

quisition; that is, animal "specimens" are not included. This tendency is to be looked upon with favor, and should be encouraged in every practicable way.

Books, as records of facts, are doubtless far more lasting than "specimens." The latter rapidly deteriorate with time and at best are only partial records, even though originally essential for the accuracy of much of the printed record.

Incidentally a distinct service is rendered the cause of science by private book collectors, in that rare volumes are gathered from obscure and unappreciative sources, and usually renovated by re-binding as well as being housed under the safest of conditions. The lives of these volumes thus become insured for much longer time than would likely otherwise be the case. Sooner or later, too, private collections find their way into public repositories where the field of their usefulness widens.

Another factor worth considering is that collectors of books on ornithology nowadays have the satisfaction of knowing that what money they put into their hobby, if discriminatingly spent, has been well invested; the market value of even some quite recent publications has doubled or even trebled within a very few years.

Mr. Thayer's catalog is an incentive to interest on the part of others along this line, and we welcome it. The reviewer, for instance, has taken great pleasure in running over the titles in comparison with the contents of his own modest collection.—J. GRINNELL.

THE AUK.—The July number of *The Auk* sustains the usually high character of that magazine as a record of ornithological discovery and scholarship. The latter element predominates in Stone's review of William Bartram's bird migration records. The writer comes to the conclusion, based on an exhaustive study of Bartram's journals, that in the case of 26 species of the commoner birds of Philadelphia no appreciable change in the time of their arrival has taken place in the past century. This conclusion, necessitated no doubt by the data at hand, is a little surprising, not to say disappointing, for we had supposed that the unquestioned "northward trend of species" would have shown itself in noticeably earlier spring arrival as it has in extended breeding ranges.

Forbes' review of Brewster's observations on the flight of gulls (recorded in *The Auk*, for January, 1912) is little more than a dogmatic reassertion of the mathematical *impasse* which has always ended the discussion of this subject. As the author himself admits, his general denial of the possibility of the advantageous 'resolution of forces' by a bird glid-

ing against a horizontal wind does not account for all the factors in Mr. Brewster's record. It does not account, namely, for the behavior of birds so far removed from the ship that ascending currents caused by the passing ship could not have been a factor. This difficult subject is not yet susceptible of explanation, but we do need further and exhaustive records of fact.

Careful, scholarly work appears in Cameron's continuation of "Notes on Swainson's Hawk in Montana" and in Tyler's account of "A Successful Pair of Robins". By the way, what an inordinate amount of attention is being paid these days to excrementation and the parental disposal of faecal sacs! The magazines are full of it. It is all very necessary, we suppose, but one cannot help hoping that the values of this particular phase of paedolatry may be settled presently so that we can pass to pleasanter topics.

Miss Sherman's painstaking study of "The Nest Life of the Sparrow Hawk" again caps the climax of scholarly research. We have in Miss Sherman a shining example of how purposeful leisure may be profitably employed in the further consideration of some of the most familiar ornithological subjects. We hope to see one day from her pen a collected series of these stimulating bird studies.

Scholarship again is the note of Swarth's review of "The Status of Lloyd's Bush-tit as a Bird of Arizona," and his studies seem to establish the fact that *Psaltriparus melanotis lloydi* is not a bird of Arizona, and that the bird once described as *P. santaritae* was a juvenal phase of *P. plumbeus*.

Three faunal lists and a brief anatomical article conspire with "General Notes" and extended book reviews to make this a most creditable number, while Abbott H. Thayer's "periodical warning" that both he and the theory are alive and cheerfully defiant gives that touch of piquancy which we relish in the staidest of journals.—W. L. DAWSON.

BIRD-LORE has come to be a magazine of which its sponsors may well be proud, and its bi-monthly visits, indispensable now as always to conservationists, are an honest joy to all bird students whether veteran or amateur. Florence Merriam Bailey contributes the leading article to the September-October (1913) number and it is as chock full of interest as it is of information concerning the Long-eared Owl. In our opinion Mrs. Bailey is one of the most gifted and refreshing interpreters of bird-life now before the public. She has in addition to keen and disciplined powers of observation a vivacious style and that sprightly quality of imagination which makes it really worth while for us to view life through her eyes. This owl