of living. But, one thing may be advanced without any fear of error: it is not a piscatory eagle, which might have been suspected from the nudity of its feet. To deduce the manners and the regimen of a bird from so trivial a character as the greater or less elongation of the feathers on the legs, is it not to expose ourselves to contempt? But, the eagle of which we are now speaking, confines itself to the interior of the country, where the rivers are not very fertile in fish; the species of fish also are not large, and would not require on the part of the bird the application of very powerful arms: and besides, it is a general remark which I have made, that the fish of these rivers, very rarely, indeed hardly ever, shew themselves on the surface of the water, and it cannot be supposed that a bird so large as this could seize them in the water, nor even that the rivers, which are not very large, and which are covered on their sides with lofty and thick trees, could furnish free room enough to enable the bird to fish with any advantage.

1 have found this eagle perched on the top of a very lofty tree, towards the source of the $Orap\hat{u}$, a large river of French Guiana. It was motionless, and uttered no kind of cry. The ball of the musquet having only broken