

swifts, humming-birds, night-hawks, etc., in which there is never any emargination.

“Again, the emargination varies in extent, being limited in many birds to the first primary alone, and to the extreme apical portion of this; in others it occurs on the apical portion only, say for two to four inches, or perhaps the outer four to six primaries; while in very many birds, including the turkey buzzard and its allies, and many hawks, it extends to the basal third or fourth of all the outer primaries.

“Having now shown that interlocking does not and cannot take place, it may be worth while further to point out that it is unnecessary.

“In a soaring bird, no great muscular tension is called into action. The large pectoral muscles, which move the wings up and down, are in a state of equilibrium, and under very slight tension, not more than are the muscles of a man’s arm when the arm is in an ordinary position of rest. The mechanism of the bony framework is such, as has been already shown, that the wing is kept extended in such a way that there can be only very slight strain on any of the numerous muscles of the wing itself. The extension of the primaries is automatically effected by the extension of the wing, and results in no special strain, when once the wing is fully extended, upon any of the muscles whose function is to flex and extend the outer or phalangeal segments of the pinion. Hence the comparison made at the meeting of December 12th, of a man’s arm held extended at a right angle to the body, in an unnatural position, with a bird’s wing held extended in soaring, in a perfectly natural position, was wholly irrelevant.

“The hypothesis of the interlocking of the primaries during protracted soaring, to conserve energy and lessen fatigue, has not only no basis in fact, but is entirely gratuitous.”—E. C.

Birds of Morris County, New Jersey.—Nearly a year ago the list to which attention is now called* was published in a local newspaper, and as the distribution of New Jersey birds is known inferentially rather than by any recent and reliable published information, such an excellent list as the present one seems worthy of wider notice. It is the result of over four years’ work in the northern part of the State and numbers 205 species and subspecies, not a large number, to be sure, but it must be remembered that Morris county is inland, and the usual array of water birds that goes to swell many lists is therefore wanting, although some occur as stragglers. The summer residents are mostly Alleghanian with a considerable sprinkling of Carolinian forms, such as *Cardinalis cardinalis*, *Seiurus motacilla*, *Mimus polyglottos*, *Thryothorus ludovicianus*, *Parus bicolor*, and others less distinctive, while little needs be said of the migrants and accidental visitors recorded. Few local lists can boast of two species relegated to the hypothetical list of the A. O. U. Check List. A specimen of *Helminthophila lawrencei*, and two of *H. leucobronchialis*

*A List of Birds of Morris County, New Jersey. By E. Carleton Thurber, True Democratic Banner, Morristown, N. J., Nov. 10, 17, 24, 1887.

are here recorded, and reference is made to the type of the former species secured just over the line, in Essex County. The brief annotations refer mostly to the abundance of the species and the dates of rare captures are usually given. There are four species that one would expect to find included which have evidently not been met with by our author, *i. e.* *Empidonax pusillus traillii*, *E. acadicus*, *Geothlypis formosa*, and *Turdus aliciae* (including, perhaps, *bicknelli*). These are found near New York City, where the fauna may be said to be almost identical with that of Morris County, but with these exceptions the list seems complete save for the probable future records of accidental visitors. Though *Porzana carolina* is called a "common migrant," it has been known to breed in the County near Whippany, and it may breed abundantly. *Ammodramus caudacutus* is said to be "not uncommon." Occurring as it does on fresh water marshes, the question naturally suggests itself, may this not be *nelsoni*? Further comment seems unnecessary. The list bears evidence of unusual care in its compilation, and is worthy of more prominence than is found in the columns of a local newspaper. —J. D., JR.

Publications Received.—**Blasius**, Rudolf. (1) Die Vogelwelt der Stadt Braunschweig und ihrer nächsten Umgebung. (Verein für Naturw. zu Braunschweig, V Jahresber. für 1886–87, pp. 59–116.) (2) *Mergus anotarius* Eimbeck, ein Bastard zwischen *Mergus albellus* Linn. und *Glaucula clangula* Linn. (Monatschrift des Deutschen Vereins zum Schutze der Vogelwelt, XII Jahrg., 1887, No. 14.)

Blasius, R., A. Reichenow, u. and. X. Jahresbericht (1885) des Ausschusses für Beobachtungsstationen der Vögel Deutschlands. (Journ. für Orn., Oct. 1887, pp. 337–648.)

Blasius, Wilh. (1) Die Vögel von Palawan. (Ornis, 1888.) (2) Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Vogelfauna von Celebes. III. (Zeitschrift für die ges. Ornithologie, 1886, Heft 3.)

Evermann, B. W., and O. P. Jenkins. Ornithology from a Railroad Train. (Orn. & Öl., May, 1888.)

Lucas, F. A. The Home of the Great Auk. (Pop. Sci. Monthly, Aug. 1888, pp. 456–464.)

Ramsey, E. P. Catalogue of the Australian Accipitres or Diurnal Birds of Prey inhabiting Australia, in the Collection of the Australian Museum at Sidney, N. S. W. 8vo., 1876. (From Australian Museum, with eight other publications of the Museum.)

Shufeldt, R. W. Osteology of *Porzana carolina*. (Journ. Comp. Med. & Surg., July, 1888.)

Tschusi zu Schmidhoffen, Victor Ritter von. Die Verbreitung und der Zug des Tannenhehers (*Nucifraga caryocatactes* L.), mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seines Auftretens im Herbst und Winter, 1885, und Bemerkungen über seine beiden Varietäten: *Nucifraga caryocatactes pachyrhynchus* und *leptorhynchus* R. Blas. (Verhandl. der k. k. zoologisch-botanischen Gesells. in Wien, Jahrg. 1888, pp. 407–506, pl. xi.) (2) Die ornithologische Literatur Oesterreich-Ungarns, 1887. (Mitth. des Orn.