for the first time. Both adults were in the hollow with five clean white eggs in a depression of broken pellets. Three of the darkened, cracked eggs from the initial clutch were pushed against the opposite wall. The second clutch contained eight eggs, all of which hatched.

East (Bird Lore, 32:4–7, 1930) observed a Barn Owl that incubated a clutch of infertile eggs three months before starting a new one. The Colorado birds evidently ceased incubating their frozen eggs and within six days began a replacement clutch.

I also observed renesting by Great Horned Owls (*Bubo virginianus*) caused by loss of the male early in incubation. A pair chose a cavity 8 m high in a large cottonwood (*Populus* sp.) located on the lawn of a rural home south of Fort Collins. They seemed relatively indifferent to the frequent human activities near them. On 16 February and subsequently the female sat in the cavity and the male roosted nearby. The male disappeared on 8 March and was not seen again. After four days of incubation following the male's disappearance, the female abandoned the eggs. It is not known if the female fed during this time. (The male supplies food to his mate during incubation, making his presence essential to success at least through that period.) After waiting several days, I examined the four eggs and found them to be fertile. Following 13 days of absence, a pair of owls returned to the nest site. Although the female had no distinguishing marks, she was assumed to be the original by her unconcern for human approach. This male, however, was obviously not the original for he was much more wary of human observers. A second clutch of two eggs was laid in the same cavity and both young fledged.

Renesting, at least in the same nest site, following an interruption of the nesting cycle apparently is unusual in owls. The Barn Owl, however, displays a very adaptable reproductive pattern and this may explain its ability to renest. A number of multiple broods have been reported (Wallace, Michigan Agr. Exp. Sta. Tech. Bull., 208, 1948; Stewart, Auk, 69:227–245, 1952; Morejohn, Auk, 72:298, 1955; Ames, Wilson Bull., 79: 451–452, 1967). Double, overlapping broods were observed in 1967 at this same Colorado nest site (Marti, Colorado Field Ornithol., 3:7–8, 1968). Ames (op. cit.: 452) suggests that this indicates a pair of Barn Owls may retain its breeding capability longer than most large raptors, and this facilitates production of second broods. It would facilitate renesting even more.

The Great Horned Owl seems to be less versatile in its reproduction. In this case, because interruption by loss of the male occurred early in incubation, the female's hormonal control may have had time to recycle, allowing her to find a new mate and start a second time. I know of no reported cases of renesting or of double broods in Great Horned Owls in this type of situation.

I would like to thank Dr. and Mrs. Robert D. Haberstroh for their cooperation in observing the Great Horned Owls noted in this paper.—CARL D. MARTI, *Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado 80521, 20 January 1969.*

Foraging association of Green-barred Flickers and Campo Flickers in Argentina.—Approximately 10 observations were obtained of association in foraging between the more arboreal Green-barred Flicker (*Colaptes* [*Chrysoptilus* auct.] *melanochloros*, including the subspecies *nigroviridis*, *perplexus*, and hybrids between *melanochloros* and the former two races) and the terrestrial Campo Flicker (*Colaptes campestris campestroides*) in Argentina. These observations were made during September to November

1967, and September and October 1968, in the provinces of Formosa, Santa Fé and Corrientes. Both these species are entirely ant-feeding, *melanochloros* (most races) being primarily a tree forager and *campestris* almost exclusively a ground forager. This difference in feeding site is undoubtedly correlated with the widespread sympatry of these species, which approach each other in size. The southern races (regarded by some as comprising a species, *C. melanolaimus*) of *C. melanochloros* are restricted in distribution by the presence of trees, but they are not forest birds. Rather, they occur among scattered trees in open country and along the edges of various types of chaco woodland. Individual southern Green-barred Flickers primarily feed in trees, but they also often fly to the ground to forage.

My observations suggest that the abundance of ants and ant colonies in the areas where I have observed association of *melanochloros* and *campestris* is sufficiently great to render significant the number of observations of such associations. Indeed the figure of 10 given above is minimal because I also occasionally have observed wary individuals of *C. campestris* move from a spot where, on closer approach, I found a foraging individual of *C. melanochloros*; these instances are not included in the 10. I estimate having observed Green-barred Flickers foraging terrestrially about 30 times, in approximately half of which instances they were in association or suspected association with Campo Flickers.

Both flickers feed in the same manner on the ground, probing with their bills and plunging the bill deep into an ant colony in the manner of the North American *Colaptes auratus*. They differ strikingly in locomotion, however, for although Campo Flickers hop when progressing greater distances they walk about a feeding site. On the other hand the Green-barred Flicker progresses exclusively by hopping in the manner of *Colaptes auratus*. There appears to be no difference in food ingested by the two flickers at the mutual foraging sites. Specimens of both species were not obtained together at those sites, but comparison of the stomach contents of terrestrially feeding individuals suggests that both ingest ant eggs, larvae, and adults. Both flickers feed on the same species of ants at the foraging sites where they feed in association, for individuals of both were noted probing, one after another, into the same spot on one ant hill.

Other differences in habits between the two flickers are evident. The Campo Flicker is exceptionally wary and vocal, as well as social; three or even four adult birds may feed together. The Green-barred Flicker is much less vocal, and it seems less wary; at least this species is more often surprised by an approaching observer, and it shows less alarm when approached cautiously. Green-barred Flickers usually were encountered individually, but sometimes they were in pairs. One instance was noted in which four Campo Flickers and a pair of Green-barred Flickers foraged at a single ant hill. When together, interspecific individuals forage in as close proximity (within a foot or even less of each other) as do conspecific individuals.

I suggest that selection has favored this terrestrial foraging association by *Colaptes melanochloros*. This species, more arboreal than is *C. campestris*, probably benefits from association with individuals of the slightly larger, more wary, and certainly more terrestrially adapted Campo Flicker. The selection pressure favoring this association is probably predation selection; individuals of *melanochloros* feeding in the open with Campo Flickers are probably less vulnerable to predators than are individuals feeding alone.

The observations were made while I was engaged in field studies of woodpeckers supported by the National Science Foundation (grant NSF GB-5891), to the authorities of which I am grateful. I also thank my research assistant Mr. John J. Morony, Jr., who made some of these observations and otherwise aided me in the field. The taxonomy

used in this report is that resulting from studies of flickers (see Short, Bull. Amer. Mus. Nat. Hist., 129:307–428, 1965) and is to be used in my forthcoming monograph of the genus *Colaptes*.—LESTER L. SHORT, JR., *American Museum of Natural History, New York 10024, 8 January 1969.*

Red-bellied Woodpecker feeds Tufted Titmouse.—On 24 June, 1968, while watching the activities of a pair of adult Tufted Titmice (*Parus bicolor*) and their 3 recently fledged young in the Oliver's Woods Wildlife Preserve, located ½ mile south of the University of Oklahoma campus, I observed the following encounter between one of the fledglings and an adult Red-bellied Woodpecker (*Centurus carolinus*).

At 20:05, 53 minutes after the young birds had fledged, the family group was perched in a large elm tree 20 yards from the abandoned nest. An adult Red-bellied Woodpecker was foraging nearby and carrying food to a single fledgling of its own species which was perched in a tree adjoining the elm. On one trip back to its fledgling, and carrying what appeared to be a larval insect, the woodpecker landed about 18 inches from one of the fledgling tits. The tit immediately began to beg (wing flutter and call) and ran along the limb toward the woodpecker with his bill opened wide and his head and neck stretched forward. The woodpecker quickly moved backward several steps but the fledgling continued in pursuit, whereupon the woodpecker leaned forward and fed the tit.

The tit family group and the woodpecker were both active in the immediate area for the remainder of the day but no further encounters between the two were observed.—JAMES R. CURRY, *Department of Zoology, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069, 26 September 1968.*

A Carolina Wren shadow-boxing.—On 21 August 1968 a Carolina Wren (*Thryothorus ludovicianus*) came to my window feeding-shelf, and soon seemed to notice its image in the pane. It stared toward that for some seconds, then, still staring, gave three bursts of song. Then it moved closer and after singing several more times gave the glass a number of sharp pecks. It flew away, in six minutes returned, stared again at the pane and gave it one peck, then left for good. On 18 October the same wren, presumably, came again and, before I accidentally frightened it away, sang four phrases while gazing at the pane. A few other times in 1968, between 22 June and 24 December, I saw a Carolina Wren on the feeder but it ignored the window. Likewise, the species has visited this feeder in other years, some color-banded birds over periods as long as three months, without ever being seen to shadow-box.

Possibly these comparatively unusual late-summer and fall instances of the behavior are related to the Carolina Wren's occupation of territory throughout the year (Laskey, Bird-Banding, 19:101, 1948), just as I have a number of August to January dates for the Cardinal (*Richmondena cardinalis*) and Mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*), which maintain year-round or winter territories—although I also have December dates for the House Sparrow (*Passer domesticus*) and Purple Finch (*Carpodacus purpureus*). No literature available to me records this behavior by any species of wren.—HERVEY BRACKBILL, *2620 Poplar Drive, Baltimore, Maryland, 8 January 1969.*

Robin kills snake.—On the afternoon of 20 June 1968, at a distance of about 25 yards, I saw an adult Robin (*Turdus migratorius*) kill a snake. The encounter took place in the bare wheel-track of a farm lane, which had grass in the center and at both