

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 paper¹ 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 reported² 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.