anus. There were talon wounds on the animal's back in the region of the kidneys, but no injuries were observed in the vicinity of the head and neck.

In the second instance, a full-grown Bushbuck ram emerged from thick cover on the opposite side of the valley and walked into an open field. Suddenly it gave its alarm bark and turned and ran into the surrounding bush, barely escaping a Crowned Eagle which dived at it, closely followed by a second eagle.

Thirdly, a party of Vervet Monkeys *Cercopithecus aethiops* in the bush on the opposite side of the valley were heard giving their alarm "coughs", without any cause for their alarm being immediately apparent. A Crowned Eagle was then seen to leave its perch on a tree high on the near side of the valley and dive across the valley towards the trees from which the alarm calls of the monkeys were coming. The eagle swooped low over the tops of the trees and zoomed up and away without pausing. As soon as it had passed, a monkey climbed out of the canopy into the very top of a tree to watch the receding eagle. A second Crowned Eagle immediately took off from a perch higher up on the opposite side of the valley and, diving on the monkey from behind, snatched it out of the tree. The attacking eagle was then joined by the first eagle and the two flew off together and disappeared from view.

These incidents suggest that the pair of Crowned Eagles was hunting as a team, with the first eagle acting as a decoy to distract the attention of the prey and the actual kill being made by the second eagle. This method of hunting does not appear to have been observed before in this species.

It is not known whether the same pair of eagles was involved in all three incidents, as there were at the time two pairs resident, each with a nest approximately equidistant from the farmhouse in the same valley. The first incident took place in the direction of one pair's nest, the second was directly opposite the farmhouse and the third incident was in the direction of the other pair's nest. It is possible, therefore, that both pairs of eagles employed team tactics and that it was not unique to one pair only.

Brown (*loc. cit.*) estimates the mass of the Bushbuck killed by the Karen eagle to be 18–20,5 kg, which is at least four times the mass of the eagle itself. Dorst & Dandelot (1970, A field guide to the larger mammals of Africa) give the mass of an adult Bushbuck as 70–170 lbs (32–77 kg). There is very little published information on Bushbuck weights in relation to horn lengths. Roberts (1954, The mammals of South Africa) gives the average length of horn for adult Bushbuck as 288,5 mm while their average body mass is probably in the region of 50 kg. So a ram with 180 mm horns is probably a bit more than half grown and therefore in the region of 30 kg (I. J. Whyte: pers. comm.).

On the basis of the observations reported above, the size of prey animal which the Crowned Eagle is prepared to attack is thus even larger than that reported by Brown. One of the eagles observed succeeded in killing a Bushbuck male weighing an estimated 30 kg (more than six times the eagle's weight) and was prepared to tackle an adult male Bushbuck probably weighing about 50 kg (ten times its own weight). Whether or not it would have succeeded in killing it is a matter of conjecture.

Although large eagles will attack and kill prey considerably bigger than themselves, they will be unable to lift them whole, and Brown records the Crowned Eagle as dissecting the young Bushbuck into pieces which it could carry in flight.

A.B.C. Daneel, 3 Leerdam Ave., Parel Vallei, Somerset West 7130

A note on hunting in Lesser and Eastern Redfooted Kestrels

In southern Africa Lesser Kestrels *Falco naumanni* and Eastern Redfooted Kestrels *F. amurensis* commonly occur in the same feeding flocks. The flocks are often associated with a local abundance of insects. While the two species differ significantly in various bill, foot and tail measurements (pers. obs.), it is likely that they often feed on the same insects. The observations reported here concern differences in hunting performance.

On 2 March 1978 between 09h00 and 11h00 I observed a mixed flock of about 20 *F. naumanni* and 150 *F. amurensis* hovering over a 25-ha maize field in the Settlers area, Transvaal (24 57S; 28 32E). Both species hovered 5–10 m above the ground and thus wind conditions were the same for

TABLE 1

COMPARATIVE HUNTING PERFORMANCES OF HOVERING *Falco naumanni* AND *F. amurensis* (DIFFERENCES ARE SIGNIFICANT IN THE NUMBER OF KILLS ($p < 0,005$) AND DURATION OF UNSUCCESSFUL HOVERS ($p < 0,025$)).

Species	No. of hovers observed	No. of kills	No. of unsuccessful timed hovers	Duration of unsuccessful hovers $\bar{x} \pm SE(\bar{x})$
F. naumanni	72	24	35	4,65 ± 0,41
F. amurensis	115	10	45	6,04 ± 0,42

the two species. A hover in one position was followed by the kestrel either flying off to a new hovering position, or diving to the ground to catch prey. As far as I could see each dive resulted in the capture of an insect on the ground. Large numbers of maize-pollen eaters *Astylus atromaculatus* (Melyridae: Coleoptera) were present on the maize tassels; probably the kestrels were feeding on the few that were on the ground. Prey was either eaten on the ground or, after flying off, in the air. Fifty hovers were timed for each species and a larger number of hovers observed to obtain data on the success rate (Table 1).

F. naumanni differed significantly from *F. amurensis* in that its success rate was about four times greater, and its hovering periods shorter. Table 1 gives hovering times only for unsuccessful hovers since hovers that resulted in prey capture were significantly ($p < 0,025$) shorter than unsuccessful hovers in *F. naumanni* ($\bar{x} = 3,13$; $SE(\bar{x}) = 0,41$ for duration of successful hovers in *F. naumanni*). *F. amurensis* showed no difference between unsuccessful and successful hovering times (only five successful hovers were timed). Using the data in Table 1 (including timed successful hovers) it can be calculated that *F. naumanni* took a mean time of 12,6 s of hovering and *F. amurensis* a mean time of 69,6 s of hovering to capture one prey item. The shorter hovering time of *F. naumanni* may mean that it is quicker than *F. amurensis* at "assessing" the possibilities for prey capture. If this suggestion is not correct, *F. naumanni* may be expected to hover for longer than *F. amurensis* since it has a tail some 20 mm longer (pers. obs.). A longer tail suggests greater lift and therefore an ability to hover for longer periods.

On 21 February 1978 I observed an emergence of termite alates at dusk in the Settlers area. About 100 *F. amurensis* were hawking termites in the air by flying repeatedly over the point of emergence; no termites were caught on the ground. Two kestrels were observed for 2 min each. They caught 36 and 41 termites respectively during this period, or a termite every 3,1 s on average. This rate of capture is different from the rate observed above. Evidently each situation is unique and capture rates are likely to differ markedly in each hunting situation, regardless of species. It is perhaps surprising that although *F. naumanni* was common in the Settlers area, none were seen at this abundant source of termite alates.

J. M. Mendelsohn, Durban Museum, P.O. Box 4085, Durban, 4000.

The nest and eggs of the Gough Island Bunting

The Gough Island Bunting *Rowettia goughensis* is endemic to Gough Island in the South Atlantic. Even though it is tame and fairly abundant, its nest and eggs do not seem to have been described. Watson (1975) states that only one old nest is known, and that the eggs are unknown. There is, however, a clutch of two eggs at the British Museum, Tring (Reg. no 1959. 4.1.), but I could not trace the nest mentioned by Watson (1975).