons* are assiduous and attentive nest-builders; that the female of *solitarius* "seems to do most of it and to be the dominant influence, the male's part consisting mainly of bringing materials."

The male Yellow-throated Vireo accompanied the female Solitary Vireo on her visits to the nest, perching nearby while she worked at the interior and the rim. Both birds were seen on a number of occasions perched side by side in pine trees in the yard, preening or resting. On May 26 the female Solitary Vireo made nine recorded visits to the nest, the exterior of which appeared complete; the male Yellow-throated Vireo sang more incessantly than on previous days. Twice on this day, I saw the male Yellow-throated Vireo join the female at the nest site. The male displayed, with wings fluttering; the pair copulated briefly only a few inches from the nest. On both of these occasions, the female remained crouched in a begging posture, with wings fluttering, after the male had hopped to a nearby perch.

On May 27, at 7:05 a.m., I saw a Yellow-throated Vireo fly silently to the nest. The bird got in, shaping and arranging the interior and the rim. Since I had never seen the male Yellow-throated Vireo in the nest, I watched carefully after the bird left; at 7:45 a.m. two Yellow-throated Vireos flew to the nest site, one perching silently nearby while the other got into the nest to turn and work in it briefly before they both left.

There was no way to determine whether this was an intruding pair of Yellow-throated