

*Sitona hispidula*, fourteen alfalfa weevils and 145 other weevils, fourteen ground beetles, thirty-six rove beetles, four click beetles, one Melyrid, three blister beetles, one Silphid, one Lampyrid, seventy-five Scarabaeidae, and one Mordellid; two adult moths and 107 lepidopterous caterpillars; twenty-six adult and four larval Diptera; sixty Hymenoptera of which twenty-three were ants and two Chalcidoidea. Also found were twelve spiders and mites and approximately 479 weed seeds besides three kernels of wheat, doubtless waste from the stubble field.—GEORGE F. KNOWLTON, *Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, Logan, Utah.*

**Red-wings eat pea aphids.**—On April 23, 1942, a male Thick-billed Red-wing (*Agelaius phoeniceus fortis*) was collected in an alfalfa field southeast of St. George, Utah. Microscopic examination of its stomach contents revealed that it contained a great mass of pea aphids (*Macrosiphum pisi*) estimated to exceed 1400 individuals. The pea aphid population in this field was high enough to cause moderate crop injury. A second male red-wing was collected approximately one-half mile away along an alfalfa-field fence line and near to sugar-beets. This stomach contained 85 pea aphids; one of four additional aphids it contained was a green peach aphid (*Myzus persicae*), a species that causes some damage to nearby sugar-beets intended for seed production. Additional insect food in these stomachs included five Hemiptera (one a *Lygus elisus*); five lepidopterous larvae, apparently cut-worms; nine beetles, one of which was a clover-root curculio (*Sitona hispidula*); and three Hymenoptera. The stomachs also contained one spider and eight weed seeds.—GEORGE F. KNOWLTON, *Utah Agricultural Experiment Station, Logan, Utah.*

**A Chuck-will's-widow carrying an egg.**—At Lake Mound, Pinellas County, Florida, on May 17, 1943, a rather unusual circumstance was observed that seems worthy of record. A Chuck-will's-widow (*Antrostomus carolinensis*) was flushed from the edge of a thicket at about 10 A. M. The bird fluttered about in a circle several times close to the ground and appeared to be carrying an object in one of its feet. When it alighted on a low-hanging live-oak branch not more than twenty feet from me, I recognized the object as an egg. I purposely flushed the bird several times to observe the manner in which the egg was carried. While the bird was resting on the tree limb, the egg was held against the breast and close to the wing, being carried in the left foot.

Later in the afternoon of the same day, the bird was again flushed but this time did not carry the egg. I examined the spot from which it had been flushed and found the egg shell completely separated and the young struggling to free itself. I considered it most unusual that such a weak-footed species could carry an egg in this manner. In all probability the shell was extremely porous and fragile just prior to hatching, and the bird had accidentally imbedded its claws into the shell and was unable to release them.—G. N. RYSGAARD, *1st Lt., Signal Corps, U. S. A., Tampa, Florida.*

**Normal and inverted courtship feeding by the Robin.**—The behavior called 'courtship feeding' appears to be rare among Robins (*Turdus migratorius*). In his summary of it, Lack (*Auk*, 57: 176, 1940) reports it "apparently absent in *Turdus*." Howell (*Am. Midl. Nat.*, 28: 567, 1942) did not see it during a study of many Robin nests at Ithaca, N. Y., and (*tom. cit.*: 556) offers only one reference: a McClanahan manuscript telling of its occurrence at a nest near Cheboygan, Michigan. The inversion of this behavior—*i. e.*, the begging of food by the male from the female—appears to be almost unknown in any species; Lack (*tom. cit.*: 170)

records it only in the Button Quail (*Turnix*), the Common Tern (*Sterna hirundo*), and, under artificial conditions, the British Robin (*Erithacus rubecula melophilus*).

At a nest of Robins watched in Baltimore in 1943, I imperfectly saw one apparent instance of normal courtship feeding, and clearly saw one instance of the inversion—the male sought food from the female, and although she had none to give him she made the motion of feeding. These birds differed greatly in coloration, and sex had been determined earlier in the nesting.

**NORMAL.**—On the day (June 20) after the third and last egg was laid, I looked up from jotting a note about the sitting female to find the male perched on the nest rim and the heads of the two birds together. I could not see plainly what was occurring, but felt morally sure that the male was feeding the female. A few seconds later I did plainly see the female pick at the male's bill or chin, and see the male swallow, as if both were disposing of remnants of food. Shortly afterward, the male flew away. This, incidentally, was the only time during about nine hours' dry-weather watching of incubation that I saw the male visit this nest.

It should be noted, however, that the date indicates this nest to have been a second-brood one, for that raises the possibility that instead of being true courtship feeding, the behavior I saw was an example of confusion on the part of a male still feeding first-brood young; cf. my record (Wils. Bull., 55: 78, 1943) of an anachronistic feeding incident early in incubation at a second-brood nest of the Wood Thrush (*Hyllocichla mustelina*) which resembled courtship feeding.

**INVERTED.**—The inverted feeding behavior accompanied an also abnormal instance of egg-covering by the male, during rain. The day (June 29) was the twelfth of steady incubation; the first egg was just about to hatch. The rain was a succession of heavy showers connected by drizzles and mistings. At a time when the fall was light, the female left the nest, but soon after she had gone it turned moderately heavy. Then I discovered the male, partly hidden by foliage, on the nest rim, and as the rain continued he went onto the nest in normal incubating position. Less than a minute later the female returned. The male, still sitting, held up his open bill toward her, and when she made no response he pecked at her closed, empty bill. Thereupon she put her bill inside his and he 'sucked' at it—drew his mandibles down over hers—a number of times. Then, half a minute after she had arrived, he rose and flew away and she went onto the nest—**HERVEY BRACKBILL, Baltimore, Maryland.**

**Purple Grackle kills English Sparrow.**—The captive animals in the National Zoological Park, Washington, D. C., require constant attention, but at times I have an opportunity to observe the unrestricted fauna of the park. While walking in front of our bear dens the other day (June 11, 1943), I was surprised to see a Purple Grackle (*Quiscalus quiscula quiscula*) stalking in almost cat-like manner an English Sparrow (*Passer domesticus domesticus*). The sparrow was not long out of the nest, but was able to fly and take care of itself. A few days later I walked along this same area, and saw the kill. The grackle approached the sparrow and as the smaller bird flew away, the attacker seized its prey in its beak and gave it several hard shakes, with the body of the sparrow hitting the hard concrete pavement. At this moment passersby frightened the grackle away, but later the bird returned to eat the viscera of the sparrow.

In April, near the hunting ground of this grackle, I discovered the nesting site of several of the species. Their bulky but rather compact nests of mud, lined with fine grasses, were about thirty feet up in a group of conifers.