

authorship of the present paper has apparently resulted in a more equable treatment of the problem than has yet been presented.

The important facts are brought forcibly to our attention that we must not look for all or even a majority of "indicators" in any one locality since other conditions limit the range of most species *within* their zone. Moreover, a thoroughly typical species may occur outside of its zone as a straggler without lessening its value as an "indicator" of the zone — in other words the abundance of the species must be taken into consideration as well as its mere presence.

We trust that ere long we may have an authoritative list of zone "indicators" for other regions besides the Pacific coast.— W. S.

Dabbene on Argentine forms of the Genera *Geositta* and *Cinclodes*.¹— In this important systematic paper, Dr. Dabbene has carefully reviewed the Argentine species and subspecies of these two genera, giving full descriptions of the plumage of each, an apparently complete synonymy, tables of measurements of specimens examined, and keys for identification. There are also half-tone plates illustrating the habitats of some of these birds in the mountain regions of north-western Argentina and maps showing their geographic distribution.

By the careful work of Dr. Dabbene and his associates we are obtaining a thorough knowledge of the Argentine avifauna such as can only be supplied by capable resident ornithologists. We congratulate them upon the admirable results of their studies and hope that their researches may continue without interruption.— W. S.

Cory's 'Review of the Genera *Siptornis* and *Cranioleuca*.'²— After examining all of the species of the old genus *Siptornis* that were available Mr. Cory has presented a key to the genera into which he would divide the group and another key to the species and subspecies. As an aid to the identification of these difficult birds it will be of much assistance but from the tentative position to which he refers a number of species that he was unable to examine, it is evident that there is still much to be learned about the group.

According to the author's views the old name *Siptornis* must be restricted to the type species, and most of the others referred to *Cranioleuca* Reichb. *S. ottonis* however, he makes the type of a new genus *Pseudosiptornis* (p. 150), while *S. flammulata* becomes the type of another new genus *Siptornoides* (p. 150) which includes ten other species. Some of these however, are separated again under the subgeneric name *Eusiptornoides* (p. 150) type *S. anthoides*.

¹ Las Especies y Subespecies Argentinas de los Generos *Geositta* Swainson y *Cinclodes* Gray. Por Roberto Dabbene. Ann. del Mus. Nac. de Hist. Nat. de Buenos Aires. Tom. XXX, pp. 113-196. July 11, 1919.

² A Review of Reichenbach's Genera *Siptornis* and *Cranioleuca*, with Descriptions of New Allied Genera and a Subgenus. By Charles B. Cory. Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, Vol. 32, pp. 149-160. September 30, 1919.

While in no way reflecting upon the accuracy of Mr. Cory's work we should have preferred rating all of these, no doubt perfectly natural divisions, as subgenera.

Our contention is that with the present rapid increase of generic names our nomenclature is being rendered more and more unintelligible. While the separation of any group into subdivisions indicating its phylogenetic development is most praiseworthy, why inject this into the *names* of the species involved, when it can be indicated just as well by the use of subgenera, leaving the nomenclature undisturbed? Here we have fifty-seven species or subspecies which most ornithologists with some knowledge of neotropical birds would recognize under the name *Siptornis*, but fifty-six of them now appear under names that are unknown to the vast majority and unless some vernacular name or synonym is appended we should have trouble in finding out what an author, who used them, was writing about. Mr. Cory has adopted a praiseworthy plan of trying to preserve the name *Siptornis* in the new names which he has coined but this is not often attempted and too often names of similar etymology apply to entirely unrelated groups.

This comment as has already been said is not directed against Mr. Cory but against a general practice the merits of which should be very carefully considered by present day systematic ornithologists.— W. S.

Chapman on New South American Birds.¹— Students of the neotropical avifauna will be pleased to learn, from the appearance of this paper, that Dr. Chapman has completed his service in the American Red Cross and is back again at his studies of the rich South American material obtained by various expeditions sent out by the American Museum of Natural History, in the years preceding America's entry into the great war. The fifteen forms here described as new are as follows: *Microsittace ferrugineus minor* (p. 323), Corral, Chile; *Upucerthia dumetoria hallinani* (p. 324), Tofo, Chile; *U. dabbenei* (p. 325) Tafi del Valle, Argentina; *Cinclodes fuscus tucumanus* (p. 326), same locality; *Leptasthenura punctigula* (p. 327), Sarmiento, Argentina; *L. andicola peruwiana* (p. 327), La Raya, Peru; *Siptornis urubambensis* (p. 328) Machu Picchu, Peru; *S. punensis rufala* (p. 328), Tafi del Valle, Argentina; *Pseudochloris uropygialis connectens* (p. 329), La Raya, Peru; *P. olivascens sordida* (p. 330), Ticara, Argentina; *Allapetes canigenis* (p. 330), Torontoy, Peru; *Diglossa mystacalis albilinea* (p. 331) Machu Picchu, Peru; *Oreomanes binghami* (p. 331), same locality; *Tangara cyaneicollis gularis* (p. 332) Candamo, S. E. Peru; *Amblycercus holosericeus australis* (p. 333), Incahaca, Bolivia.

They are described with the author's characteristic care and detail with frequent comparison with related forms.— W. S.

¹ Descriptions of Proposed New Birds from Peru, Bolivia, Argentina, and Chile. By Frank M. Chapman. Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., Vol. XLI, Art. V, pp. 323-333. September 1, 1919.