

WILBUR WRIGHT (biplane).

8 Aug., 1908	...	Hunaudières...	...	0 1 45	—
11 "	"	"	...	0 3 43	—
12 "	"	"	...	0 6 56	—
13 "	"	"	...	0 8 13 ³ / ₅	—
3 Sept., 1908	...	Auvours	...	0 10 40	—
5 "	"	"	...	0 19 48 ² / ₅	—
10 "	"	"	...	0 21 43 ² / ₅	—
16 "	"	"	...	0 39 18 ² / ₅	—
"	"	"	...	0 2 20 †	—
21 "	"	"	...	1 31 25 ⁴ / ₅	—
25 "	"	"	...	0 9 1 ³ / ₅	—
28 "	"	"	...	0 11 35 †	—
3 Oct., 1908	...	"	...	0 55 37 ² / ₅ †	—
6 "	"	"	...	1 4 26 ¹ / ₅ †	—
10 "	"	"	...	1 9 45 ² / ₅ †	—
18 Dec., 1908	...	Le Mans	...	1 54 22 ³ / ₅	—

FERBER (biplane).

12 Aug., 1908	...	Issy	...	—	First flight.
19 "	"	"	...	—	256 metres.
"	"	"	...	—	500 "

ORVILLE WRIGHT (biplane).

9 Sept., 1908	...	Fort Meyer (U.S.A.)	o 6 of	—
"	"	"	1 2 30	—
10 "	"	"	1 5 57	—
11 "	"	"	1 10 50	—
12 "	"	"	1 15 20	82 kiloms.
"	"	"	0 9 6†	—

DE CATERS (triplane).

26 Oct., 1908	...	Brussels	...	—	800 metres.
---------------	-----	----------	-----	---	-------------

ZIPFEL (biplane).

24 Nov., 1908	...	—	—	—	200 metres.
1 Dec., 1908	...	—	—	—	1,000 "
9 "	"	—	—	—	1,500 "

* First attempt at turning.
 † With passenger.
 ‡ Flight across country.
 m. = metres.
 kms. = kilometres.

CORRESPONDENCE.

* * The name and address of the writer (not necessarily for publication) MUST in all cases accompany letters intended for insertion, or containing queries.

THE following correspondence was addressed to the Editor of *The Automotor Journal* this week, but as the matters contained therein are of peculiar interest to the readers of FLIGHT, we need make no apology for reproducing them by way of inaugurating our correspondence columns. We hope to make our correspondence columns a regular and interesting feature of FLIGHT, and we would again remind our readers not to hesitate in sending us communications regarding the many questions which must come under discussion during the early days of the industry.—ED.

WHAT IS AN AERODROME?

SIR,—I regret to see that the misuse of the word "aerodrome" is receiving your support in your columns.

This word was invented by Langley and applied by him as meaning a flying machine of the "aeroplane" type; it is in this signification quite regular in its definition, and at the present time constitutes a part of the English language (see recent editions of Webster's and other dictionaries).

I suppose because a hippodrome is a big open space for horses, you think that an aerodrome should be a big open space for flying machines (or rather, I should say for *air*), but as this is not the signification, the idea is not well founded.

You will find in a footnote to the preface of my "Aerodynamics" the remark:—The word aerodrome has been grossly misapplied by Continental writers to denote a balloon shed; shall I have to add "and by home writers to denote a ground or space for exhibition flights."

I do not know whether you wish to be taken for the kind of man who says a thing is "chronic" simply because it is very bad, but this should not be the ambition of a leading motor paper.

Excuse my bluntness, but do not let us have a dozen meanings to one word, one meaning is enough if that is the right one.

Yours faithfully,
 F. W. LANCHESTER.

[Mr. F. W. Lanchester is quite right in saying that we have used the term "aerodrome," editorially, to signify a piece of land set apart for the trial of flying machines, or for the holding of races with flying machines, as the case may be. We consider, moreover, that such use of the term is fully justified by analogy with "hippodrome," which Webster gives as being derived from the Greek ἵππος = horse, and δρόμος = course; i.e., a place set apart for equestrian and chariot races; a circus. While the root derivation of the expression "drome" is δραμεῖν = to run, and as such might perhaps have been better suited to form an adjective qualifying the noun with which it is compounded—as Mr. F. W. Lanchester suggests it should do in the case of "aero-drome"—custom has, it will be seen, already established a prior claim in the other direction which we have indicated. With all respect, therefore, both to Professor Langley and to Mr. Lanchester, we think that it is more in the natural course of things to let the word "aerodrome" denote a "flight-

ground," than it is to change the accepted meaning of "hippodrome," and of "motodrome" to "horse-drawn vehicle" and to "motor car," respectively.—ED.]

SIR,—As a humble student of aeronautical science, I should feel much obliged if you will explain the meaning of the term "aerodrome" as used in your issue of the 19th inst.

The definition of this word given in one of your contemporaries is as follows:—

"Aerodrome (an air runner), firstly used by Professor Langley, is the most suitable and comprehensive word used to denote a flying machine of any kind. It should never be used in the meaning of a balloon shed."

On page 1666 of the issue in question, you use it in the sense of a flying machine. "The most successful types of flying machines or aerodromes at present in existence, &c., &c.," whilst on page 1662, under the headings respectively of the Juvisy and Lannemazan aerodrome, you refer to it as a sort of "space" or ground for the purpose of practising aerodromics. Now I submit that the word aerodrome cannot stand both for a flying machine and an open piece of ground, and in the interests of aeronautical terminology I should be glad if you will explain how this term can be used to convey two such different meanings. Enclosing my card,

I remain, Sir, IGNORAMUS.

[The answer to "Ignoramus" will, for the most part, be found in our note which follows Mr. Lanchester's letter on the same subject. Otherwise it is only necessary to explain that the paragraphs referred to on page 1662 were editorial, whereas the article referred to on page 1666 of *The Automotor Journal* was written by Mr. Lanchester.—ED.]

PROGRESS IN FLIGHT.

SIR,—It is with great pleasure that I read the article in last week's issue by Mr. F. W. Lanchester, on the merits of the two machines made by the Voisin Frères and Wilbur Wright.

I think it is a pity that the fact that the Voisin machine was invented, built, and made to fly by Voisin is not more prominently stated in other journals, as it is popularly supposed that credit attached to Farman, whereas all the credit should be given to the Brothers Voisin.

Owing to a quarrel the Voisins had with the French press, the papers abroad make a point of avoiding their name as much as possible; but in England, where, happily, the news department of a paper is not directly affected by advertisements, there is no reason why justice should not be done to the two brothers who have done so much for France in aeronautical matters.

I write this to your paper, Sir, because I believe the time has come when you should slightly alter the name of your paper to include aeronautics.

THE AUTOMOTOR JOURNAL has been always the paper which has shown most sympathy with the movement, and when at last our sleepy countrymen are awakening to the fact that the aeroplane has come to stay, and in future must be reckoned with as a factor in modern civilisation, the time is at hand when your paper should take advantage of the work it has done in the past and reap the reward.

When motor cars were in an empiric stage they were interesting to many people, but now motor cars and their construction must be put aside under the head of engineering, and left to develop as any other industry.