

best as only casual, and the infertility of hybrids, especially among the higher animals, is too well known to need further comment here"! He believes that in the case of these two forms, "we have examples of two separate and distinct 'mutations' from a common parent stock or species. That is," he continues, "I believe that *H. pinus*, early in the last century became unstable as a species and began to throw what must be considered as 'mutants,' taking de Vries's definition of the word." He concludes with the following: "In the light of the evidence set forth only one answer can be made to the question as to the part that the process defined by de Vries as mutation is playing among higher animals to-day. Beyond doubt we have witnessed the birth of new species of birds during the past seventy years. Moreover, some of these new species have flourished so as to have become a salient part of the bird fauna in the region where they occur and where they were unknown to skilled ornithologists, who carefully studied these regions in the early part of the last century." Elsewhere in his paper he lays great stress on the fact that these forms were unknown to "such keen field naturalists as Audubon and Wilson, [Nuttall,] Lawrence, Coues and Prentiss."

Having elsewhere replied¹ in considerable detail to Mr. Scott's paper, we will here merely state, (1) that the area where these birds have been found (except in the case of a very few migrants) was wholly outside of the regions studied by the above named "keen field naturalists," and that their ignorance of these birds does not imply their absence from the area where they have since been found in some numbers, and their probable recent origin; (2) that these birds do not present the stable character observed in mutants, which always breed true; (3) that they occur only where the breeding ranges of *Helminthophila chrysoptera* and *H. pinus* overlap, and are thus strictly comparable with the hybridity seen on a grand scale between *Colaptes cafer* and *C. auratus* over the extensive region where their breeding ranges overlap; (4) that Mr. Scott has not shown a very clear grasp of the facts in the case of these warblers, or of the real character of mutants; (5) that the hypothesis of hybridity, plus more or less tendency to dichromatism, satisfactorily accounts for *H. lawrencei* and *H. leucobronchialis* and their endless variants.—J. A. A.

Clark's 'Birds of the Southern Lesser Antilles.'—This paper, of over one hundred pages,² relates to Barbados, St. Vincent, the Grenadines, and Grenada. Twenty-five pages of introductory matter treat of the 'Literature,' 'Geology and Geography' (pp. 206-215), 'Meteorological and Geological Phenomena' (hurricanes and volcanic eruptions), 'Present Status of Bird Life,' 'Locally Extinct Species,' 'Introduced Species,' 'Exported

¹Science, N. S., Vol. XXII, No. 562, pp. 431-434, Oct. 6, 1905.

²Birds of the Southern Lesser Antilles. By Austin H. Clark. Proc. Boston Soc. Nat. Hist., Vol. XXXII, No. 7, pp. 203-312. Oct., 1905.

Species,' 'The Mongoose,' and 'The West Indian Avifauna' (pp. 221-228). The 'Annotated List' occupies pp. 228-302, and is followed by nominal lists of species known to breed in the different islands; and by a bibliography of nearly one hundred titles. The list numbers 168 species as of known occurrence, of which 11 are introduced; 5 others are given as of doubtful occurrence, and 3 as 'hypothetical.' Quite a number of the species admitted rest on single records.

The list is based primarily on observations and collections made by the author during a continuous residence of rather more than a year (August 3, 1902-September 22, 1904), and on the literature of the subject, which appears to have been very carefully examined, including such 16th and 17th century authors as Rochefort, Ligon, Dutertre, Labat, Hughes, and Sloane. *Coccyzus minor vincentis* is here described as new, and four others, based on the investigations here recorded, were described by the author in earlier papers, and are in part here redescribed. Besides the very extended remarks on the distribution and habits of the forms here enumerated, there are often critical remarks on their relationships and probable origin as birds of these islands. The work altogether shows careful research and is an important contribution to West Indian ornithology.—J. A. A.

Oberholser's 'A Monograph of the Genus *Dendrocincla* Gray.'¹—

Of this difficult genus 18 forms are recognized, namely, 12 species and 6 additional subspecies. Two species and two subspecies are here described as new, and four names previously current are reduced to synonymy. Specimens of all except two were examined, including the types of seven of them. *Dendromanes* Sclater, proposed for *Dendrocincla anabatina*, is treated "as a simple synonym of *Dendrocincla*." There is a key to the species and subspecies, and the type locality, distribution, and synonymy of each are given.—J. A. A.

Beebe's 'The Ostriches and their Allies.'—

Apropos of the recent opening of the Ostrich House in the New York Zoölogical Park, Mr. C. William Beebe, Curator of Birds at the Park, has prepared an excellent popular account of 'The Ostriches and their Allies,' which is published in the Ninth Annual Report of the Society, and also separately.² It consists of Part I, a general account of the Apteryges, the Emeus, the Cassowaries, and the Ostriches, and Part II, their external structural adaptations to cursorial habits. The text is a well prepared popular account of these

¹A Monograph of the Genus *Dendrocincla* Gray. By Harry C. Oberholser. Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia, 1904, pp. 447-463, June 19, 1904.

²The Ostriches and their Allies. By C. William Beebe, Curator of Birds. Ninth Ann. Rep. New York Zoöl. Soc., 1904, pp. 203-229. Also separate, 8vo, pp. 32, with 8 half-tone plates and 11 text illustrations.