Dissection of the body later, showed no apparent cause of death save that there was little food in the stomach, a condition that could not be considered abnormal early in the morning. But the stomach contained no small pebbles or grit, such as are generally present in the stomachs of seed-eating birds. There had been snow on the ground for several days, so that possibly the bird could not get such material, and this might have been the cause of death. The body was not in the least emaciated, however, so that if this lack caused death, it was rather by something akin to acute indigestion than by starvation. The previous night had not been unusually cold, and weather conditions up to that time were normal.

That afternoon I picked up a dead Song Sparrow (Melospiza melodia melodia) that had possibly met its death in the same manner. The number of birds that are found dead is larger than most of us realize. Last spring twenty-four birds were brought to me by pupils of the Bridgeport High School. The West Haven High School has a very good collection of mounted birds, nearly all birds that were found dead and brought in by pupils. Most of such birds that I have examined have shown no sign of injury. Probably many birds die in this sudden manner, but the chances of an observer actually witnessing such a death must be very slight.— Aretas A. Saunders, Norwalk, Conn.

Birds and Mulberries.— Though it is well known that mulberries are very attractive to many species of birds, an instance of this attractiveness that seems worthy of record has recently been observed by the writer.

On the farm of Mr. J. B. Golsan, near Prattville, Ala., is a small orchard of nine "Everbearing" mulberry trees situated only a few rods from the barnyard in a corner of the pasture, and surrounded on three sides by woods and thickets. On April 29, 1918, these trees, covered with ripening fruit, were kept under close observation from 3:15 until 5:15 P. M., and though the day had been mostly cloudy, with some rain - by no means ideal for birds — twenty-two species were recorded in the orchard in that short time. Next day (April 30) three additional species (Towhee, Chat, and Carolina Wren) were recorded by the writer and one (Hairy Woodpecker) by Mr. Lewis S. Golsan. No attempt was made to count the host of individuals which was constantly passing between the mulberry trees and the surrounding woods. The list of species follows, the asterisk denoting that individuals of the species so indicated were seen to actually swallow mulberries (a six-power binocular was used): Dryobates v. auduboni, * Dryobates p. pubescens, *Melanerpes erythrocephalus, *Centurus carolinus, Archilochus colubris, *Tyrannus tyrannus, *Myiarchus crinitus, *Cyanocitta c. florincola, *Icterus spurius, *Icterus galbula, Passer d. hostilis, *Zonotrichia albicollis, *Pipilo e. canaster, *Cardinalis c. cardinalis, Zamelodia ludoviciana, *Passerina cyanea, *Piranga erythromelas, *Piranga r. rubra, * Vireosylva olivacea, *Icteria v. virens, Mimus p. polyglottos, *Dumetella carolinensis, *Toxostoma rufum, Thryothorus l. ludovicianus, *Hylocichla mustelina, and Hylocichla f. fuscescens.

In almost every instance the Orchard Orioles would pluck a whole berry and then hold it under one foot and eat it piecemeal. Indigo Buntings seemed very partial to a white variety of berry and paid little attention to the others. It is perhaps worthy of note that at the time these observations were made dewberries were ripening in great profusion along almost every hedgerow.— Ernest G. Holt, Biological Survey, Washington, D. C.

An American Edition of Audubon's 'Ornithological Biography.'—In a recent bibliographical memoir of Audubon's work,¹ Doctor Stone included the American (Philadelphia, 1831) edition of volume one of the 'Ornithological Biography,' also mentioning that there was said to be another American edition of the same volume, dated 1832, and referring in a foot-note to Loomis' description² of a copy of this edition. Loomis states that this edition, which bore the imprint Judah Dobson, Agent, and H. H. Porter, is "wholly distinct so far as typographical features are concerned" from the Edinburgh edition and mentions, casually, the existence of an edition of the same year (1832) with the imprint of E. L. Carey and A. Hart, Philadelphia, which, apparently he had not seen, or had not at hand, as his statement that it is "the Edinburgh edition with the Philadelphia title-page" is misleading.

A copy of the E. L. Carey and A. Hart, 1832, Philadelphia edition is now before me. Like Loomis' copy it is wholly distinct typographically from the Edinburgh edition, but typographically similar to the Dobson and Porter, Philadelphia, 1831, edition, except the imprint of the title. A comparison of these two American editions of volume one, at hand, with the Edinburgh edition of volume one, seems to show that the first two were printed from the same setting of type, corresponding line for line throughout, all peculiarities of any given letter or alignment being the same. In this respect they differ from the Edinburgh edition, the minor differences in the spacing of letters or words alone making it clearly evident, where gross differences are wanting, that the work is of another setting of type.

So far as I am aware, the imprints on these two American editions of volume one have not been given. That of the Dobson and Porter, 1831, edition is as follows:—Philadelphia: (which is in black-letter)| Judah Dobson, Agent, 108 Chestnut Street; | and | H. H. Porter, Literary Rooms, 121 Chestnut Street. | MDCCCXXXI.

The imprint on the title of the Carey and Hart, 1832, edition is as follows: — Philadelphia: (which is in black-letter) | E. L. Carey and A. Hart — Chesnut Street. | MDCCCXXXII. In this edition Chestnut Street is incorrectly spelled, as given.

¹ Witmer Stone. A Bibliography and Nomenclator of the Ornithological Works of John James Audubon. 'The Auk,' XXIII, 1906, pp. 298–312.

² Leverett M. Loomis. A Forgotten Volume. 'The Auk,' VIII, 1891, p. 230.