

Considering the points of the table where either bird shows intermediacy, we see that the Minnesota specimen more nearly approaches the Western Tanager in the interscapular area and in depth of bill, whereas the Kentucky bird more nearly resembles it in the condition of the crown and underparts. The Minnesota bird, additionally, shows some approach to *P. ludoviciana* in the marking of the tertials and middle coverts, where the Kentucky bird does not. The specimen from Kentucky is intermediate, therefore, in three characters, while the Minnesota bird, being intermediate in five, must be adjudged as morphologically somewhat closer to *P. ludoviciana*. An additional point concerning the Kentucky bird is that, according to Monroe, its call notes were distinctly odd for a Scarlet Tanager. Although the songs of the Scarlet and Western Tanagers are rather similar, the call notes, as rendered by Peterson (1960. "A Field Guide to the Birds of Texas," Boston; pp. 235-236), differ, being *pi-tac* or *pit-i-tic* in the Western Tanager, and the familiar *chip-burr* well known to most eastern ornithologists (including Monroe) in the Scarlet Tanager.

No further reports of this presumed cross have come to my attention, and only the above-mentioned published record was listed by A. P. Gray (1958. "Bird Hybrids," Bucks, England, Commonwealth Agric. Bur.; p. 243).

We can, of course, only guess at the events resulting in the two birds discussed. The totality of their characters suggests to me that, if resulting from hybridization, which I think probable, they are not first-generation hybrids. It is more probable that they resulted from backcrossing or even more remote genetic interchange. Taken together, they reinforce the obvious probability that, like various other North American east-west allopatric pairs of species, the Scarlet and Western Tanagers are descendants from a common ancestor of the not-too-distant past. It is therefore possible not only that occasional hybrids occur, but also that random mutations of appropriate alleles could produce phenotypes in either species resembling the other in various characters.—ROBERT M. MENGEL, *Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, 18 February 1963.*

**Interspecific relations among Red-bellied and Hairy Woodpeckers and a flying squirrel.**—While watching a pair of nesting Red-bellied Woodpeckers (*Centurus carolinus*) during May and June 1962, about 2 miles south of Carbondale, Illinois, conflict between them and a southern flying squirrel (*Glaucomys volans*) was observed. Concurrent with this conflict but also considered important was continual competition between this pair and a pair of Hairy Woodpeckers (*Dendrocopos villosus*).

The pair of Red-bellied Woodpeckers had completed excavation and had laid their eggs before the Hairy Woodpeckers showed an interest in nesting in the same snag (about 10 feet above the cavity of the former pair). During subsequent observations (covering a span of 38 days) of the incubation and nesting periods of both species, the Red-bellied Woodpeckers were subject to constant harassment by the Hairy Woodpeckers, but did not respond similarly. Grimes (1947. *Fla. Nat.*, 21:1-13), however, has reported a probable case of destruction of nestling Hairy Woodpeckers by a male Red-bellied Woodpecker.

One morning halfway through the nestling period of the Red-bellied Woodpeckers, the male, after feeding the young, moved up the trunk and midway between his cavity and that of the Hairy Woodpeckers began to pull dead grass and leaves from an old excavation that had been broken through at the bottom. Immediately, he was attacked by a flying squirrel roosting there. The bird, however, returned to his young when the squirrel started down the tree in that direction. When the female came to feed the young, the male again attacked the squirrel at its cavity. At one point, he grabbed the mammal

by its tail and threw it off the tree—a fall of about 30 feet. The squirrel immediately returned to its hole. The male bird then broke off the altercation while he and his mate dodged repeated attacks by the Hairy Woodpeckers. Subsequently, he and his mate flew off to scold a third Red-bellied Woodpecker that had started calling nearby. Presently, the female returned and then she, too, attacked the mammal at its cavity. Finally, after she had also tossed the squirrel from the tree, it scampered up the snag and glided off to the north. Throughout this observation the squirrel was not attacked by the Hairy Woodpeckers. During a half-dozen subsequent observation periods, over the next 11 days, the flying squirrel was not seen again.

Reports of aggressive behavior of Red-bellied Woodpeckers toward other species of woodpeckers are numerous. McGuire (1932. *Wilson Bull.*, 44:39) described a conflict with a Yellow-bellied Sapsucker (*Sphyrapicus varius*) over food. Grimes (loc. cit.) reported competition with Red-cockaded Woodpeckers (*Dendrocopos borealis*) as well as Hairy Woodpeckers over cavities. Selander and Giller (1959. *Wilson Bull.*, 71:107-124) described conflicts with the closely related Golden-fronted Woodpecker (*Centurus aurifrons*) over territories. Kilham (1961. *Wilson Bull.*, 73:237-254) noted aggressive behavior of Red-bellied Woodpeckers directed toward a female Pileated Woodpecker (*Dryocopus pileatus*) under confined conditions. I have observed aggressive behavior of Red-bellied Woodpeckers directed toward Yellow-shafted Flickers (*Colaptes auratus*) over both nesting and roosting holes.

On the basis of this information, one wonders why the observed pair of Red-bellied Woodpeckers tolerated the Hairy Woodpeckers while not tolerating the flying squirrel. It may be speculated that the relative distances of the other two species from their nest hole was a factor. However, flying squirrels frequently compete with woodpeckers for their holes and occasionally eat nestling birds (Calahane, 1947. "Mammals of North America." Macmillan Co., N.Y.:421-422). Therefore, the relative distances of the three species from one another could not be the only factor controlling the described relationships.—DAVID W. STICKEL, *Zoology Department, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois, 4 January 1963.*

**Le Conte's Sparrow wintering in northern Illinois.**—On 16 January 1954, I collected a male Le Conte's Sparrow (*Passerherbulus caudacutus*) in a fallow oat-stubble field about 1 mile south of Glenwood, Cook County, Illinois. Although the species is common during fall migration in this area, it has never been noted there in midwinter before.

Ford (1956. "Birds of the Chicago Region," *Chicago Acad. Sci. Spec. Publ.* No. 12:88) lists 15 October as the latest fall migration record for the Le Conte's Sparrow and, according to Nice and Clark (1950. "William Dreuth's Study of Bird Migration in Lincoln Park, Chicago," *Chicago Acad. Sci. Spec. Publ.* No. 8:26), 12 October is Dreuth's latest fall date for the species. Although the Fifth Edition of the A.O.U. Check-list records the Le Conte's Sparrow as wintering occasionally in southern Illinois, Smith and Parmalee (1955. "A Distributional Check-list of Birds of Illinois," *Ill. State Mus. Popular Sci. Series*, 4:56) regard it only as a migrant. It appears, then, that this is the first and heretofore only record of the Le Conte's Sparrow wintering in northern Illinois.

The specimen is now deposited in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Collection, U.S. National Museum.—SEYMOUR H. LEVY, *Route 9, Box 960, Tucson, Arizona, 30 October 1962.*