some of which are here recorded for the first time from these islands, two are described as new and descriptions are given of previously unknown plumages of others. Nominal lists follow the general list, giving the species observed on each island.

The second paper is of a similar character, and relates to the islands Ticao, Cuyo, Culion, Calayan, Lubang, and Luzon, and are supplementary to previous papers on collections from these islands. This relates to 15 species, including two described as new and interesting notes on the nesting habits of the Panay Hornbill (*Penelopides panini*) and the nesting habits of several of the Philippine Swifts.

The eleven half-tone plates illustrate the mound of *Megapodius cumingi* (two plates), the nests and eggs of several species of swifts (genus *Salangana*), the nest and eggs of the Panay Hornbill, and a species of *Cisticola*. — J. A. A.

Hartert's 'Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna,' Heft III. - The third part1 of Dr. Hartert's Birds of the Palæarctic Fauna carries the species and subspecies from No. 394 to 629 - from about the middle of the Alaudidæ through the families Motacillidæ, Mniotiltidæ (three extralimital species), Nectariniidæ, Zosteropidæ, Certhiidæ, Sittidæ, and the greater part of Paridæ. The method of treatment is of course uniform with that of the preceding parts (cf. Auk, XXI, 1904, pp. 95 and 505), showing similar conservatism in respect to genera and the same proneness to fine splitting in respect to subspecies. Especially noticeable also is the tendency to combine allied forms as subspecies, sometimes apparently without satisfactory reasons therefor, as where Parus sclateri of Mexico is made a subspecies of Parus palustris, although separated geographically by thousands of miles from the range of any other member of the group. Similarly a form of Nuthatch from Corsica and another from northern China are made subspecies of Sitta canadensis. Ten palæarctic forms of titmice are referred to Parus atricapillus, including the whole P. montanus group, and a number of others. The author apparently has no use for subgenera, all of the palæarctic subgenera of Parus, recognized by Hellmavr in his recent excellent monograph of the Paridæ, being merged in Parus. In short, our author's treatment of this and allied families is far less satisfactory, and less consistent and rational, than the recent revision of these groups by Hellmayr. Hartert includes under Parus 93 palæarctic forms, of which 20 rank as species and of which 8 have no subspecies, leaving 73 subspecies under the other 12 species, or an average

¹ Die Vögel | der paläarktischen Fauna. | Systematische Übersicht | der | in Europa, Nord Asien und der Mettelmeerregion | vorkommenden Vögel. | Von | Dr. Ernst Hartert. | Heft III. | Seite 241-384. | Mit 16 Abbildungen. | — | Berlin. | Verlag von R. Friedländer und Sohn. | Ausgegeben im Juni 1905.—8vo, pp. 241-384. Price 4 marks.

of 6 (= 7 forms) to each, P. major and P. palustris each having 13, P. ater 14, etc.

The Alaskan Budytes flavus alascensis Ridgw. stands as Motacilla flava alascensis; the North American Anthus pensylvanicus as A. spinoletta pensylvanica.

Eremophila is used in place of Otocoris, since in the opinion of Mr. Hartert the generic names Eremophilus and Eremophila are both tenable. It may here be also noted that from his point of view a specific or subspecific name need not agree in gender with the generic name, it being his preference to preserve the original ending of a specific name when transferred to a genus which has a different gender ending, as in the case above of Anthus pensylvanicus, which was originally described as a species of Alauda. It may be further noted that the palæarctic species of Otocoris here recognized number 15, all subspecies of alpestris, as against 14 recently admitted by Oberholser, who, however, gave full specific rank to 5 of them. But in only nine cases are the same names adopted.

Despite certain excentricities of treatment, Dr. Hartert's 'Die Vögel der paläarktischen Fauna' will long prove a most useful and convenient hand-book, for which ornithologists may well feel deeply grateful.— J. A. A.

Clark on the Amount of Difference that should characterize Species and Subspecies.— We regret that the character of Mr. Clark's paper 1 is such that if it is to be noticed here at all it must be considered at some length. Were it not that it doubtless reflects the attitude of the 'lay' class, and thus appeals to the sympathies of the untrained who have neither the opportunity nor, perhaps, the desire to become experts, and is thus a misleading presentation of the case, it might well be passed over without mention. The author, Dr. Hubert Lyman Clark, is not unknown to readers of 'The Auk' and to ornithologists in general through his various excellent papers on the pterylography of various groups of birds, but so far as technical descriptive ornithology goes his experience has evidently been extremely limited. That such is the case, the rules he prescribes give evidence.

In the present paper he has formulated "fundamental rules," which, it seems to him, ought to govern work in systematic zoology. They are each explained and defended at some length against criticisms made by the present reviewer upon a previous paper of his on the same subject. The history of the case cannot be given better than in his own words. As the following quotations contain transcripts of the previous objectionable criticisms they will in part cover what it seems desirable to say in the present connection. He says:

¹ The Limits of Difference in Specific and Subspecific Distinctions. By Hubert Lyman Clark. Fifth Annual Report of the Michigan Academy of Science for the year 1903, pp. 216–218.