which it treats. There is a brief sketch of physiography, an historical summary, a list of eighty "field workers," a map, and descriptive list of localities and a nominal list of the bird forms found in the state and following these the main text presenting a condensed statement of the character of occurrence of each form (or "kind" as the author prefers) in Nevada, followed usually by more details as to dates and localities. The A. O. U. 'Check-List' is followed for sequence but changes in the names or distribution of the Nevada forms are made in many cases, as a result of more accurate information. No synonymy or reference to place of publication of names are given, as the work is essentially geographic not systematic. There is a full bibliography, and we realize the relief that the author must have experienced when we find only about a dozen faunal papers published on the birds of the state! He has, however, taken the pains to examine all recorded specimens possible where identification in terms of modern knowledge was desirable and has thus eliminated many misidentifications. Three hundred and fifteen forms of which specimens have been procured are treated, as well as 23 others based upon sight identifications while a "hypothetical" list of 14 is appended.

Dr. Linsdale is to be congratulated upon an excellent piece of work adding as it does one more state list to the modern publications of this kind. While admittedly not complete it brings the subject up to date and makes it possible for others to carry on work intelligently.—W. S.

Griscom on Problems of Field Identification.—In this paper[1] Mr. Griscom has presented an interesting sketch of the development of ornithology and its present day tendencies which all should read. He compares the early days of discovery and description, the collecting period, the rise of field identification and the present era of specialization when "the living bird is more than ever the subject for both research interest and amusement, not the dead stuffed one," and the old time museum ornithologist has had to "retire to equatorial Africa, the wilds of South America or the mountains of New Guinea" as there is nothing left for *him* to do with North American birds. Likewise our author considers the making of big May lists useless from a scientific standpoint, as the results can be predicted in advance with an accuracy of 98%. Such work he regards as a hobby or outdoor pastime and not to be abandoned, but it is not scientific research, so far as well known regions are concerned.

As to the scientific value of sight records he says "No one sight record can ever be absolute proof" but a series may be, or a sight record by a series of competent observers. The present day arguments on the possibility of identifying closely related species in the field is of no scientific consequence in the region where the status of each has been accurately determined. "The real reason for such debate is that the present day enthusiasts wish to count both birds in their yearly list!"

With most of Mr. Griscom's conclusions and predictions we are in entire accord though there are doubtless many who will not agree. However, while it is true that the "old fashioned museum ornithologist is being replaced by the modern biologist" it seems to us that there will always be a need for the former. The collections in the museums must be intelligently cared for and after systematic study of skins has reached the limit of refinement—and it is rapidly approaching that goal—there are countless problems still to be solved from a study of skins and skeletons just as there are from field observation or aviary experiments. And furthermore there will probably always be those fitted for just this sort of work and no other.

We agree that the number of persons seriously interested in ornithology is increasing by leaps and bounds but we feel that there will be various limits beyond which

[1] Bird-Lore, January–February, 1936, pp. 12–18.

various groups will be unable to pass, either from lack of fundamental biological knowledge, from lack of time to equip themselves, or from lack of enthusiasm for concentrated study as opposed to a broad view of nature. We have for years urged young field ornithologists to make an exhaustive study of a single species but with very few exceptions they have preferred to wander widely and make a short acquaintance with a number of different species. We doubt, therefore, if a very large number of field students will reach the higher planes that the leaders attain. And so long as trained biologists, like Mr. Griscom and others, still "love to see how many birds they can see on a May 'big day'" their admiring satellites will continue to regard this as the height of ornithological achievement, even though it be really only a pastime and hobby. Mr. Griscom constantly contrasts the "amateur" and the "gifted scientist" which is really necessary in such a discussion but we have found this very dangerous ground upon which to tread; most "ornithologists" and especially "oologists" do not like anyone to separate the sheep from the goats!

One of the important and depressing factors in the development of technical ornithologists is: What is going to become of them when they are developed? To reach the higher planes which would seem to be their aim they must have a college training. A mere dilatante or a good field collector could become an "old fashioned museum ornithologist" but they cannot qualify as modern ornithological biologists. Unfortunately if a young man receives a college training, even in a college with a special ornithological course, it is difficult for him to find a position in which he can make a living. There are an increasing number of field positions opening up in connection with game preservation etc., for which the man most familiar with field work is the best fitted but here Government regulations too often step in and exclude all but those with a college education! Thus do well intentioned regulations defeat their own ends.

To return to field identifications: Mr. Griscom states that "those who wish to make sight records of scientific value must possess the proper qualifications and must acquire the reputation of possessing them." This cannot be too strongly emphasized. The young men who accompany men of Mr Griscom's well known attainments in field identification, and see how easily they can identify off hand almost every bird that they see, think that the thing is very easy and armed with Peterson's 'Field Guide' they add many records of interest to their experience and that of others as well—a "Prothonotary Warbler" in Pennsylvania in March and an "Olive-sided Flycatcher" in the same month sitting by a spring house wagging its tail! (Both actual reports!) If we regard field lists wholly as a game it probably does not make much difference what sort of identifications are made as we shall have to reject the list *in toto* so far as any scientific value may go, but we should be very sorry to see this come to pass. There is much value to field lists if censored before publication by those who know the abilities of the observers—this sort of censorship is unfortunately seldom possible and less often practiced. The really unfortunate feature of the "Christmas Lists" is the element of competition which naturally creeps in. Even the most careful individual observer will, more or less unconsciously, give a record the benefit of a doubt if it adds one more species to his team score.

Such lists if confined to a limited area and repeated for a number of years with counts of individuals as well as species have a definite value but we have absolutely no sympathy with the so-called "century runs" extending from 3 A. M. to 10 P. M. and covering a hundred miles or more. They are purely endurance tests for the participants and the man who stays at home, if he knows the territory, can compile a list of species that the others will see that will be almost perfect.

Mr. Griscom has done a good service in publishing this paper and we hope that it may serve to emphasize the importance of accuracy and care in field identification. If he has made "ten-thousand mistakes" as he says [!? Ed.] how many are others likely to make? The reviewer has made many but, probably like Mr. Griscom, he fortunately did not publish them! If more care be not taken and more observations of rarities kept in the seclusion of note books the usefulness and charm of field lists will disappear. It is impossible to identify *every* bird that one sees. Other points that Mr. Griscom emphasizes and which should be carefully considered are the possibilities of other results from field observation besides the forming of big lists, and the impossibility and undesirability of publishing local lists for regions already well known. Our ornithological journals already have more really good papers and notes than they have space for and local lists of the sort mentioned are of no service except to gratify their compilers.

In regard to the abandonment of personal collections of skins in most of the well studied sections of the United States to which Mr. Griscom refers, and which is the natural result of accurate field identification and the desire for bird conservation, we have often wondered why the oölogists do not also "play the game," and give the birds a chance, especially the rarer species and those threatened with extermination! —W. S.

Peters and Loveridge on East African Birds.—This paper[1] is based upon a collection made by Mr. Loveridge in the interests of the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy in certain rain forest areas in Uganda and Kenya from November 1933 to June, 1934. A series of 530 skins representing 228 forms was secured, of which *Tyto capensis libratus* and *Zosterops silvanus* proved to be new and have been described (Proc. Biol. Soc. Washington, 48, p. 77). The narrative and general zoological results will be presented in a final report.

The arrangement of the annotations in the present report is under definite headings—Breeding, Synonymy, Diet, Measurements, etc., usually only one (rarely more than three) being given under a single species. One heading "parasites" contains mention of Mallophaga or other parasites which may be of interest to entomologists and which would be easily overlooked, buried as they are in the body of the text.

The proof-reading seems to have been hastily done as we notice several errors in spelling; the generic name *Argya* is consistently misspelled "*Argyra*" throughout the paper, and the heading for *Nectarinia formosa centralis* seems to have disappeared. There is a bibliography and several half-tone illustrations of nests and habitats.

The paper is a welcome contribution to the ornithology of east Africa and we shall look forward with interest to the final report on the region.—W. S.

Recent Papers on Guatemalan Birds.—Messrs. M. A. Carriker and R. M. de Schauensee have recently reported[2] upon two collections of birds from Guatemala, in the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia; one obtained by Samuel N. Rhoads and E. L. Poole during a trip to that country in 1915, and the other secured by the junior author in the highlands of the country in 1935. The former comprised 704 skins, the latter 408. From the former collection are described *Eumomota superciliosa sylvestris* (p. 418), *Geococcyx velox pallidus* (p. 426), *Ramphastos sulfuratus*

[1] Scientific Results of an Expedition to Rain Forest Regions in Eastern Africa. By James Lee Peters and Arthur Loveridge. Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool. LXXIX, No. 4, pp. 129–205. January, 1936.

[2] An Annotated List of Two Collections of Guatemalan Birds in the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia. By M. A. Carriker and Rodolphe Meyer de Schauensee. Proc Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila., LXXXVII, Pp. 411–455, December 27, 1935.