

excavation at Workman and Alhambra streets, Los Angeles, in 1933. The specimens, a distal end of tibiotarsus and complete pedal phalanx, both petrified, may be assignable to *Parapavo*, but unfortunately they do not possess any diagnostic generic characters by which to make definite identification. For this reason they have been heretofore unrecorded.

The only other fossil meleagrids which have been recorded from California are from the Pleistocene of Potter Creek Cave and of Mission San José. Eight specimens from the former locality were originally recorded as *Meleagris* sp., though later Miller, Carnegie Inst. Wash., Publ. 349, 1925, p. 67) indicated that they were "referable either to *Parapavo* or to *Meleagris*." The fragment of sternum from the Mission San José locality is the type specimen of *Meleagris richmondi* Shufeldt.—HILDEGARDE HOWARD, *Los Angeles Museum, Los Angeles, California, July 14, 1936.*

Pasadena Screech Owl and Desert Sparrow Hawk in the Same Nest.—A most interesting set of eggs was found on the Mohave Desert north of the San Bernardino Mountains on May 5, 1935. I discovered a bird about eight inches down from an opening which was five feet up in the trunk of a Joshua tree. It was not a surprise to remove a Pasadena Screech Owl (*Otus asio quercinus*), but it certainly was one to feel the bottom of the cavity well filled with eggs.

The first egg removed was brown instead of white and I began to suspect the reason for the large set. The nest proved to hold four each of the owl and Desert Sparrow Hawk (*Falco sparverius phalaena*), all of which were normal for size, shape, and color. The two kinds of eggs all lay on the old wood at the bottom of the hole and were well intermingled. Those of the owl showed slight incubation while those of the hawk seemed to be slightly addled. Thus the evidence indicates that the owl took possession of the nesting site before the hawk had started to incubate her set of eggs.—WILSON C. HANNA, *Colton, California, August 26, 1936.*

Opinions Aroused by Pettingill's Monograph on the American Woodcock.—One by one and at an accelerated rate our North American birds are being studied for the purpose of writing exhaustive accounts of their lives. On April 30, 1936, the Boston Society of Natural History published as volume 9, number 2, of its memoirs the final report based on a five year study of the American Woodcock by O. S. Pettingill, Jr. The volume contains 223 pages and 10 plates; it sells for \$3.50 in paper covers.

Dr. Pettingill's patient industry in preparing this book will be appreciated by those bird students of the future who will have to come to it for an acquaintance with this reclusive bird, especially if the whims of civilization completely exterminate it. He has made a better than average report upon a difficult topic. It is obvious, even from casual examination, that the aim primarily was to provide an instructive book, not one that would be merely pleasing to the reader. It is fair, then, to consider the work as a pattern for other serious studies of single species and to see if any improvements in method be desirable. Persons intending to prepare monographs on single species can learn much by thus analyzing the reports already in print. In the following paragraphs are indicated several opinions on the preparation of a report on the life of a given bird, along with examples, from Pettingill, which do not agree with them. According to these opinions a writer should observe especially the following rules:

Discard any part of an original outline for which materials do not become available.

"Defense of Nesting Territory" (p. 287) is discussed without any supporting evidence. The third major division of the book, "The Struggle for Existence", is so far below the standard of the rest as to indicate that it should have been eliminated and the usable facts placed in other sections.

Give full details where required for clear indication of significance.

Usefulness of the list of vernacular names (pp. 187-188) would be enhanced if we knew something about each one—the time, place, and frequency of application. Surely the most important parts of such a list would be citations to authorities.

Base general statements on evidence presented, not on some generally accepted theory or supposition.

It is demonstrated (p. 278) that woodcock sometimes "travel at a low level", but where is the evidence that they "generally" do? Uncertainty in treatment of the topic "Breeding Territory" is indicated (p. 280) first by declaring that the "rule" implied in the concept is in the woodcock "subject to great variation," and second by defining, in the first three paragraphs, five separate kinds of territory—breeding territory, wooded territory, open-country territory, diurnal territory, and nesting territory. Considerable influence of a traditional theory of territory is shown. Is there evidence (p. 305) that polygamy actually occurs in this bird? The explanation of injury feigning (p. 332) seems not to follow the evidence or even to agree with it. There is probably