yny is rarely reported in Merlins, (Roberts, in Newton, *op. cit.*), this is the first report of polygyny where the two nests were far enough apart so that they might be occupied by two different pairs (Type C polygyny). This is apparent from the fact that another pair was nesting 400 m from nest B and that two different pairs were nesting about 350 m apart at another location in the city.

Acknowledgments.—I thank L. W. Oliphant for comments on the manuscript and Geoff Peat for field assistance. This note was written while the author held a Univ. of Saskatchewan graduate scholarship.—NAVJOT S. SODHI, *Department of Biology, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 0W0, Canada.* *Received 28 Sept. 1988, accepted 5 Dec. 1988.*

Wilson Bull., 101(3), 1989, p. 507

A possible foraging relationship between Black-billed Magpies and American Kestrels.—While studying the behavior of American Kestrels (*Falco sparverius*) in Washoe County, Nevada, I observed a possible foraging relationship between Black-billed Magpies (*Pica pica*) and kestrels. On 20 occasions, June 1987–January 1988, I observed lone magpies flying from distances of up to 100 m away and perching within 2 m of solitary kestrels. During 15 of these observations, magpies remained at their perch and seemed to observe perched, non-feeding kestrels. During the remaining observations, however, magpies perched for 30–90 sec., then slowly approached feeding kestrels along the kestrels' perch to approximately 30–40 cm before kestrels flew carrying their prey. On two occasions, magpies followed kestrels to subsequent perches and repeated the behavior.

It is possible that magpies which perch near hunting or feeding kestrels utilize food leftover by kestrels. This idea is supported by one observation of a magpie eating food left by a female kestrel. It is well documented that magpies occasionally cooperate to harass larger, less agile raptors and steal their prey (Ryser, Birds Of The Great Basin, Univ. Nevada Press, 1985).

In addition, some researchers have suggested that magpies watch hunting coyotes in anticipation of a kill (Ryser 1985). Similar hunting relationships have been reported between certain raptorial species (Bourne, Ibis 102:136, 1960; Merchant, Raptor Research 16:26–27, 1982). However, this may be the first observation of a corvid systematically seeking a hunting or feeding raptor with the intent of securing food. This strategy may be energetically more efficient than chasing smaller more agile kestrels for the entire prey.

Acknowledgments.—I would like to thank G. Vinyard, S. Jenkins, F. Ryser and an anonymous reviewer for comments on an earlier draft of this note.—RONALD J. SARNO, *Dept. Biology, Univ. Nevada, Reno, Nevada 89557.* (Present address: *Iowa State Univ., Dept. Animal Ecology, 124 Sciences Hall II, Ames, Iowa 50011.*) *Received 25 Aug. 1988, accepted 30 Jan. 1989.*

Wilson Bull., 101(3), 1989, pp. 507–508

Loggerhead Kingbirds feeding on Sesarma crabs.—Kingbirds (Tyrannidae) are known to use a variety of foraging behaviors (see Fitzpatrick, Condor 82:43–57, 1980). They have been observed to capture lizards (Pinchon, Faune des Antilles Francaises: les Oiseaux, Museum d'Historie Naturelle, Fort-de-France, Martinique, 1963; Wunderele, Herpetologica 37:104–108, 1981) and fish (Lefebore and Spahn, Wilson Bull. 99:291–292). Berries are also included in their diet (Fitzpatrick 1980).

We observed a Loggerhead Kingbird (*Tyrannus caudifasciatus*) capture five small (1-cm carapace) crabs, *Sesarma* sp., at 1450 hours on 24 January 1988, on the beach at Casuarina, Great Abaco, Bahamas. The bird was first observed in the branches of a dead Australian pine, *Casuarina* sp., at the beach edge. After we observed the bird for 3–4 min at a distance of 5 m, it flew directly to the ground and captured a crab almost at our feet. The bird returned to its perch, struck the crab against the branch three times and swallowed it within 5 sec. In 6 min the kingbird captured four more crabs, struck them 0–2 times each and swallowed them shortly after returning to the tree.

Lefebore and Spahn (1987) and Wunderle (1981) suggest that island flycatchers and kingbirds may broaden their diet opportunistically by using typical foraging behavior to capture novel prey. The behavior recorded here is similar to that observed by Lefebore and Spahn, in which a kingbird captured small fish.

Acknowledgments.—This observation was supported in part by grant number 667188 from the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program of the City University of New York. We wish to thank two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments and J. Pratt for renting his house to AEB. The Bahamas Government, through its Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries gave AEB permission to conduct scientific research on Abaco.—ALBERT E. BURCHSTED, *Dept. Biology B-204, College of Staten Island, 715 Ocean Terrace, Staten Island, NY 10301;* AND GRACE CHAMBERS, *23 Beechill Park Ave, Belfast BT8 4PR, Northern Ireland, UK.* *Received 13 Sept. 1988, accepted 29 Jan. 1989.*

Wilson Bull., 101(3), 1989, pp. 508–509

Common Moorhen parasitizes a Boat-tailed Grackle nest.—On 18 April 1988 in a cattail (*Typha angustifolia*) marsh at Magnolia Gardens, Charleston County, South Carolina, Post found a Boat-tailed Grackle (*Quiscalus major*) nest that contained one grackle egg and one Common Moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*) egg. He removed the moorhen egg to confirm its identity and to obtain measurements. The moorhen egg was not returned until 20 April, at which time the nest contained three grackle eggs. The first grackle young hatched on 30 April, and the second on 3 May. The third hatched, but died when it was less than one-day-old. Two nest checks made before the grackles hatched showed that the moorhen egg remained in the bottom of the nest under the grackle eggs. On 13 May, Seals checked the nest and saw a downy young moorhen sitting on the rim of the nest. As she approached, the bird jumped down onto some prostrate cattails below the nest. It then jumped into the water, and swam away. There were no moorhen eggshells in the grackle nest. At this time the two grackle young were well grown (10 and 13 days old). If we assume that the moorhen hatched on 13 May, then the interval between hatching and the day it was returned to the nest is 22 days, which is within the known incubation period of the Common Moorhen (19–22 days; Ripley, Rails of the World, David R. Godine, Boston, 1977).

In addition to accepting this extremely large egg (weight: 26.8 g, vs Boat-tailed Grackle egg weight of 7.7 g; Bancroft, Auk 102:43–48, 1985), it appears that the female grackle incubated and turned it even after her own young had hatched and were well-grown. Boat-tailed Grackles in this population do not brood their young for extended periods after they are seven days old, therefore it is surprising that the moorhen egg received enough heat to hatch. Common Moorhens have been reported using old nests of other species (Ripley, op. cit.), and in some populations intraspecific brood parasitism has been reported (Petrie, *in* Ecological Aspects of Social Evolution, D. I. Rubenstein and R. W. Wrangham, eds., Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1986). In this study area they sometimes build their nests on