chiefly the mountainous section," lists covering neighboring States and publications of the U. S. Biological Survey, we cannot help but wonder whether he is familiar with the most important of all the Tennessee lists, that of Saml. N. Rhoads, published in the 'Proceedings of the Philadelphia Academy' for 1895, which furnishes data on no less than 215 species. There is also an interesting paper on Tennessee birds by Bradford Torrey in the 'Atlantic Monthly' for February, 1896.— W. S.

**Birds of Carthage, Illinois.**— Carthage College has published a list of the birds of Hancock County, Ill., compiled by the members of the bird class under the direction of Prof. F. C. Gates. 155 species are listed with the dates on which they were seen. Appended is a list of specimens in the college museum.— W. S.

**Swarth and Bryant on the White-fronted Geese of California.**— The writers of this interesting contribution to our knowledge of the American geese were led to make an investigation of the White-fronted Geese of California by the statements of Mr. Geo. Neale and Judge F. W. Henshaw, to the effect that there were two forms of these birds, a large one and a small one. Subsequently specimens were presented by the same gentlemen to the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology at Berkeley, Cal., which fully substantiated their claim. A thorough examination of a large number of birds, as well as the literature of the subject, has led the authors to the following conclusions. The existence of two perfectly distinct races of White-fronted Geese in North America has been overlooked by all writers on the subject and the discrepancy in the size of certain individuals has caused doubt as to the validity of the race *gambeli* as distinct from *albifrons* of the Old World. As a matter of fact the former was based on the large American bird while the smaller form, which seems to be by far the commoner is nothing more than the true *albifrons* hitherto supposed to be restricted to the Old World except as a doubtful straggler to Greenland. The authors have done a good piece of work and the only fault that we have to find with their paper is the rather careless use of the word "species" when they mean subspecies. The term "form" seems to be the only word available where we are forced to discuss both species and subspecies at the same time. Possibly this ambiguity may have had something to do with the apparent perplexity of a reviewer in a recent issue of "The Oologist" who charges the authors with describing a new subspecies, a "crime" which they studiously avoided.— W. S.
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