as to what the climate may have been in those times. . . . To speak again of the climate, it might well be compared with the present climate of Florida and the lower part of Louisiana, with the vegetation fully as luxuriant as it is now in those parts and with the palms more abundantly represented."

Dr. Shufeldt's memoir is thus a very interesting and important contribution to the early history of bird life in North America. Although he has fortunately had a comparatively large amount of material for examination, the field is obviously not exhausted, so that much may be hoped from further exploration of even this same region.—J. A. A.

Shufeldt on Ichthyornis, and on the Classification of the Longipennes.
—In a paper entitled "Comparative Osteological Notes on the Extinct Bird Ichthyornis" Dr. Shufeldt reaches the conclusion that this type, while resembling in many points the Gulls and Terns, shared more characters in common with the Skimmers. Much of the paper is, in fact, given up to a discussion of the relationship of the Skimmers (Rhyncho- pidae) to the Laridae, reaching the conclusion that while the Gulls and Terns gradually approach each other, through such forms as Xema, Creagrus, and Gelochelidon, as long since stated by Coues, the Skimmers are sharply separated from either, and are well entitled to the rank of a distinct family, as placed in the A. O. U. Check-List. In a later paper he returns to the subject, and after reviewing various previous classifications of the group, proposes that already adopted in the A. O. U. Check-List as best agreeing with his extended osteological studies of the North American forms.—J. A. A.

The Affinities of Hummingbirds and Swifts.—The pros and cons of the relationship of Hummingbirds and Swifts have recently been presented in various more or less controversial papers on the subject by Dr. Shufeldt and Messrs. Ridgway and Lucas. As is well known, Dr.
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4 Comparative Notes on the Swifts and Hummingbirds. By R. W. Shufeldt. Ibis, Jan., 1893, pp. 84-100.
Shufeldt has for some time contended that while Swifts and Humming-birds have some superficial resemblances, they are in no way closely related, and should constitute two separate suborders, and that the Swifts are in reality only highly modified Swallows. In 'The Ibis' for January, 1893, he has presented his evidence anew and discussed the subject at length. In the following number of 'The Ibis' (July, 1893) Mr. Lucas has presented at moderate length the counter-evidence, taking apparently well-founded exceptions to a number of Dr. Shufeldt's propositions. In this connection Mr. Lucas objects to sweeping generalizations based on the examination and comparison of a limited number of local forms and the assumption that certain questions have been definitely answered when we are really just beginning to gather in the facts that shall make such answer possible."—J. A. A.

Ridgway on New Birds from Mexico and the West Indies.—Mr. Ridgway has recently described two new subspecies of Basileuterus rufifrons from Mexico,\(^1\) namely, \(B. r. jouyi\), from San Luis Potosi, and \(B. r. dugesi\) from Guanajuato, western Mexico. Also a new species of Odontophorus (\(O. consobrinus\)) from Mirador, southern Mexico,\(^2\) allied to \(O. guttatus\). Mr. Ridgway has also described two new Swifts,\(^3\) one, Chaetura lawrencei, from Grenada, West Indies, the other, Cypseloides cherriei, from Costa Rica. The first is allied to \(C. guianaensis\) Hartt, and belongs to the \(C. cinereiventris\) group, to which Mr. Ridgway considers both must be referred as subspecies of \(C. cinereiventris\). The \(Cypseloides cherriei\) finds its nearest relative in \(C. brunnitorques\).—J. A. A.

Stejneger on Japanese Birds.—Dr. Stejneger has recently made two additions\(^4\) to the Japanese avifauna, one being Tringa temminckii (Leisl.), from the neighborhood of Tokyo, the other Acanthophanes ijmae sp. nov., from Seven Islands, Japan, allied to \(A. coronatus\). He has also published a short paper\(^5\) on a specimen of Gray Shrike from Yezo, which he refers to \(Lanius sibiricus\) (Bogd.), and incidentally considers the relationship of \(L. borealis\) and \(L. sibiricus\) to \(L. excubitor\), regarding
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