

lish inches in length, similar to that of the curlew, &c. In a word, its description agrees entirely with ours.

Caylus, in his *Collection of Antiquities*, vol. vi. pl. xl. fig. 1., gives a representation of the mummy of an ibis, the height of which, with its bandages, is only one foot seven inches four lines, although he says expressly that the bird was placed upon its feet with the head straight out, and that it had no part inflected in its embalment.

Hasselquist, who took a small white and black heron for the ibis, gives, as his principal reason, that the size of this bird, which is that of a crow, corresponds very well with that of the mummies of the ibis *. How, then, could Linnæus have given the name of ibis to a bird as large as a stork? How, especially, could he have considered this bird to be the same as the *Ardea ibis* of Hasselquist, which, besides its smallness, had the beak straight? And how has this latter error of synonymy been preserved to this very day in the *Systema Naturæ*?

A short time after this examination, which was made in the presence of M. Fourcroy, M. Olivier

* Hasselquist, *Iter Palestinum*, p. 249. *Magnitudo gallinæ, seu cornicis*; and, p. 250., *vasa quæ in sepulchris inveniuntur, cum avibus conditis, hujus sunt magnitudinis.*