TABLE

HEARING RANGES FOR SEVERAL SPECIES OF BIRDS (SUPPLEMENT TO TABLE 1, SCHWARTZKOPFF (1955b[1]))

Species	*Lower limit cs./sec.*	*Highest sensitivity cs./sec.*	*Upper limit cs./sec.*	*Method*	*Author*
Aythya valisineria	190	—	5,200	D	Edwards, 1943
Phasianus colchicus	250	—	10,500	D	Stewart, 1955
Columba livia	200	—	7,500	D	Brand and Kellogg, 1939a
	<300	1,000–4,000	—	C	Heise, 1953
Bubo virginianus	300	—	8,000	D	Edwards, 1943
Otocoris alpestris	350	—	7,600	D	Edwards, 1943
Sturnus vulgaris[2]	700	—	15,000	D	Brand and Kellogg, 1939a
	—	2,000	—	D	Trainer, 1946
Passer domesticus	675	—	11,500	D	Brand and Kellogg, 1939a
Serinus canarius	1,100	—	10,000	D	Brand and Kellogg, 1939b
Plectrophenax nivalis	400	—	7,200	D	Edwards, 1943

D = conditioning. C = cochlear potentials.

[1] In Table 1, Schwartzkopff (1955b), which is based on Tabelle 2 of Schwartzkopff's (1955a) German review, there is an error: the four cases in the column headed, Upper Limit, in which the symbol, < (less than), is used should have this symbol reversed to > (greater than).

[2] In Table 1, Schwartzkopff (1955b) the *Sturnus vulgaris* data were erroneously attributed to Granit (1941), who did not study this species.

LITERATURE CITED

BRAND, A. R. AND P. P. KELLOGG. 1939a. Auditory responses of starlings, English Sparrows and domestic pigeons. Wilson Bull., **51:** 38–41.

BRAND, A. R. AND P. P. KELLOGG. 1939b. The range of hearing of canaries. Science, **90:** 354.

EDWARDS, E. P. 1943. Hearing ranges of four species of birds. Auk, **60:** 239–241.

HEISE, G. A. 1953. Auditory thresholds in the pigeon. Amer. J. Psychol., **66:** 1–19.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, J. 1955a. Schallsinnesorgane, ihre Funktion und biologische Bedeutung bei Vögeln. Acta XI Congr. Int. Orn. Basel, **1954:** 189–208.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, J. 1955b. On the hearing of birds. Auk, **72:** 340–347.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, J. 1956. Über die derzeitigen Kenntnisse vom Gehör der Vögel. Forsch. und Fortschr., **30:** 262–268.

STEWART, P. A. 1955. An audibility curve for two ring-necked pheasants. Ohio J. Sci., **55:** 122–125.

TRAINER, J. R. 1946. The auditory acuity of certain birds. Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell Univ.

HUBERT FRINGS AND BETTY SLOCUM, *Department of Zoology and Entomology, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Penna.*

Hummingbird Feeding Preferences.—The pioneer research of Dr. Curt P. Richter of Johns Hopkins has shown that when experimental animals are offered a free choice of the elements of a diet they choose in accordance with their physiological needs and that when the needs are changed (as by an artificially produced diabetes, for example) the choices change, and that taste is the guide. In other words, what tastes best is actually best. With this in mind an experiment was set up to test the preferences of hummingbirds for the following sugars: sucrose, or common beet sugar; dextrose, or glucose; levulose, or fruit sugar; galactose, or milk sugar; maltose, or malt sugar; and saccharin, the substitute for sugar. These were made up into syrups using equal parts (by volume) of sugar and water, with the saccharin solution having a sweetness estimated to be equal to that of the sucrose solution. The experiment was made on August 15–29, 1957 at the Cherokee Ranch near Sedalia, Colorado, where a hummingbird feeding station has been maintained for a number of years.

The birds were adult and juvenile Broad-tailed Hummingbirds (*Selasphorus platycercus*) and the estimated number of individuals involved was 20–25. The feeding bottles used were half-ounce vials with a one-tenth inch hole drilled in the cap, which excluded any feeders, insect or avian, except hummingbirds. Six bottles were hung in a row on a standard at each of three stations about 100 yards apart. For several days, until the birds were accustomed to the set-up, the regular 50–50 sucrose syrup was placed in all bottles. Then in succession each of the sweeteners listed above was tested against sucrose on each stand—three bottles of sucrose alternating with three of the test syrup. Output was measured each morning, bottles refilled and the order changed. Each test syrup was used for two days. Finally all six kinds of syrup were offered together for two days. Without going into details the result in round numbers on a scale of 10 was as follows: sucrose 10; dextrose 8; levulose 5; galactose 1; maltose 0; saccharin 0. Previous experiments had indicated that a 50–50 sucrose syrup was preferred to weaker mixtures and to various solutions involving honey and orange juice. This experiment tends to confirm the conclusion that this syrup is the most desirable for hummingbird feeding.—WALKER VAN RIPER *Denver Museum of Natural History.*

The Spelling of *Notharchus macrorhynchos hyperrhynchus* (Sclater).—Peters' "Check-List of Birds of the World" is so remarkably free of errors in the spelling of names that ornithologists tend to follow it uncritically. To prevent further perpetuation of an error in the name of a neotropical puffbird listed as "*Notharchus macrorhynchos hyperrynchus* (Sclater)" (*op. cit.*, **6**: 10, 1948), attention is called to the fact that the spelling of the subspecific name should be "*hyperrhynchus*". The omission of the middle "h" must have been a typographical error or pen-slip, for Peters cites as the original source of the name, using the correct spelling, "*Bucco hyperrhynchus* Sclater, Proc. Zool. Soc. London, pt. 23, 1855 (1856), p. 193, pl. 105". Until Peters' book Sclater's spelling was consistently used in the literature (see Cory, Field Mus. Nat. Hist., Zool Ser., 13, pt. 2, no. 2: 391, 1919).—EUGENE EISENMANN, *American Museum of Natural History, New York, N. Y.*

A Yellow Mutant of the Evening Grosbeak.—On Oct. 29, 1957, in my yard at Canaan, Conn., there appeared among a flock of Evening Grosbeaks (*Hesperiphona vespertina*) that we were feeding, a single individual that was mainly so bright yellow in coloring that it stood out from the other birds very strikingly. My wife and I watched it from a distance of about ten feet, and I studied the details of its coloring with a 7x binocular.

The head, neck, back and entire underparts were a brilliant, clear yellow. Except for a few black speckles on the crown, there was nothing of the dark colors on the head and body that normal individuals show. The wings and tail were the normal black and white of a male Evening Grosbeak, though it seemed to me that the white patch in the wings was somewhat larger than in the other male birds near it. Except for the larger size and heavier bill, the bird suggested a summer male American Goldfinch (*Spinus tristis*).—ARETAS A. SAUNDERS, *Box* 141, *Canaan, Conn.*

Unilateral Microphthalmia in *Quiscalus quiscula* and Synophthalmia in *Mimus polyglottos*.—In the course of artificially incubating more than two thousand eggs of more than one hundred native bird species over a period of six years only two teratological specimens have come to my attention. On May 25, 1955 there hatched in my incubator a Common Grackle (*Quiscalus quiscula*) with apparently no right eye and with the upper bill crossing the normal lower one toward the right.