

ers from the same colony distribute themselves over a huge area and intermingle with others in the feeding grounds such that it is very unlikely that in any given flower meadow the parasitized individuals all come from the same nest.

Our findings are preliminary but suggest that flower choice is not independent of parasitization of the pollinator. If this effect can be substantiated in future studies, the presence of parasites adds intriguingly new aspects to the study of pollinator behavior and plant-pollinator interactions. On the other hand, we do not yet know what causes the altered behavior of parasitized workers. The presence of the endoparasitic larvae probably stresses the host physiologically [18]. Visiting less difficult flowers (such as *B. officinalis*; Fig. 1) may thus be a coping strategy that could be expected when costs and benefits of flower choice are different according to body condition of parasitized vs nonparasitized bees. Alternatively, the presence of the parasites might impair sensory capabilities, so that workers alight more often on inflorescences of *B. officinalis* which protrude conspicuously above the grasses in our meadows (inflorescences are 32.0 ± 5.9 cm above ground, $n = 50$), while inflorescence of *P. grandiflora* are presumably more difficult to locate close to the ground (6.3 ± 1.9 cm, $n = 51$). Whatever the exact mechanism (and note that here we

are not concerned with causation), the consequences of parasite-induced behavioral changes are potentially far-reaching for the study of pollinator ecology and coevolution with entomophilous plants, as parasitization rates are so high. For example, if parasitized bees avoided difficult flowers (as hypothesized here), variation in parasite pressure on pollinator populations could affect selection for or against certain flower morphs. Hence, the presence of the conopid parasites may also affect the reproductive success of a third party – the plants. The present situation is therefore somewhat different from earlier reports on altered host behaviors which have discussed modifications in the context of either facilitating parasite transmission [19] or minimizing fitness loss in the host [20]. As we mentioned before, entire assemblages of coexisting bumblebee species are affected by conopids [10, 12]. Consequently, interspecific differences in flower choice of bumblebees that have been used as evidence for the importance of competitive interactions as a force structuring ecological communities may have to be reassessed in the light of possible effects of parasites.

Supported by grants from the Swiss NSF (nos. 3.017-0.87 and 31-25692.88) to PSH. We thank S. C. Stearns, J. A. Shykoff, C. Müller, B. Baur, F. Vollrath and an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on the manuscript.

Received March 12 and June 18, 1990

1. Gould, J. L.: *Science* 227, 1492 (1985)
2. Heinrich, B.: *Ecology* 60, 245 (1979)
3. Waser, N. M., in: *Pollination Biology*, p. 242 (Real, L., ed.). Orlando: Academic Press 1983
4. Feinsinger, P., in: *Coevolution*, p. 282 (Futuyma, D., Slatkin, M., eds.). Sunderland: Sinauer 1983
5. Harder, L. D.: *Ethology* 104, 60 (1988)
6. Inouye, D. W.: *Ecology* 59, 672 (1978)
7. Begon, M., Harper, J. L., Townsend, C. R.: *Ecology*. Oxford: Blackwell 1986
8. McFarland, D. (ed.): *The Oxford Companion to Animal Behavior*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 1981
9. Schmid-Hempel, P., Schmid-Hempel, R.: *Ecol. Entomol.* 13, 469 (1988)
10. Schmid-Hempel, P., Müller, C., Schmid-Hempel, R., Shykoff, J. A.: *Ins. Soc.* 37, 14 (1990)
11. Schmid-Hempel, R., Schmid-Hempel, P.: *Mitt. Schweiz. Entomol. Ges.* 62, 279 (1989)
12. Cumber, R. A.: *Trans. R. Entomol. Soc. Lond.* 24, 119 (1949)
13. Pouvreau, A.: *Apidologie* 5, 39 (1974)
14. Alford, D. V.: *Bumblebees*. London: Davis-Poynter 1975
15. Smith, K. G. V.: *J. Zool. Lond.* 149, 263 (1966)
16. Morse, D. H.: *Ann. Ent. Soc. Am.* 70, 311 (1977)
17. Harder, L. D.: *Can. J. Zool.* 60, 1073 (1982)
18. Heinrich, B., Heinrich, M. E.: *Physiol. Zool.* 56, 563 (1983)
19. Moore, J.: *Am. Nat.* 123, 572 (1984)
20. McAllister, M. K., Roitberg, B. D.: *Nature* 328, 797 (1987)

Erratum

B. D. Jackson, S. J. Keegans, E. D. Morgan: Trail Pheromone of the Ant *Tetramorium meridionale*
Naturwissenschaften 77, 294–296 (1990)

Unfortunately, the same error occurred three times in one paragraph of this paper.

The middle column on p. 295 should read as follows from the middle of the first line:

The natural compound showed m/z 40:m/z 39 of 2:3 in two samples. Of the three possible isomers of EDMP, the mass spectrum of 5-E-2,3-DMP is easily distinguished from the

other two. The spectrum of 3-E-2,5-DMP shows m/z 42 at almost three times the intensity of m/z 56 while that of 3-E-2,6-DMP shows m/z 42 to be slightly weaker than that of m/z 56.

On line 4 of the legend to Fig. 1 it should read *D* indole (not *E* indole).

We apologize for these errors.