

recommendation to some. If the word is from the Greek or Latin the analogue must be adducible from those languages. Something has already been said upon such cases. To proceed.

Rafinesque is said (96) to have written *Helmitherus*, which is asserted to be inadmissible since it must come from the stem *ἐλμυθ-* from the nom. *ἐλμυς*. Accordingly, *Helmintherus* has been written, with a longing for still further change, to *Helmintheras*. But there is another stem, *ἐλμυ-*, used by Aristotle, which, with the addition of *-therus* from *θήρ*, would give the word of Rafinesque exactly and legitimately. For the form of the second component we have a large number of models, as *λεξιθῆρος*.

Pelagria of Linnæus is objected to (405), and *Pelagica* substituted in its place. The former is as good a form for the feminine of the adjective in Greek as the latter, and occurs in Æschylus.

Before accepting *plagata* for *plagiata* (527) it would be well to weigh the fact that *plagiare* was used in mediæval Latin in the same sense as *plagare*.

In closing, it may not be amiss to offer the suggestion that a rule be established that hereafter whenever an ornithological name may be coined the inventor shall publish, along with the description of the bird, the derivation of the name and the model upon which it has been constructed, somewhat in this form:—

Castanogastris (*κάστανα, γάστρις*, “chestnut-bellied”); model, *ζωνόγαστρις* (Hesychius).

This would serve a four-fold purpose. It would preclude all criticism if properly done, secure more accurate and legitimate words, insure to the inventor the exact form which he has preferred, and save future lexicographers a deal of trouble and vexation of spirit.

ORNITHOPHILOLOGICALITIES.

BY PROFESSOR ELLIOTT COUES.

PROFESSOR Merriam may imagine with what mixed amusement and consternation we find ourselves sent down to the foot of the class for missing our lesson and kept in after school to learn it. Twenty-five years ago, when Latin grammars and Greek dictionaries looked bigger to us than they do now, the Professor's attitude would have seemed to us

quite natural and proper; indeed we should have admired alike his erudition and his authority. But it is otherwise now that we have forgotten all the parts of speech in learning in the school of linguistic experience that the rules of Latin and Greek grammar are the masters of boyish students and the servants of scholarly men. While it is not necessary for us to stand *super grammaticam* to object to the rule of the ferule, yet, were this position required, we should not hesitate to assume it with entire confidence in our ability to maintain it. We have been too long in the green-room of philology to be deeply affected by the glare of the footlights. Thanking our genial critic for this pleasant reminder of our college days, which brings up the scenes of our youth and almost makes us feel young again; assuring him of the perfect good nature with which we take his shingle full of philological holes, we nevertheless beg to amuse ourselves in turn by playing the professor. We own the soft impeachment of "that divine seeking which longs to be right and know why it is right"; we confess a "positive passion" to learn how to express our thoughts in a manner worthy of ourselves, of the discoveries our critic has made, and of the beautiful science of philology which he loves. Wherefore, we beg to dissent in general terms from the tone and tenor of Professor Merriam's remarks, and to disagree with him in sundry particulars.

(a) Professor Merriam's review of the 'Coues Check List of North American Birds,' is a piece of obvious hypercriticism from beginning to end. It is pitched upon a philological E-string instead of the natural A, and then fiddled above the bridge. Every scholar will recognize the skill with which this is done, and we bear witness alike to the care with which Professor Merriam has guarded his points, and the soundness upon which they rest. But it is a canon of criticism, which practised book-reviewers recognize, and which we suspect Professor Merriam has yet to learn, to hold in view always what the author undertook or intended to accomplish, not what the reviewer thinks the author might, could, would, or should have done. For example: We wrote a little book to explain the meanings in English of some 1200 or more foreign words from almost every language under the sun — chiefly Græco-Latin, but also barbarous in every degree of barbarity. We addressed a *clientèle* some percentage of which required to be informed that *caput* and *κεφαλή* mean head, and that the genitive of *caput* is *capitis*, and that *κεφαλή* is *cephale* in Latin letters.* We also tried to patch up or do away with some of the worst atrocities of bird-Latin, as far as the rules of zoölogical nomenclature (which we perceive that Professor Merriam knows nothing about) would permit us to do so, in fact taking liberties in this particular which many zoölogists have already resented. We were furthermore hewing our way where no one had gone before in any systematic manner, with few finger-posts off the common dictionary highway, again and again forced to fall back upon our instincts of philological locality and our linguistic

*In fact, the most serious defect of our 'Lexicon' is, that we did not transliterate the Greek characters.

intuitions, in order to find our way at all. How nice it is, under such circumstances, to hear the rustle of the silken robes of a professorial chair in the following, for instance:—

“A frequently recurring example of what in these days of comparative philology is regarded as vicious teaching consists in declaring that Latin words which are only cognate to the Greek are derived from it, as *-ceps* from *κεφαλή*,” followed by remarks upon Aryan stock, the separation of Italic and Hellenic races, and the comparative antiquity of the Greek and Latin languages.”

Under the circumstances, this is not only hypercriticism, but pure pedantry. We never declared that Latin words which are only cognate with the Greek are derived from it. We made no declarations upon the thesis of cognation as distinguished from direct derivation. If we had been at an essay on that subject we should have perhaps produced one. All we did, or intended to do, was to adduce *-ceps*, *κεφαλή*, *caput*, *cephalic*, *occiput*, etc., as words referring alike to ‘head.’

One more example of this pedantic hypercriticism and we will pass to other matters. Our suave critic remarks with fortitude that “the lack of clear logic, incisive statement, and proper arrangement in the process of derivation confronts one continually” in our little book. He supports this generalization by saying, among other things, that we deduce *galeata* from *galea*, and that from *galeo*, making it appear that we do not know that *galeata* is a participle meaning ‘galeated.’ In point of fact we deduce nothing of the sort; we make no deductions of any sort. Our words are: “Lat. *galeata*, helmeted; *galea*, a helmet; *galeo*, I crown with a helmet”; all of which we submit is perfectly true. For a case of the Professor’s *fortiter in modo, suaviter in re*, let this suffice. To take him on his own ground, however, we beg to state that we do not believe the proper derivative sequence of *galea* and *galeo* to be as he asserts, though we do not propose to discuss whether a verb or a noun is the most primitive part of speech. There are treatises enough on that subject already.

(*b*) Passing to a further point, we beg to instruct our critic in another canon of criticism; which is, to review a book upon its merits as well as upon its demerits. The heart of sound and useful criticism consists not in finding fault, but in correctly adjudging the praise and blame which a book may deserve. It is dangerous for a reviewer to spend a dozen pages of rebuke upon a book for which he has just one line of qualified commendation. Literary men understand this perfectly well; it always makes them suspect the animus of a reviewer—perhaps unjustly. Still the suspicion will enter their minds; there is room to surmise some private grudge, or private purpose; it looks to them like “an attack”; in which case the unpractised reviewer’s blunder deprives his most just and conscientious criticism of its due weight, and defeats his own purpose, whatever that may be. Moreover, the average reader gets an idea, somehow, that there must be something remarkable about a book bad enough to be pursued for a dozen pages with “fateful law unredeemed by clemency.” We say these things with regret, and only to instruct our critic in the art of criticism; for, as

we have said, we regard his review as a perfectly fair, upright and downright piece of pedantic hypercriticism, to which we have no right nor desire to object, if it suits his fancy to indulge in that amusement. We do not even take the liberty of admonishing him that his "positive passion" for expressing himself on the subject of philology is open to the suspicion of being merely a ventilation of very little learning, on very small provocation, on a very untimely occasion. For example, the Professor says of our work:

"The plan is excellent and the great majority of the derivations are correct; but the treatment of some of the most essential points which should form the initial training of the word-constructor and word-expounder is erroneous and misleading; to show this with as much clearness and detail as a limited space will permit is the purpose of this article." But where, in the dozen pages which follow, does Professor Merriam show that the plan is excellent and that the great majority of the derivations are correct? There is not another word about the excellence of the plan or the correctness of the great majority of the derivations. On the contrary, our erroneous and misleading treatment of the essential points which should form the initial training of the word-constructor and word-expounder receives our critic's undivided attention—attention lavished upon authors so long past their "initial training" in the use of language that they remember little of, and care less for, any possible verbal quibbles or grammatical quirks—attention that had much better have been bestowed upon such "small minority" of their derivations as may be found incorrect. For when the professional word-expounders have set their own house in order, and have agreed upon what's what, will be time enough for the rest of us to mind what they say.

To illustrate our meaning, and possibly make it clear to our pains-taking and unnecessary critic: His opening charge upon *aurum* and χρυσός being passed over as mere verballity, which will not hold water for a moment as serious criticism—as just about what one should bounce one's little son with if he got out on his *musa*, *musæ*—we find the Professor formulating our views on the orthography of a certain class of Latin words in this way:

"The terminal vowel of the first component before a consonant should be *i* unless the second component is a participial form; then it should be *o*, because it is the ablative, and we are to say *albocaudatus*," etc.; whereupon follows a neat little disquisition upon connective vowels, to show how foreign to the real genius of the Latin tongue the *o* is; backed up by considerations of the quantity of the termination of the ablative case according to Kühner and the "best German authorities." This sounds formidable; but—bless our philological soul!—we thought everybody knew that before it was thus put in such a masterly manner by our critic, and never thought of evolving any principle in the matter. What we *did* say was, that *atri-*, *albi-*, *magni-* (with the *i*), is undoubtedly a correct form of such compounds, and that we simply put *atro-* in the ablative of instrument conformably with usage in *Picus albolarvatus*, *Tyrannus aurantio-atro-cristatus*; and we find the Professor, with the help of his 'Harpers'

Latin Dictionary,' adducing about thirty cases in support of our position which he attacks so vigorously. We are delighted to find there are so many cases of the kind; we had no idea there were so many in "genuine Latin," though we could show up many hundreds in fair to middling bird-Latin. We are inclined to plume ourselves on our sagacity, though it may be simply "through the influence of Greek literature" upon our minds that "the *o* crept into this small corner of" our work. We will hereafter write *atrocristatus* with entire confidence, and cite our critic, if need be, in support of our views; even though, as he appears to be in dead earnest and very serious about it, it is a good deal of Don Quixote and the wind-mill over again. Let us in our turn say a word to our critic on the general subject of connecting letters in Græco-Latin, for his own information. It is this: that there is no vowel, and possibly no consonant, in the whole alphabet that may not serve that purpose. Once more: if we were not in the best possible humor, we might be inclined to say something sharp on being referred to our Latin grammar to learn that Roby says that one of the "distinctive features of two words being compounded is the possession of but one set of inflections"; and that, as Professor Merriam kindly informs us, "of course at the end of the word, not at the point of junction." We begin to think that our "initial training" was all wrong, after all; for it seems to us we do remember something about our early struggles with *respublica*, *jusjurandum*, *paterfamilias*. Can Professor Merriam be ignorant of the fact that the genitive case of *respublica* is *reipublicæ*; that it is a compound word; that it has two sets of inflections; that one of these is at the point of junction?

Let us try another "summer-day sauntering" with our æstivous critic; if he finds us as amusing as we do him we shall both be amused. Let us saunter on to contractions in general, and contractions of *oou* in particular. The hitch with the Professor appears to be that he misunderstands our use of the word "full form," by which we simply mean all the letters which enter into the composition of a compounded word. Does he suppose us to mean that *leucoourus* can have any existence? We simply say what is perfectly correct, viz., that the composition is *leuco* + *oura*; when in *leocoura*, as often written, we preserve one *o*, and transliterate *ou* by *u*; and in *leucura*, as often written, we glide the other *o*; leaving a remarkably long *u* to do duty for *oou*. So with *megalonyx*; where we instinctively lengthened the penult—though we confess, upon not so good a principle or precedent as the Professor furnishes to support us.

We can note but a few more points, by which we mean to show how light is the real weight of what looks at first blush to be very heavy criticism. Take *Molothrus*. The upshot of that matter is, that Swainson's word "should stand as he gave it," which is exactly how we left it standing. *Spermophila* we said to be contracted from *Spermatophila*; so it is; and the fact that there are in the Lexicon "more than twice as many" similar contractions has no bearing upon the case in any way. Take *thyroides*: respecting which it would be easy to retort upon the Professor. that he would have been right had his first step been correct. Take

Dendræca: we said the "full form" would be *Dendræcetes*; so it would be; and the fact that there are more Greek models for a shorter form does not affect our statement in any way.* But before we leave this subject we must express our surprise that Professor Merriam should as a purist and classicist even by implication assent to such a monstrosity as *Dendræca*, or *Dendræcetes* either, considering how "many classicists now insist that we shall write *Mousaios* instead of *Musæus*."

In orthoepy, we find that the Professor catches us in a number of "false quantities," and we feel the ferule on our knuckles. We gracefully concede the point, and with alacrity add the expression of our amazement that there are not more of these dreadful things to be atoned for—considering that we are habitual sinners in this respect in our conversation, with no hope of repentance; and that it was only by the most resolute buckling down to that point that we got so many of our quantities about right. We are likewise pleased to learn that we may return to *Helmitherus* and *pelasgia* on the authority of Aristotle and Æschylus, and may say *plugata* or *plagiata* as we may prefer. We also heartily endorse Professor Merriam's suggestion, more notably Utopian than novel, that future minters of bird-Latin shall say what they mean in coining names, and so save future authors and their critics a deal of trouble and vexation of spirit. That is not a Quixotic idea; it is a dream of Arcadia. But what would then become of reviewers, should philologists and ornithologists prove *Arcades ambo*?

(c) We have thus written ourselves into such a blessed good humor, that we hardly have the heart to adduce the real gravamen of our rejoinder. We had two reasons for replying to Professor Merriam. But for these we should have let his remarks go for what they may be worth; for we seldom find it necessary now-a-days to take issue with those critics who honor our productions with their distinguished consideration.

Our contention is, that Professor Merriam's article conveys the impression, to all excepting scholars capable of weighing his remarks with ours, that it is a "sockdolager"; that is to say, that it would make those very persons, whom our 'Lexicon' was designed to assist and benefit, believe a pretty nearly worthless work to have been effectually deprived of its pernicious effect by being thus handsomely and conclusively crushed beneath the weight of professorial philological erudition. But in point of fact, nothing of the sort has occurred. Nothing would be easier than for us to tilt, and pretty successfully, against almost every one of the purely philological points which our critic has raised. But where would be the use? The majority of the readers of 'The Auk' would merely dis-

* While we are on words ending in *-æcetes*, let us whisper to our critic that he missed one of the best things that lay in his line. Baird, in 1858, coined three words, which he wrote *Poocætes*, *Pediocætes*, *Nephocætes*. Sclater, in 1859, emended the first of these into *Poæcetes*, and we later followed suit with *Pediæcetes* and *Nephæcetes*, on the idea that οἰκετης was concerned. The fact is, these words were formed, like *Ammocætes*, etc., from κοίτη, *Poocætes* (i.e., *Poocætes*) meaning the bird that makes her bed in the grass, etc.

cover that a war of words was going on, and would be bored to death. Does Professor Merriam flatter himself that the clientèle he seeks in 'The Auk' are interested in his nice points? His article is a good article, entirely out of place. It should have been addressed to philologists, through an appropriate medium. Otherwise, before concluding his observations, he should have explained just what bearing his criticisms have; how far he expected to influence ornithological opinion of the general trustworthiness and value of the treatise; what damage he supposed he had done, and how much of the book, if any, he thought might survive the infliction, etc. In fine, why not have given us his opinion of the book on the whole? If it ought to be damned, why not have said so, in language that any one could have understood? No, Professor, you are quite wrong. We have done our share of reviewing for many years, and have learned to apply to the works of others a touchstone which we leave you to discover the art of using. You will, we trust, perceive that touchstone in the paragraphs which have preceded this one, and in those which are to follow.

Our other reason for replying is, that we are anxious to have the benefit of all the sound criticism we can secure, in view of a third edition of the 'Check List.' We wish to be set right wherever we have gone wrong. The praise that our little piece of pioneering has received from mouths of wise censure no more blinds us to its many defects, nay, great defects, than does such criticism as we have met open our eyes to any of its real merit and usefulness. Our annotated copy stands ready to receive and incorporate every correction of a wrong etymology, of a false quantity, of an inelegance even, which may be pointed out; but it is not open to any results of fiddling above the philological bridge—that being quite out of our line, and entirely foreign to the scope and aim of this particular book. We have for some time intended to review our list of names, and make ourselves a good many needed corrections — partly the result of our own studies, partly the fruit of several just and generous criticisms which our work has elicited. As most of our real blunders appear to have escaped Professor Merriam's observation, we beg to call his attention to the following list of words; and, since he has assumed censorship, we have a right to require him to give us the benefit of his learning; with the assurance that it will be kindly received, respectfully considered, and, if found available, be incorporated in the next edition of the 'Check List,' with proper credit to himself. *

* Should Professor Merriam wish to study bird-Latin further, we can confidently commend to him 'A List of British birds compiled by a committee of the British Ornithologists' Union.' This is what we refer to in following paragraphs as the 'Ibis List,' in which Mr. Henry T. Wharton has done for British Birds what we have attempted to do for American ones. The Index of Gray's 'Hand List' might also furnish him with food for thought, while Sundevall's 'Die Thierarten des Aristoteles,' u. s. w., might be found to contain some valuable reflections.

No. 4. *Iliacus*. Professor Merriam's remarks upon this word are interesting and valuable, especially as they also bear upon No. 141, *trichas*. See also the 'Ibis List,' p. 2. But how does this view bear upon No. 282, *Passerella iliaca*? Merrem, in naming an American Fox Sparrow *iliaca*, certainly could not have intended to call it a Trojan. We said it might be intended to note some resemblance to *Turdus iliacus*, or refer to the conspicuous markings of the flanks (iliac region). Most probably, we may now suppose *iliaca*, as applied to the Fox Sparrow, means simply thrush-like.

No. 33. *Calendula*. We were doubtless right in deriving this word from *calco*, but wrong in saying that it was "apparently coined by Brisson in 1760"; for the 'Zoologist' reviewer says that it was used in botany centuries ago, quoting Gerard's 'Herball,' 1597: "The marigold is called *Calendula*; it is to be seen in flour in the Calends of almost every moneth."

No. 86. *Motacilla*. We must take definite issue, and agree to disagree, with all those who, upon purely etymological grounds, say that *motacilla* does not mean literally wag-tail. The 'Ibis List' states the case thus: "*Motacilla*, as if *motäcūla* from **motax*, from *mōto* = I keep moving. Hence not a compound as has been alleged [by ourselves, for example], of a non-existing word *κἄλλος* = a tail." This makes *motacilla* mean, of course, a little thing that keeps moving; whereas we insist that it means the bird that wags its tail. No matter what it *ought* to mean, to be etymologically proper; it *does* mean wag-tail, '*quod semper caudam movet*, and is synonymous with *κἄλλουρος*, *σεισπορυγίς*, *siurus*, *hochequeue*, etc. The etymologists, we admit, are perfectly right; but we submit that the ornithologists who make or use the set of words ending in *-cilla* do intend it to mean -tail; and we are glad to learn that "some philologists array a Sanscrit cognate" in favor of this view. *Motacilla* is harder to defend than such words as *ruticilla*, *albicilla*, *atricilla*, *bombycilla*, etc., which do mean, and were meant to mean, red-tail, white-tail, black-tail, and silk-tail. We are ready to surrender our technical etymology (which was simply a groping in the dark after what was needed), but we really have a right to ask Professor Merriam, or Mr. Wharton, to explain *bombycilla*, for example, on any other theory than that it means silk-tail.

No. 169. *Myiadestes*. This unhappy word being up for castigation again, after having caused an international controversy in a number of articles, we are proud to find Professor Merriam with us as to its derivation from *μυῖα* and *ἔσσητῆς*, which we believe we were the first to insist upon, when combatting the idea that it should be changed to *Myiadectes*. But we cannot agree with him that the proper form should be *Muiedestes*. We should say *Myiadestes*, as the 'Ibis' reviewer has pointed out. Swainson originally wrote *Myadestes*, but he was as great a sinner as an average Frenchman in compounding words. By the way, will Professor Merriam tell us what should be the nominative plural of *Myiadectes*? For we observe that the "Ibis" reviewer has it *Myiadectæ*.

No. 191. *Pyrrhula*. This we called a diminutive of *Pyrrhus* = *πύρρος*, fiery-red (*πύρ*, fire). So it is, *in form*; but, as Professor Merriam says, the

actual derivation is otherwise. In the 'Ibis List' *Pyrrhula* is given by Mr. Wharton as Latinized direct from $\pi\upsilon\acute{\rho}\rho\text{-}\lambda\iota\lambda\iota\varsigma$, a red bird in Aristotle, from $\pi\upsilon\acute{\rho}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, and perhaps $\omicron\upsilon\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}$, tail, as some texts read $\pi\upsilon\acute{\rho}\rho\omicron\upsilon\acute{\rho}\alpha\varsigma$. On this understanding the word is *Pyrrhi'la*, not *Pyr'rhūla*.

No. 192. *Passer*. We have nothing to detract from what we said of this word, but will insert here what the 'Ibis List' gives: "The original form was probably **sparg-ter* (as *sparsus* = **spargtus*; *rs* then becomes *ss*, cf. *russum* for *rusum*), from the root of $\sigma\pi\omicron\rho\gamma\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ = some bird in Aristophanes (*Av.* 300), and of $\sigma\pi\alpha\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\omega$ = I swell, meaning 'the wanton bird'; akin to our 'sparrow.'" If Professor Merriam agrees to this, it bears out our idea and suggestion, that the bird was named for its salacity, though we did not know enough about the word to prove it.

No. 209. *Hornemanni*. The 'Zoologist' reviewer supplies the full name: Jens Wilken Hornemann, *1770-†1841. He was the author of a 'Haandbog for Fugleelskere.'

No. 227. *Savana*. The London 'Athenæum' reviewer points out that the actual pronunciation of the Spanish *sábana* is undoubtedly with the accent on the first syllable. This we did not know; but we correctly accented *sava'na* as the Latinized form of the word.

No. 326. *Oriole*. "Dr. Coues does not seem very clear about the origin of the name oriole, although it has been traced by Littré directly, along with the French form of the same word, *Lorient*, from the Latin *aureolus*, golden." ('Zoologist' reviewer.)

No. 329. *Parisorum*. The 'Ibis' reviewer catches us here at great fault. We might have known that the bird was dedicated to the brothers Paris, and not to the people of the city of that name.

No. 333. *Quiscalus*. We discussed this word at some length, coming to no satisfactory or final conclusion. The London 'Athenæum' reviewer suggests a probable etymon in inquiring, Is there no Mexican Indian word like *quezal* which could be Latinized into *Quiscalus*? Compare also *quezal* or *quesal*, the native name of the Paradise Trogon.

No. 359. *Perisoreus*. We advanced a purely conjectural derivation of this word, and our guess in this case is wide of the mark. According to Agassiz's 'Nomenclator,' to which the 'Zoologist' reviewer refers us, the word is derived from $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, *accumulo*, I heap up all around. "What the application of the name may be we are not sufficiently acquainted with the bird's habits to disclose, but it clearly has to do with the bird's affinity to the magpie, and the well-known tendency to hoarding which that bird has." But we were after all on the right scent when we noted $\sigma\omicron\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (i. e. $\sigma\omega\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, cf. $\sigma\omega\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$); and did more than "indulge in a little imagination about it."

No. 416. *Atthis*. The 'Zoologist' reviewer very properly administers a rebuke to the lack of gallantry in forgetting, or omitting to state, that *Atthis* is the name of the beautiful maiden who was the beloved of the poetess Sappho.

No. 462. *Bubo*. In connection with our conjectured relations of this word, see the 'Ibis List,' p. 90. Mr. Wharton concurs with us to compare

βύας, βύζα, βύζω, I hoot, etc., from the root of **βοή**, a cry, and cites Byzantium, 'the place of owls.'

No. 491. *Ictinia*. Here is a point on which Professor Merriam might have thrown some light. We gave as probable radication **ἰκτερός**, a disease, in the idea of attacking; *ictus*, a blow, etc. Wharton says (l. c.): Perhaps from the root **ικ**, to strike, as in **ἰξ**, **ἰψ**, a worm, **ἰππη**, a woodpecker, *icere*, to strike, etc.; but then adds, more probably from Skt. *cjena*, a falcon, as if ***l-kjéivos**; cf. **ἰκρίς**, a pole-cat, thief.

No. 494. *Accipiter*. Should not Professor Merriam have helped us to decide which of the alternative derivations we gave should be accepted? Wharton gives **ἄκτιπτερος**, swift-flying, — thus making it formed on the model of, and synonymous with, **ταχυπέτης**, *Tachypetes*.

No. 498. *Hierofalco, Gyrfalcon*. Why could not Professor Merriam have given us the benefit of his sound erudition on this? We advanced what the 'Zoologist' reviewer calls an ingenious idea, very probably true; but it is against Skeat (whose 'Dictionary' we had not seen when we wrote the 'Check List'). The word seems to trouble the etymologers, and no doubt the ornithologists would be glad to have them settle it among themselves.

(To be concluded.)

THIRD ADDENDUM TO THE PRELIMINARY LIST OF BIRDS ASCERTAINED TO OCCUR IN THE ADIRONDACK REGION, NORTHEASTERN NEW YORK.*

BY C. HART MERRIAM, M. D.

206. *Turdus aliciae bicknelli*. BICKNELL'S THRUSH.—In my cabinet is a specimen of this recently described Thrush which I shot in Lewis County, near the western border of the Adirondacks, May 24, 1878. It is a male of the preceding year and its scapulars still show several (four on one side and one on the other) of the light tear-shaped spots so characteristic of immaturity in this group of Thrushes. Following are its measurements:—

No. 1873 (Mus. C. H. M.) ♂ one year old, Lewis County, New York, May 24, 1878. Length, 174 mm. (6.85 in.); extent, 293 mm. (11.53 in.); wing, 92.25 mm. (3.63 in.); tail, 70. mm. (2.75 in.); culmen from feathers, 12.50 mm. (.50 in.); culmen from base, 17 mm. (.66 in.); depth of bill at nostrils, 3.75 mm. (.15 in.); tarsus, 28.50 mm. (1.13 in.).

* For the original list and first and second addenda, see Bull. Nutt. Ornith. Club, Vol. VI, No. 4, Oct. 1881, pp. 225-235; Vol. VII, No. 2, April 1882, p. 128; Vol. VII, No. 4, Oct. 1882, pp. 256-257.