

The arrangement of the ornithological matter is not very satisfactory for one seeking data upon any given species, especially in the absence of an index, as can be judged from the character and sequence of the headings, i. e. Ducks and Geese, Coot, Rails and Gallinules, Snipe, Plovers and other shore birds, Wild Turkey, Quail, Prairie Chicken, Doves, Raptores, Smaller Land Birds, Non-Game Water Birds, and as an appendix, Birds of Accidental Occurrence.

The same prominence could, we think, have easily been given the game birds, in a more systematic and better balanced grouping. However, the report places a vast deal of information at the disposal of the general reader and will do much good in the campaign for conservation, while the map and accompanying discussion will be most welcome to the student of zoogeography. A large number of half-tones illustrate the report but as a rule they do not show to advantage, probably owing to the texture of the paper. Mr. Kopman is to be congratulated upon a valuable contribution to the literature of the conservation of wild life.—W. S.

Todd on the Genus *Pipromorpha*.¹ Mr. Todd's revision of this genus of flycatchers is the first of a proposed series of 'Studies in the Tyrannidae.' After an examination of 460 specimens including the series from most of the larger museums of America, Mr. Todd is able to recognize four species, *rufiventris*; *macconnelli* (three subspecies); *oleaginea* (five subspecies) and *assimilis* (two subspecies).

P. macconnelli amazona (p. 179) Buena Vista, Bolivia; and *P. oleaginea pacifica* (p. 187) Bucay, Ecuador, are described as new, while four of Mr. Chubb's recently described races of *P. oleaginea* fall into synonymy in Mr. Todd's opinion. The genus *Pipromorpha* he finds is very close to *Mionectes* from which Ridgway separated it in 1907, in fact there is but one character—the shape of the ninth primary which serves to separate it! The work seems to be very carefully done and the descriptions, synonymy and lists of specimens are full and in every way satisfactory.—W. S.

Recent Papers by Chrostowski. Several papers on neotropical birds have appeared during 1921, by the Polish ornithologist T. Chrostowski. In one of these ² seven rare or little known Brazilian birds are discussed, one of which *Nonnula hellmayri* (p. 39) from Parana is described as new. Another paper³ deals with the types of neotropical birds in the Museum of the Academy of Sciences of Petrograd, the collections of F. H. von Kittlitz and Emele Menetrice being considered. Incidentally, *Planesticus bianchii* (p. 28) from "Brazil" is described, as new. In connection with

¹ Studies in the Tyrannidae. I. A Revision of the Genus *Pipromorpha*. By W. E. Clyde Todd. Proc. Biol. Soc., Wash., 34 pp. 173-192. Dec. 21, 1921.

² Ann. Zool. Mus. Polonici Hist. Nat. 1, Fasc. 1. September 30, 1921. pp. 31-40. [In English and French.]

³ Ibid. Sept. 30, 1921. pp. 9-30. [In French.]

these papers attention might be called to the author's report¹ on a collection made at Parana in 1910 and 1911 which apparently appeared in 1912.—W. S.

Oberholser on Bird Life in the Great Basin.²—One naturally associates Dr. Oberholser's name with the most technical treatises dealing with nomenclature and taxonomy, and the present paper will doubtless come as a pleasant surprise to many who are unacquainted with his versatility. He has here presented us with an admirable popular sketch of the physical characteristics and bird life of one of the most interesting of the desert areas of the west—the Great Basin.

The habits and appearance of many of the water and shore-birds of Tule and Pyramid Lakes are described in some detail as well as of a number of the more truly desert birds which are not dependent upon the presence of bodies of water. The student of the life history and behavior of our native birds will find Dr. Oberholser's paper one well worth consulting. While no scientific names appear, one cannot but notice some of the peculiarities of the English names, for which the author is probably not responsible. Instead of following the standard forms established by the American Ornithologists' Union and in very general use, we find the editor of the Smithsonian Report, insisting that "humming bird" and "mocking bird"³ consist of two words with not even a hyphen, though "meadowlark" and "nighthawk" pass as single words. In another report from the same institution however, we find "humming-bird" hyphenated!—W. S.

McAtee's Community Bird Refuges.³ In this attractively gotten up pamphlet the author calls attention briefly and concisely to the advantages of increasing the number of birds on or about our farm lands. While the average number of birds to the acre throughout the country is shown to be two, the number has been increased by the offer of suitable inducements to as many as 59 pairs. At an annual average value of 10 cents each to the farmer, as insect destroyers,—a ridiculously low estimate, the birds of the United States effect a saving of four hundred million dollars every year, and it is readily seen that the more we can attract to our grounds the better.

The usual methods of erecting nest boxes, winter feeding, planting of berry bearing bushes, etc., are mentioned, with references to other available publications on the subject. A novel feature however, is a plea for

¹ Compt. Rend. Soc. Scient. de Varsovie, 1912, V. Ann., fasc. 8. pp. 452-500. [In Polish with condensed reprint in French].

² Glimpses of Desert Bird Life in the Great Basin. By Harry C. Oberholser. Smithsonian Report for 1919, pp. 355-366. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1921.

³ Community Bird Refuges. By W. L. McAtee. Farmers' Bulletin 1239. U. S. Dept. Agr., December, 1921, Svo. pp. 1-14.