


ering of the bill persists at the base in the form of a triangle, the apex extending .31 inch along the culmen; this portion thus showing much the shape of a normal maxilla. On the rest this outer layer has disappeared, doubtless from effort of the bird to scoop up food. Mr. Verrill said he saw it attempt to pick up pieces of cracker in this manner.

Of the mandible only a fragment .28 inch long (measured from the commissural angle) at the base of the left ramus is present, the rest having



been lost through some accident. The wound had healed, leaving the tongue exposed. Most of the feathers on the upper throat and malar region have been worn away, and the plumage in general was dirty, ruffled and matted, as the bird was of course unable to preen. The body was emaciated, but there was a little subcutaneous fat, and a partial molt was in progress. The stomach contained a little white sand, and a soft, whitish substance, probably cracker.

That this bird in its crippled condition after the loss of the mandible succeeded in living the time necessary for the great overgrowth of the maxilla seems to me very remarkable. Mr. W. H. Hoyt of Stamford has shown me a mounted Parrot (*Amazona leucocephala*) in which the mandible had grown over the maxilla and extends for more than one third of an inch upwards, but this bird lived in captivity. — LOUIS B. BISHOP, M. D., *New Haven, Conn.*

The Loggerhead Shrike in New Brunswick.—On different occasions broods of young shrikes have been seen near here, and the writer always supposed they were the Northern Shrike (*Lanius borealis*), as that was the only species of shrike in Chamberlain's list of New Brunswick Birds. But two years ago on writing to Mr. F. M. Chapman of their occurrence, he suggested that they were *Lanius ludovicianus*. Since that date no young have been observed, but during the past summer, at two different times, shrikes were seen that, I was most certain, were the Loggerhead,

but having no gun I was unable to obtain a specimen for close inspection. On the 15th of January while calling on a taxidermist friend, I saw what was without a doubt a Loggerhead Shrike, that had been taken near here, yet he did not know it to be anything uncommon, as he is very poorly informed in ornithology. This is probably a new addition to the birds of New Brunswick, and for which a keen lookout will be kept in future —
WM. H. MOORE, *Scotch Lake, York Co., N. B.*

The Scientific Name of the Southern Yellow-throat. — Mr. Chapman's disagreement (Auk, Oct., 1900, p. 389) with my acceptance of *Geothlypis trichas roscoe* (Aud.), brings up an interesting nomenclatural question well worth discussing. I have never seen *trichas* in a cypress tree, but I have seen *roscoe* often. This is not of course evidence that Audubon shot a *roscoe* but neither is Mr. Chapman's idea that the bird was a *trichas* because it was high up in a cypress and the time September. It should be remembered that Audubon knew little about subspecies and nothing about their values, and therefore his action in reversing a former view is not surprising. Also, previous to the publication of Dr. Hasbrouck's paper, and Mr. Brewster's name for the western bird, all were considered as *trichas*. My conclusion on the subject was based on ideas not thought necessary to discuss in a long paper but I will do so now that the issue has been raised.

Hasbrouck definitely and rightly separated the southern bird and would have given a new name but for the existence of the name *Sylvia roscoe*. It seemed reasonable from the evidence before him that Audubon's bird under the circumstances was the southern form. Chapman brought forward no additional evidence concerning the distribution of these birds and has not disproved the early view of Audubon, or Hasbrouck's action. The known eastern distribution of these birds for hundreds of miles beyond the limits set for it by Chapman, and the existence of Gulf specimens referable to the same form, renders Hasbrouck's acceptance of Audubon's name logical and reasonable. It should be, scientifically speaking, necessary that positive evidence should be acquired before upsetting a name so well established as Hasbrouck's, yet Mr. Chapman furnished none in his paper and none since.

There is no taint on Hasbrouck's name; it is not a homonym, nor is there a particle of evidence to prove or even tending to show, that it is a synonym of *G. trichas trichas*. It is really necessary to dispose logically of the older name by *evidence*, not opinion. I consider that there are three things which should prevent acceptance of Mr. Chapman's name, and that the burden of proof rests with Mr. Chapman, not with the other side. It is necessary to prove that *Sylvia roscoe* is a synonym of *G. trichas trichas*. It is necessary to prove that the southern bird does not exist in the cypress swamps of Mississippi. It is necessary to show that another form occurs in that State that in all probability is Audubon's bird. Until