general reader on the various phases of bird migration should be more or less vitiated throughout by the ill-devised theory which pervades and colors an otherwise praiseworthy book,—a work, in other respects, as regards its general character, far in advance of Mr. Dixon's previous one bearing the same title.—J. A. A.

Marsh on the Affinities of Hesperornis. — Professor Marsh here reaffirms the correctness of his conclusion, published in 1880, that "the Struthious characters, seen in Hesperornis, should probably be regarded as evidence of real affinity, and in this case Hesperornis would be essentially a carnivorous, swimming Ostrich." Authors who had not seen the original specimens, says Prof. Marsh, "seem to have accepted without hesitation the striking adaptive characters of the posterior limbs as the key to real affinities," till soon "the Ratite affinities of Hesperornis were seldom alluded to in scientific literature." He has remained silent, "leaving to future discoveries the final decision of the question at issue." This decision, Prof. Marsh thinks, is now on record. Prof. Williston having discovered near the original type locality a remarkably perfect specimen of Hesperornis, with the feathers in place, showing that Hesperornis had "the typical plumage of an Ostrich." Reference to Prof. Williston's paper (Kansas University Quarterly, Vol. V, No. 1, July, 1896, pp. 53, 54, pl. ii) shows that there is still ground for a difference of opinion as to the Struthious character of the downy feathers found on the tarsus and head of Prof. Williston's specimen of Hesperornis.—J. A. A.

Stone on the Genus Sturnella. — Mr. Stone's paper has relation mainly to the forms referred to S. magna mexicana, the Rio Grande Valley phase of which group Mr. Stone now separates as a new subspecies, under the name S. m. hoopesi. This form resembles magna in the coloration of the lower parts, it lacking the yellow on the malar region, while the upper plumage is lighter even than in neglecta, with the tail bars "more distinct than in any of the other races." True S. m. mexicana thus becomes restricted to southern Mexico and Central America, S. m. hoopesi taking its place in the A. O. U. Check-List. The Florida bird, which has sometimes been referred to mexicana, Mr. Stone finds is not separable from Louisiana examples, and that these latter differ but little from specimens from southern Indiana and southern Illinois. He considers it therefore inadvisable to separate this Gulf coast phase from magna.—J. A. A.
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