

less able, or inclined, to "home" accurately under experimental conditions than are regularly migratory species. Let us not forget that even if some recording device tells us when and by what route a bird flies to its nest, it cannot tell us *why* it followed that itinerary.

We need not regard as gospel truth every word in any book, even official Checklists. But let us strive to achieve some harmony between our own conclusions and the many facts already carefully established by the painful investigations of others; for otherwise it is apt to be our own work that is faulty. Above all let us stop and *think* about our own basic assumptions and root out those that are unwarranted. Complacent assumption, taking things for granted, is the main enemy of scientific progress.—Allan R. Phillips, Instituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México, D.F.

Consolidation of Northward Extension of the Glossy Ibis's Breeding Range.—There is mounting evidence that the Glossy Ibis, *Plegadis falcinellus*, is steadily extending its breeding range northward (see Stewart, 1957 and references cited). On 6 June, 1959, my wife and I visited the heronry located in the center of the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on the outer banks of North Carolina, for the purpose of banding the young herons and egrets. Since the colony is relatively small, we decided not to band the young for fear of disturbing the birds. (Assistant Refuge Manager Phillips informed us that disturbance in prior years is thought to have been responsible for the decreasing numbers of nesting pairs.) While in the colony for a short time, we observed seven Glossy Ibis flying and perching with the adult herons and egrets which had left the nests. Although we did not find the Ibis nests, I presumed that nests existed at the southern end of the colony. Phillips informed us that eight pairs nested in the colony in 1959. This represents a marked increase over the two pairs known in 1958 by Manager Turner (Phillips, pers. comm.) and is in contrast to the general trend of decreasing numbers of herons in the colony. It appears that the Glossy Ibis is not only extending its breeding range northward, but also consolidating the areas in which it has begun to breed.

The number of breeding areas is also increasing. The *A.O.U. Checklist* (Wetmore *et al.*, 1957) lists three breeding localities north of Georgia (p. 54), but a brief look at recent reports (Table I) indicates at least eight nesting localities, and probably more are being utilized. Perusal of recent issues of *Audubon Field Notes* also reveals increasing numbers of Glossy Ibis reported in spring, greater numbers being observed near known breeding sites in summer, and increasing numbers of birds seen in the post-breeding season. For instance, 63 individuals were seen

TABLE I. SOME KNOWN BREEDING LOCALITIES
OF THE GLOSSY IBIS—NORTH OF GEORGIA

Locality	Reference
Brigantine N.W.R., New Jersey	Potter and Murray, 1957
Cape May County, N. J.	Potter and Murray, 1955, 1956; Stewart, 1957 Potter and Scott, 1958
Chincoteague Bay, Maryland	Stewart, 1957
Hog Island, Virginia	Bock and Terborgh, 1957 Potter and Murray, 1957
Pea Island N.W.R., North Carolina	This note
Starvation Is., N. C. (near Beaufort)	Chamberlain, 1956
Southport, N. C.	Chamberlain, 1956 Stewart, 1957
Waccamaw River, South Carolina (near Georgetown)	Chamberlain, 1957
Drum Is., Cooper River, S. C. (near Charleston)	Chamberlain, 1956, 1957

in Georgetown, S.C. in 1955 (Chamberlain, 1955), and by 1957 the estimated summer population was 150-160 (Chamberlain, 1957); similar counts for the Chincoteague, Virginia area are 5 and 20 (Potter and Murray, 1955, 1957). My wife and I have repeatedly observed Glossy Ibis in the Oregon Inlet area north of Pea Island, and saw sixteen feeding in a single flock on Bodie Island (still further north) on 4 July 1959. There were definitely more on the outer banks in 1959 than in any previous year. I believe that there can no longer be any doubt but that the Glossy Ibis is undergoing a definite northward extension of its breeding range, as evidenced by the increase in numbers of individuals, of breeding localities, and of nests at breeding sites.

LITERATURE CITED

- BOCK, W. and J. TERBORGH. 1957. Breeding of the Glossy Ibis in Virginia. *Bird-Banding* 28: 98.
- CHAMBERLAIN, B. R. 1955. Southern Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 9: 371-373.
- CHAMBERLAIN, B. R. 1956. Southern Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 10: 376-379.
- CHAMBERLAIN, B. R. 1957. Southern Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 11: 396-399.
- POTTER, J. K. and J. J. MURRAY. 1955. Middle Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 9: 370-371.
- POTTER, J. K. and J. J. MURRAY. 1956. Middle Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 10: 375-376.
- POTTER, J. K. and J. J. MURRAY. 1957. Middle Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 11: 394-396.
- POTTER, J. K. and F. R. SCOTT. 1958. Middle Atlantic Coast Region. *Audubon Field Notes* 12: 17-19.
- STEWART, R. E. 1957. Eastern Glossy Ibis nesting in southeastern Maryland. *Auk* 74: 509.
- WETMORE, A. et al. 1957. *Checklist of North American Birds*. American Ornithologists union.
- Jack P. Hailman, 4401 Gladwyne Drive, Bethesda, Maryland.

Convergence in Passerine Alarm Calls.—In the January issue (*Bird-Banding* 30: 46-47) Hervey Brackbill noted a marked similarity in the calls uttered by some passerines in response to predators. He suggested that these high pitched calls may have been "evolved because they are inaudible to predatory birds." Actually, high-pitched "eeeeee" calls have been described for a variety of unrelated passerine species (see Marler, 1955. *Nature* 176: 6). Andrew (1957. *Ibis* 99: 27-42) recorded this type of call given by several European emberizines, and in my own studies of North American emberizines I have heard similar calls by the Slate-colored Junco (*Junco hyemalis*), Tree Sparrow (*Spizella arborea*), Lark Sparrow (*Chondestes grammacus*), and White-throat (*Zonotrichia albicollis*).

Marler's proposed explanation for the form of these predator calls is interesting. In a popular review of his work with the audiospectrograph, (1956. *New Biology* 20: 71-87) Marler shows that this form of call has probably been selected for predator alarms because it is difficult to locate (but not necessarily inaudible to the predator). The ears utilize three clues in localizing the source of a sound: (1) difference in the time that the sound reaches one ear before reaching the other; (2) difference in loudness (intensity) of the sound at each ear (especially high-pitched notes); and (3) difference in the phase of sound pulses at each ear (especially low-pitched notes). A sound like the "eeeeee" predator call is difficult to locate because (a) the single pitch is too high for good phase differentiation, but too low for good intensity differentiation, thus falling into the well-known "error zone" of sound localizing; and (b) it is long and drawn out providing no "breaks" which would provide time clues. Thus the predator call is completely audible (probably to both companions and the predator), but is extremely difficult to locate because all of its possible localizing qualities are reduced to a minimum. It is not surprising, then, that Brackbill's thrushes, my emberizines, and a variety of European passerines use highly similar warning calls in the presence of predators.—Jack P. Hailman, 4401 Gladwyne Drive, Bethesda, Maryland.