

Sturnella magna neglecta. WESTERN MEADOWLARK.—On May 10, 1894, I secured a female Meadowlark which, though it appeared to be the western form, I at first called *S. magna* (?), knowing the Western Meadowlark had never been taken in the State. Before it was secured the notes and flight suggested the Western, and on examination the coloration answered to the description given by Dr. Hatch in his very valuable work on Minnesota birds. To obtain the correct determination I sent the specimen to Dr. C. Hart Merriam who identified it as *S. m. neglecta*, and adds that it is of special interest as being the first authentic record of its occurrence in Michigan.

Junco hyemalis. SLATE-COLORED JUNCO.—On November 21, 1894, a solitary individual was observed. This I consider a very late date.

Pipilo erythrophthalmus. TOWHEE.—One seen May 16, and one male taken May 20, 1894. Very rare here.

Geothlypis agilis. CONNECTICUT WARBLER.—One fully feathered young female secured Aug. 5, 1894, one very young bird August 10, and on August 12, a fully feathered young male. Over fifty seen on the morning of August 29, at Green's Creek, a few miles south of Palmer. The taking of the fledgling August 10 proves that this species breeds here.

Geothlypis philadelphia. MOURNING WARBLER.—An adult pair in high plumage was seen July 15, 1894; on the 16th a female secured, which undoubtedly had a nest in the near vicinity. On August 5 one young male was taken; last seen August 12, 1894.

Harporhynchus rufus. BROWN THRASHER.—Rare in 1893, but common in 1894.—OSCAR B. WARREN, *Palmer, Marquette Co., Mich.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

"A Demand for English Names."

TO THE EDITORS OF 'THE AUK':—

Dear Sirs,—I have been much interested in an article by Mr. W. T. Hornaday, in the January number of 'The Auk,' entitled 'A Demand for English Names,' and feel called upon to reply to some of the points which he has raised, because I believe myself to belong to a class, or at least to be authorized to speak for a class, in whose interest he assumes to write; *viz.*, the "unscientific public." To the agricultural portion of this public I can fairly claim to belong, being a practical farmer myself, and a member of the 'grange.' For a number of years I have been

engaged in a modest way in the popularization of science, both with the pen and in familiar talks to my 'granger' neighbors, and think I can pretty correctly gauge the intelligence of this class of people, and speak from personal knowledge with regard to the way in which scientific names are received by them. I believe Mr. Hornaday would receive some light on this subject if he should hear, as I have often heard, a group of Iowa farmers discussing the damage done to their fruit trees by the *Tortricidæ*, speaking of each species by its correct scientific name. If he will consult the columns of any modern agricultural paper, and compare it with a copy of the same paper, or any similar one, published fifty years ago, or if he will attend a Farmers' Institute and hear the discussions (by the farmers themselves, not the lecturers) on the correct proportion of *carbonaceous* and *nitrogenous* elements that go to make up a proper feed for stock, or the ratio of *nitrates* and *phosphates* for a certain special fertilizer, he may perhaps discover that scientific terms have few terrors for the modern farmer, at least. What he says about the modern editor I am inclined to think is correct.

Among other things, Mr. Hornaday makes the following remarkable statement: "If I can read signs aright, the gap between our really scientific zoölogists (speaking generally) and the unscientific public is growing wider and wider, day by day." I am glad of the first clause, which is a saving one, for I am convinced that he does not read the signs aright. I am fully persuaded that at no time in the world's history has the gap been so narrow as it is to-day; and it is narrowing all the time. If it were otherwise, it would indeed be a discouraging outlook, when we consider the long and illustrious line of popular scientists, from Agassiz down to those of the present day, who have written and talked to the American people on scientific subjects. If all this not only counts for nothing, but is actually a negative quantity, it is high time the scientists stopped their popular publications, and allowed themselves and the public to resume their former relations, which, according to Mr. Hornaday, must have been closer than the present ones. But, thank Heaven, this is unnecessary. The "Tom Joneses" and "Bill Smiths" who "pay the freight" do not need that any one, on their account, should demand "milk for babes" instead of "meat for strong men." They do not hold themselves on so low a plane of intelligence that they cannot understand ordinary scientific names and terms.

Assuming for the moment that any new discovery in the Animal Kingdom is christened with a vulgar name as well as the scientific one, how is the general public to get at the former any more easily than the latter? In any case the description must accompany the name, and any person who can understand that would have little difficulty with the scientific name. The points of excellence of the last are that it is given by one man, and is immediately published in all parts of the civilized world, and will never be changed (at least recent ones will not), and it applies to one animal, and to one only. Not so with a vulgar name. This

may be given by Tom, Dick or Harry, and is not published beyond a limited district. Now, in spite of the fact that the scientist may have already named an animal, the aforesaid T., D., and H. will exercise their inborn right to name any creature that brings itself conspicuously to their notice, and this is the normal way for an animal to gain a vulgar name—the way by which thousands have already gained them,—some of them more than one—as Mr. Gurdon Trumbull has so well shown. This is to be regretted, but it is not a remedy to have a scientist add still another.

The assumption that a vulgar name is necessarily more simple than the scientific one is wholly fallacious. Let us take as an illustration some of our flowering plants. Here we have such names as Geranium, Fuchsia, Dahlia, and Verbena, which can be placed in contrast with “Butter and Eggs,” “Bouncing Bets,” “Love lies Bleeding,” and a host of other monstrosities. Among practical working farmers, I have heard *Poa pratensis* used as a shorter and better name than “Kentucky Blue-grass.”

There is one other point on which I would like to say a word. I cannot see the propriety of speaking of scientific names as Latin names. It seems to me they are no more Latin than are such words as *conduit*, *aqueduct*, *locomotive*, *benévolent*, and a thousand other common words of the English language. They are supposed to be of the Latin form, in their terminations, at least, but in other parts they often present combinations of letters, the very sight of which would make Cicero turn in his grave.

Right here is one point on which I think I can agree with Mr. Hornaday, and that is in demanding that names shall be made shorter and not contain a lot of letters which cannot be sounded in pronouncing them. It is unfortunate that scientists have been too fond of indulging in *sesquipedalia verba*, which have been the greatest cause of complaint. It seems to me that the difficulty of which Mr. Hornaday complains could be easily obviated by allowing all scientific names to be pronounced exactly as if they were English words, without any regard to the rules of Latin pronunciation, and permitting other nations to follow a similar law.

F. E. L. BEAL.

Washington, D. C.

TO THE EDITORS OF ‘THE AUK’:—

Dear Sirs,—As one of the sinners named by Mr. Hornaday in the January ‘Auk’ I ask for a little space. I am in entire sympathy with Mr. Hornaday in his grievance of the omission of vernacular names of new species, but really should not have been included in his list of culprits, as a reference to my original description would have shown. Reference to the original descriptions in many others of the cases mentioned shows the charge to be well founded, however. The last

paragraph of the Code of Nomenclature of the A. O. U. should be read to the 'shortcomers' so often that to obtain relief they would remedy their omissions.

Canon II of the Code should be amended by striking out the last clause and inserting "and a species shall not be considered named until provided with both a scientific and a vernacular name." This would give us instant relief, as rather than see their names replaced by some others as describer, the real describers would do their duty to save their rightful honors. If it were not for the above clause we could get even with the describers by furnishing the vernacular name ourselves and tacking our name to the vernacular name, and so steal half of the coveted honor.

Yours respectfully,

F. STEPHENS.

Witch Creek, Cal.,

Feb. 1895.

Cold Storage as an Aid to the Bird Collector.

TO THE EDITORS OF 'THE AUK':—

Dear Sirs,—It is possible that some of the readers of 'The Auk' may sometime find themselves in the very unsatisfactory position that I found myself last September, when I returned from a successful day's collecting trip only to confront an emergency requiring prompt attention, which of course meant the loss of the birds.

Hastily saving two or three of the more important ones, the remainder were packed, just as they were brought in from the field, in a box and placed in the freezing room of a local cold storage concern. A week later I visited the place with the intention of taking them out, but upon examination I found them in perfect condition, and there and then decided to make an experiment, and accordingly left the lot for an indefinite period. Every ornithologist and collector appreciates the fact that sometimes an opportunity occurs to secure a fine series of some bird,—an opportunity that may not occur again for many years,—and it is irretrievably lost because pressure of business stands like a wall between him and the time necessary for the proper preservation of the skins. Being confronted with this situation last fall, and after the favorable start made by the first dozen of birds put in, I determined to solve, if possible, the problem; so during the latter part of September and the first part of October I secured a nice series of the birds sought, together with a scattering lot of Sparrows, Woodpeckers, Canada Jays, etc., birds ranging in size from a Brown Creeper to a Flicker, some 98 in all. Carefully replacing the cotton in their throats, each bird was slipped into a cone