

the writer knows nothing whatever about the bees—would not know one species from another. He happened to be at the head of an expedition which, utterly unknown to him, collected a new species of bee, which was given his name. Why, then, should he be entitled to call it "Henderson's Bee"? Why not call *Motacilla alba*, white's wagtail, to be consistent? Baird is as much honored by speaking of the Baird Sparrow as by using the possessive. If the possessive is to be used, then it should be the name of the man who actually discovered the first recorded specimen, whether he is the one who described it or whose name was given to it, or not.

JUNIUS HENDERSON.

*University of Colorado,
Boulder, Colo.*

A PRIZE BIRD DIARY

Editors of THE CONDOR:

An interesting ornithological study was recently successfully conducted by the children in Alameda, California. The children were invited to daily record during a given period of two months all birds which they actually themselves observed; to give the name of the bird, popular and scientific name when possible; to describe the bird's plumage; to say when, where and what the bird was doing at the time of observation; to state anything they knew of the habits, food or nature of the birds; whether resident or visitor; whether common or rare. The children were divided into two grades. Class A, 14 years of age to 10 years; Class B, all 10 years or under. Drawings of the birds were also asked for and thus a most interesting series of pictures of birds were obtained. Many of these pictures were colored and displayed marked ability on the part of the young artists. The number of birds observed and recorded by an individual student reached in some cases sixty, and forty different species, a record which not only indicated a very persistent search on the part of the student, but also an abundant local avifauna which was a revelation to the ordinary resident who from his limited field of observation concluded that there were no birds outside of a Sparrow and a Blackbird. Much interest was taken by parents and teachers and the experiment proved one of much attractiveness as well as one of considerable educational value. Prizes consisting of ornithological books were given to the most deserving students; the judges who examined the reports and upon whose decisions the prizes were awarded were the President, Vice President and Secretary of the Northern Division of the Cooper Club. The following birds were among those recorded: Western Gull, Cormorant, Pelican, Wild Ducks, Wild Geese, Great Blue Heron,

Night Heron, Rail, Sandpiper, Curlew, Willet, California Quail, Mourning Dove, Sharpshinned Hawk, Red-tailed Hawk, Barn Owl, Burrowing Owl, California Woodpecker, Lewis Woodpecker, Red-shafted Flicker, Allen Hummingbird, Wood Pewee, Western Flycatcher, Blue Jay, Redwinged Blackbird, Meadow Lark, Oriole, Blackbird, Goldfinch, White-crowned Sparrow, Golden-crowned Sparrow, Oregon Junco, English Sparrow, Oregon Towhee, California Towhee, Grosbeak, Louisiana Tanager, Cliff Swallow, Barn Swallow, Cedar Waxwing, Shrike, Warbling Vireo, Lutescent Warbler, Yellow Warbler, Audubon Warbler, American Pipit, California Thrasher, Winter Wren, Parkman Wren, Nuthatch, Titmouse, Bush-Tit, Ruby-crowned Kinglet, Russet-backed Thrush, Dwarf Hermit Thrush, Robin, Varied Thrush, Blue Bird.

FREDERICK W. D'EVELYN

PUBLICATIONS REVIEWED

THE EYES AND EYESIGHT OF BIRDS, WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE APPEARANCE OF THE FUNDUS OCULI, by CASEY A. WOOD, M. D., D. C. L., F. Z. S. (= Reprint from *Ophthalmology*, April, 1907, 24 pages, 2 colored plates, 8 illustrations in text.)

Eyesight and the structure of the eye is a most absorbing and interesting study. Since in birds vision reaches its highest expression, and since there are more wonderful adaptations of eye-structure in this class than in any other, surely a few moments spent in the consideration of bird's eyes will not be wasted.

The visual capacity of birds is very great. Dr. Wood takes the case of the humming-bird, which flies more rapidly than our eyes can possibly follow, and yet alights suddenly upon an almost invisible twig; of the woodcock, which flies rapidly thru dense forests, dodging every branch and twig; of the owl, which sees at night as well as it does in the day-time; and of the kingfisher, which can see in the water as well as in the air.

The author makes many original observations upon the likeness and unlikeness existent between the bird's eye and the human eye, taking up the bird's power of accommodation in some details. In this connection he quotes C. William Beebe, who asserts that a bird can transform his eye from a telescope to a microscope in a fraction of a second. A bird is able to see objects a quarter of a mile away which to us would be invisible, while on the other hand it can pick tiny seeds from the dust which we would need a magnifying glass to distinguish.

Much of the paper is devoted to a consideration of the ocular fundus, or the background of the eye as revealed by the use of the ophthalmoscope. Attention is called to the fact that