

On Sept. 3, at night, some Plovers were heard as they passed over the town. On Sept. 9 a severe storm prevailed, wind east-northeast with heavy rain. On the 10th it was still storming with wind southeast, also raining very hard during the first half of the day, but clearing about noon. No birds were noted, nor did any land, so far as I know. On Sept. 13 and 14 still another very severe storm prevailed at sea. On the morning of the 16th I visited a number of the principal game stalls in Faneuil Hall market, Boston, Mass. In all of them were six Golden Plovers, one of which was a young bird.

No Eskimo Curlews have been received in the market from this coast this season, as far as I can learn, nor have I seen or know of one being authentically noted this season.

A number of *young* blue-legged Jack Curlew (*N. hudsonicus*) landed in Massachusetts during this storm, and a number were taken. I saw about thirty in the market and about a dozen were shot in Nantucket. During the storm high easterly gales prevailed along the southern New England coast on the 13th, the maximum wind velocity being 52 miles at Block Island, 33 miles at Boston, and 26 miles at Nantucket. This storm came from the sea, giving no previous warning. No Plovers or Eskimo Curlews could have been passing at the time, as otherwise they would have been forced to seek land for shelter from the elements.

Personally I have taken but four Golden Plovers this season, two of which were young birds. In addition to these perhaps one dozen more may have been shot on Nantucket and Tuckernuck Islands. On the north shore of Massachusetts, at Ipswich, one of the principal sportsmen there informed me he had seen and taken only one Golden Plover. There was no landing of Plover or Eskimo Curlews in that vicinity this season. He thought he saw four Eskimo Curlews very high up in the air flying on migration.

Some of the large game dealers in Boston, Mass., received *as usual* the past spring and summer, considerable numbers of these birds which had been taken in the Mississippi Valley while on their northern migration to their *breeding grounds*. Among them were large numbers of the Bartramian Sandpipers, which bird is already scarce as a resident on the New England coast. Are we not approaching the beginning of the end? —GEORGE H. MACKAY, *Nantucket, Mass.*

**Validity of the Genus *Lophortyx*.** — It is well-known that in the Gallinæ the number of tail-feathers is a good clue to the genera. Excepting when very numerous — 20 to 32 — they are quite constant in the genera usually recognized, such a case as that of *Coturnix*, in which the rectrices are 10 or 12, being quite unusual. Our Grouse, for example, are well marked in this respect, though some have as many as 20 rectrices, and are not free from some individual variation in the numbers. In the Odontophorinæ, a compact group of *Perdiciidæ*, peculiar to America, the rectrices are invariably 12, except in the recently separated genus *Rhynchortyx*, which

has only 10, and in *Callipepla* proper, which has 14. *Lophortyx* has 12, like all the rest of the genera, excepting the two just named, and in my judgment should never have been united with *Callipepla* by the A. O. U. I propose that we restore it to full generic rank, on the ground of the difference from *Callipepla* in the number of rectrices, together with the remarkable peculiarity of the crest, and also the decided difference in the plumage of opposite sexes, as compared with the great similarity between the sexes of *Callipepla*. *Lophortyx* seems to me to be, in fact, one of the best characterized genera of Odontophorinæ; and *Callipepla* is unique in this subfamily in the number of its rectrices. — ELLIOTT COUES, *Washington, D. C.*

**Notes on the Mexican Ground Dove.** — Desiring to do what I can to free the A. O. U. Check-List of even the slightest blemishes, I may correct two errors which appear under *Columbigallina passerina pallascens*, No. 320a, where “C 374, part” and “C 547, part” appears. The facts are otherwise. I believe I am the only author who has persisted in recognizing this subspecies ever since it was described by Baird in 1859; it is ignored in the A. O. U. List of 1886, and first given a place in the List of 1895. But it has stood unchallenged in the ‘Key’ since 1872; it is “C 374a” of my first Check-List, 1873, and “C 548” of my second Check-List, 1882, with the same separate number in all the eds. of the ‘Key’ since 1884.

No doubt many ornithologists share my regret, that *Chamæpelia* must give way, under our rules, to such a monstrous name as *Columbigallina*; but the peculiar atrocity of *Columbigallina* may not yet have dawned upon all of them. It is traceable back to the “Colombi-Galline” of the mendacious Levaillant, Oiseaux d’Afrique, VI, 1808, p. 98, pl. 278, the same being a fictitious bird of Africa, made up of the skin of a tame pigeon with artificial wattles: see Sund., Kön. Svensk. Vet.-Ak. Handl., 1857, p. 55, and Tent., 1873, p. 98; also, Salvad., Cat. B. Brit. Mus., XXI, 1893, p. 647. This miserable artefact became promptly the *Columba carunculata* of M. Temminck and Mme. Knip, and in due term spawned three bastard genera: *Verrulia* Fleming, 1822; *Creogenys* Gloger, 1842; and *Alectryopelia* Van der Hoeven, 1855. Such is the pity that our innocent little Ground-doves should expiate the original sin by bearing the stigma of such a name; and more’s the pity that it is saddled on the patient ass of ornithological nomenclature. — ELLIOTT COUES, *Washington, D. C.*

**Another Golden Eagle in Connecticut.** — An adult male Golden Eagle (*Aquila chrysaetos*), weighing eight pounds and a half, alar extent seven feet five inches, now in my possession, was taken Jan. 19, at Salem, twelve miles west of this place towards the Connecticut River. It was trapped while feeding on the carcasses of sheep killed by dogs. Its tracks were seen the day before, and foot-prints similar to these were seen last winter