

781, written with lead pencil. A search was at once made among several old catalogues of the Society's collections, with the result that in "A new Catalogue of the Specimens in the Department of Comparative Anatomy belonging to the Boston Society of Natural History," 1859-1875, there was found the entry of this specimen, as "Phyllostoma," one example, from Surinam, received in 1832 from Dr. Cragin". From this it would appear that the type locality of *Ametrida minor* is Surinam, or Dutch Guiana, South America. The date of acquisition, as above given, is probably erroneous. This catalogue, it appears, was copied from an earlier manuscript catalogue and the date 1832 may have been substituted through mistake, for 1839, when Dr. Francis W. Cragin, in March of that year, presented to the Society "a large and valuable collection of Mammalia, Birds, Reptiles, Fishes, Insects and Shells from Surinam". The previously recorded donations of Dr. Cragin, as entered in an early catalogue of the '30's, did not include any mammals. The exact locality in Surinam whence the bat came, cannot now be determined; but, as I am informed by Dr. Cragin's son, Prof. F. W. Cragin, the donor of the specimen resided for a number of years at Paramaribo, where he was for a time U. S. consul, so that it is quite probable that it came from that vicinity. The coloration of the type specimen, as recorded by its describer, is "almost white", which may in part be due to bleaching in alcohol for these sixty odd years, though otherwise it is still in an excellent state of preservation. Trouessart appears to have omitted the species altogether from his recent "Catalogus".—*Glover M. Allen.*

An early name for the northern form of *Sphyrapicus ruber*.

About a year ago Mr. Joseph Grinnell (Condor, III, 12, 1901) described a new sapsucker from southern California as *Sphyrapicus varius daggetti*, restricting Gmelin's *Picus ruber* to the northwest coast region. Mr. W. H. Osgood has recently (N. A. Fauna, No. 21, 45, September 26, 1901) reversed the case by considering the northern form to be the new one, reviving for it *Picus flaviventris* Vieillot (Ois. Amer. Sept., II, 1807, 67), based on Cook's description (Last Voyage, II, 1784, 297). If Mr. Osgood's view of the question should prove to be the correct one, a still earlier term, *Picus ruber notkensis* Suckow (Anfangsgr. Naturgesch. Thiere, II, I, 1800, 535) will have to be considered. Suckow also based his name on Cook, and gave practically the same description as did Vieillot. He indicated the relationship of Cook's bird by making it a subspecies of *Picus ruber*, and was one of the first naturalists to consistently and intelligently use trinomials as we do at present. The proper name for the northern form would therefore appear to be *Sphyrapicus ruber notkensis* (Suckow).—*Charles W. Richmond.*