

in only one nesting category. Nor was the situation much better with most of the 11 other species. Seven of these were known from two colonies each and two from three colonies each. Thus there were only three species (*flavitaris* 5 colonies; *wheeleri* 8 colonies, *squamifera* 15 colonies) which might be said to furnish more than a suggestion of nest preferences. What Wheeler did with these last two species is astonishing. He knew that both *wheeleri* and *squamata* have flexible nesting habits. In 1920 W. M. Mann published observations that leave no doubt on this score and I had later amplified Mann's data in a personal communication to Dr. Wheeler (4). Yet both *wheeleri* and *squamata* each appeared in a single category in the nidification list. Thus, although Wheeler saw clearly that nesting responses vary widely within the genus *Macromischa*, he failed to appreciate that the nesting response of the individual species may also be variable. On the basis of present data it is impossible to say what percentage of species in the genus possess flexible nesting habits but, if further progress is to be made with the habits of *Macromischa*, it is imperative to recognize that some of the species, among them *subditiva*, behave in this fashion.

Remarkably few records of any kind have been published for *M. subditiva* since Wheeler described this species in 1903 (5). In 1912 Mitchell and Pierce provided a two-line habit note on specimens taken in Victoria County, Texas which repeated the observations carried in Wheeler's original description (6). When M. R. Smith monographed our species in 1939 he gave no new data on habits and added only one new locality record (7). Apparently there are no other published records for *subditiva*, although M. R. Smith stated in a paper published in 1947, that the species occurs in Louisiana (8). This reference is enigmatic, since no locality was cited and since repeated surveys in the area between Austin and the Louisiana border have failed to turn up *subtiva* in eastern Texas. The record is not included in the list presented in this paper.

From what has already been said it should be obvious that it is important to distinguish between records based on strays and records where the nest was found. I have, therefore, divided the records into two groups, the first based on strays (Table I), the second on nests taken (Table II).

In six of the above colonies a single female was present. It is impossible to say whether this was true of the seventh nest (Wimberley colony) for part of this colony was scattered when the crevice in which it was living was forced open. In addition to the female