

and the writer of this review, at frequent intervals from early in December till into March, which differ not in the least in respect to the black face-markings from summer specimens. And similar examples are, to our knowledge, in various collections, both public and private, notably in those of Messrs. Brewster, Cory, and others, and that of Princeton College.

Four beautiful plates illustrate Mr. Sharpe's monograph of the Mniotiltidæ, in which are figured the heads of eight species of *Geothlypis*, while full-length figures are given of *G. speciosa*, *Parula pitaiayumi*, *P. nigrilora*, *Teretristis fernandina*, and *T. fornsi*.

The genus *Polioptila* (with 13 species) is noticed in an 'Appendix to the family Mniotiltidæ' (pp. 440-445), the group having been omitted by Mr. Seebohm from the Sylviidæ, where authors have generally placed it. Mr. Sharpe believes that their most natural position is "in the vicinity of the Muscicapine genus *Stenostira*."

In the family Motacillidæ, the Field Wagtails, usually separated as a genus *Budytes*, are placed with the Water Wagtails under the single genus *Motacilla*, there being "certain intermediate species . . . which unite these two supposed genera." Yet he considers it expedient to continue the generic separation of *Anthus spraguei* from *Anthus* proper, under the genus *Neocorys*. As already noticed (*antea*, p. 290, footnote), our Titlark is made a subspecies of the Old World Water Pipit, *Anthus spinoletta*, (*spinoletta* Linn., and 'auct. plur.'), under which it stands as "Subsp. *a*. *Anthus pennsylvanicus*." A similar disposition of it was made previously by Mr. Seebohm (Hist. Brit. Bds., II, 1883, p. 248). The adoption of 'radical changes' in specific names, when called for by nomenclatural rules does not seem to inspire in our author, we are glad to see, the same degree of dread as 'radical changes' in generic names, though we fail to trace any principle of consistency in such diverse action under similar contingencies.—J. A. A.

Turner's List of the Birds of Labrador.*—While Mr. Turner's 'List' is very valuable, and will prove very useful, it is at the same time disappointing and unsatisfactory, owing largely to the faulty plan of its construction. Mr. Turner spent nearly two years and four months (from July 15, 1882, to October 5, 1884) in Labrador; his investigations being made chiefly "in the vicinity of Fort Chimo, situated about 27 miles up the Koksoak River, flowing into Ungava Bay, which is an immense pocket toward the eastern portion of the south side of Hudson Strait," where he "remained from August 6, 1882, to September 4, 1884." His list includes about 207 species, only a few more than one-half of which appear to have come under his own observation. Quite a number of the others are

*List of the Birds of Labrador, including Ungava, East Main, Moose, and Gulf Districts of the Hudson Bay Company, together with the Island of Anticosti. By Lucien M. Turner. Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., VIII, 1885, pp. 233-254. Published July 13, 1885.

given apparently from specimens in the National Museum, collected by Mr. C. Drexler, mainly at Moose Factory, but some 70 or more rest on the authority of previous authors, as Audubon, Richardson, Nuttall, Coues, Kumlien, Stearns, and Brewster, including seven recorded only from Anticosti, or other points south of Labrador. The area intended to be covered by the List extends from Anticosti and the Gulf of Saint Lawrence to Hudson Strait, and from the Atlantic coast westward to the 82d meridian, or a region some six hundred miles in length by about one thousand miles in breadth. It is apparently intended to be a complete list of the birds hitherto observed in Labrador, although the only statement to this effect is that implied in the title of the paper.

Our first criticism relates to what we deem a radical fault in the construction of the List, namely, the omission of the author to divide the species into two categories, the first to include only the species observed by him within his own field of investigation about Fort Chimo, the second to consist of the additional species attributed to Labrador by previous explorers. Respecting the species actually collected or observed by the writer, we must confess to a feeling of disappointment that he tells us so little about them, his remarks rarely exceeding a few lines to each, while in many cases more detailed statements would have been of the highest interest. This certainly was not due to any lack of opportunity for observation, for the magnificent collection of material brought back by him to the National Museum testifies alike to his success and great industry in collecting. For instance, it is quite tantalizing to find species like the Redpolls dismissed with less than two lines, merely stating that the species is abundant and resident at Fort Chimo, that it breeds plentifully there, and that its nests and eggs were obtained. On the other hand, his record of species observed by others is sufficiently explicit and apparently has been very carefully compiled, although all are obviously not included, as, for instance, *Larus canus* among the Gulls, and *Somateria v-nigra* among the Ducks.

Again, it is disappointing to find a writer who has had so much experience as a collector in the country under notice giving these reports and extracts without comment as to their character, in cases even where the temptation to a little intelligent criticism must have been very strong, as, for instance, where *Dendroica cærulea*, *Vireo noveboracensis*, *Pipilo erythrophthalmus*, *Tyrannus tyrannus*, *Sayornis phæbe*, *Contopus virens*, and the two Cuckoos are given on the authority of Audubon, and *Hylocichla mustelina* and *Aix sponsa* on Stearns's authority. While we would not imply any sweeping discredit upon the observations of Audubon, we can not help feeling that in writing out his biographies of birds he sometimes trusted to memory rather than to carefully recorded field-notes. While thus freely criticising the paper under notice, we do not lose sight of the fact that it is a most important and welcome contribution to our knowledge of the birds of a region Mr. Turner has been the first to explore, and at the cost, too, of a long sojourn in a most inhospitable country, necessarily entailing much hardship.—J. A. A.