

might have a fair chance of thwarting a raccoon or other predator. It would seem, however, that if one male were killed at a nest, a replacement would stand a high risk of being killed also.

Power further states that "a truly altruistic bird could be expected to provide care immediately." This seems a bit dubious. Under normal circumstances a sapsucker or other bird goes through a succession of stages in reproductive behavior, each one leading to the next and accompanied by hormonal changes as discussed by Emlen and Power (1976, *Science* 191: 808). A feature of the behavior of the male sapsucker consort was that he went through a series of behavioral changes in a remarkably short time. He perched the nest tree as if looking for a site to excavate, he tapped at the nest entrance, flew in courtship flight when female C came near, all of these being features of the early breeding season, but not of the period of feeding nestlings (Kilham 1962). The consort male reached this final stage after a day of becoming adapted to a new situation. If he spent the night on the nest and defended the young, as is suggested by the fact that his remains lay below the hole in the morning, then his behavior was, it would seem truly altruistic. From the exchange of views given by Emlen and Power (op. cit.) it would seem that the subject of altruism is a complex one, supported by few observations such as the present ones of situations in nature.

Instances of a widowed parent attracting a new mate that participated in either incubation or care of nestlings appear to be rare among hole-nesting birds. The only one I have found is that of Hamilton (1943, *Auk* 60: 91) on a male Eastern Bluebird (*Siala sialis*) that, having lost its first mate to a cat, attracted a new one within 2 days. This new female incubated the eggs (4 out of 6) to hatching. I have encountered 4 instances where one of a pair of sapsuckers lost its mate in the nesting season; the widowed survivor having been a female in 3 cases and a male in one. Lawrence (1967, *A.O.U. Ornithol. Monogr. No. 5*) mentions a widowed male sapsucker who, while feeding its young, was courted by a strange female, but she did not participate in care of the nestlings. My impression of studying sapsuckers for over 20 years in New Hampshire is that there is nearly always a floating population of lone, unattached males and females in the nesting season, due possibly to shortage of suitable nest trees. The male that came to widowed female (FC) and joined in feeding her nestlings may have come from this unattached group.—LAWRENCE KILHAM, *Department of Microbiology, Dartmouth Medical School, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755*. Accepted 6 Jul. 76.

Correction.—In my paper "Pectoral Appendage Myology of the Hawaiian Honeycreepers (Drepanididae)," *Auk* 94: 331–342, 1977, a muscle description is printed incorrectly. The correct form for the muscle following *M. abductor allulae* and preceding *M. abductor digiti majoris* on p. 341 is as follows: *M. adductor alulae* (*M. adductor pollicis*). This is a very small muscle, about 2 mm long and 0.5 mm wide. It arises fleshy from the carpometacarpus at the base of the extensor process and inserts partly on the first digit and partly on a branch of the tendon of *M. extensor digitorum communis* (which see for details) (Fig. 3).

Also, *allulae* will be spelled *alulae* in the final version of the forthcoming *Nomina Anatomica Avium*.—ROBERT J. RAIKOW

Correction.—Those puzzled by the abnormal phoebe nest in Fig. 1, page 367 of April *Auk* (as both my assistant and I were) have only to turn the picture upside down. The original photograph was mis-oriented, and the author failed to catch it in galley.—Ed.