

This is the question I wish to ask, and to answer it, it is necessary to have observations of a more extensive nature on the relation of yellow insects to pink flowers, and *vice versa*. I have myself noticed that (in Kent, England,) *Gonepteryx rhamni* appears to be exceptionally fond of settling on pink flowers, but it seemed to me rather that the butterfly was conscious of the contrast between the colours and its own conspicuousness arising therefrom.

May I rely upon your readers to supplement these notes, and so clear up this question?

CORRESPONDENCE.

DICERCA PROLONGATA.

With reference to Dr. John Hamilton's note on p. 120, I may say that I have found the larva of this species boring in *Populus tremuloides* in Colorado, concerning which details were published in the "Entomologists' Monthly Magazine" for March, 1888, vol. xxiv, p. 232-233.

T. D. A. COCKERELL.

CAPTURES IN 1887.

Dear Sir: My additions to the list of Canadian Lepidoptera for the past season is of the most meagre description. I took a good many micros, new to me; but as usual, with them a large proportion were single specimens of a kind. I sent to Prof. Fernald 17 specimens which I had in duplicate; of these three turned out to be variations of kinds that he had previously named for me; three proved to be all one; one, *Depressaria heracliana* Dege. was new to me, but already in the list, and one *Eccopsis nitidana* Clem. is new to the Canadian list; the rest were unknown to him. Three years ago I captured at Ridgeway, along with *Limacodes*, to which I thought it belonged, a moth new to me, and which has been from that time until lately awaiting a name. During the past winter, Mr. Johnston, of this city, was making some exchanges with Miss Emily L. Morton, of Newburgh, N. J., and received from her a specimen labelled *Adoneta spinuloides* H. S., in which I recognized my unnamed Bombycid. Miss Morton acknowledges her indebtedness to Mrs. Fernald for the correct identification of most of her Lepidoptera. On the 11th of July last I came on an assemblage of Pyralids in the grass under the shade of a butternut tree, where I had taken refuge from the excessive heat. At first

I thought it was *Botis magistralis*, on closer inspection I doubted its identity—it was like, and yet unlike. I concluded that if it was *Magistralis*, it was an unusually fine specimen, so I took a quantity of it anyway, and all the more willingly as it was quite abundant in the very spot where I wanted to stay for a while. On comparing them, I was still undecided; whilst in communication with the Rev. Mr. Hulst, about some Geometers, I sent to him a specimen and received for it the name *Botis quinquelinealis* Grote. These three names are then the only presentable result of my last season's work in this direction.

J. ALSTON MOFFAT, Hamilton, Ont.

KNOWLEDGE OF DEATH IN INSECTS.

Dear Sir: An incidental remark in one of my papers, page 6, of the present vol., has attracted the attention of a correspondent of the ENTOMOLOGIST, as may be seen by turning to page 120. I was then entirely unaware that I was meddling with an "*ipse dixit*" of Mr. Grote's, or was touching one of his 'chips,' but, in common with the readers of the ENTOMOLOGIST, I know it now. While Mr. Grote certainly had the right to show, if he could, that the alleged assertion, whether made by himself or not, was not "unsupported," was not "dogmatic;" yet he had no right to assume that I had seen his paper, and even on that assumption no right disposed person, while differing from me, could take legitimate offence at my words, which are strictly scientific. The cause is said to be weak, when the advocate resorts to the *argumentum ad hominem* to overcome his opponents *argumentum ad rem*; * * * Let us see where Mr. Grote stands, his words are: "It is by *the keeping still* that the insects seem to me to appear to 'feign death,' of the existence of which latter they could have no knowledge." Few or none will dispute the first part of the quotation. It states exactly what such insects do, that is, "keep still;" but this does not prove that insects can have "no knowledge of death;" no proof of this is anywhere offered, nor is the assertion in any way limited or qualified; hence "unsupported," "dogmatic" are appropriate adjectives, and though not made by me with any reference to or knowledge of Mr. Grote's paternal claim. Now see how he "corrects" the adjectives "unsupported," "dogmatic" (*ib*, p. 120). His words now read: "Whether insects can have any knowledge of death, as such, may be a matter of opinion," etc., quite a different statement from his former

postulate, that insects could have no knowledge of death. The reader will notice how *ingenuously* "dogmatic" is disposed of by this change of base. Now, as to what he doubts not is the main point, that is, "the keeping still," that is only what these insects do, a mere act, and one to which even Mr. Grote himself attaches a motive, "the approach of danger." But why "keep still" on the "approach of danger"? His answer cannot be surmized. Writers have expressed various opinions about this "keeping still," "death mimicry," "feigning death," as practiced by certain insects and other animals, but I have not seen any statement that they can have no knowledge of death, except that claimed by Mr. Grote and a similar one in a Pittsburg newspaper. Dr. Lindsay, in his work "Mind in Animals," in treating of death-feigning, says: "This must require great self-command in those that practice it;" while Professor James, of Harvard College, in an article in Popular Science Monthly, June, 1887, on "Some Human Instincts," says: "It is really no feigning of death at all and requires no self-command. It is simply a terror paralysis, which has been so useful as to become hereditary." In commenting on this the newspaper man makes the remark I took exception to, my notice of which, without at the time being able to state where I had derived it, brought out Mr. Grote, whom I would most assuredly have quoted had I been aware of his assertion.

JOHN HAMILTON, Allegheny, Pa.

ARZAMA OBLIQUATA, G. AND R.

Dear Sir: In reference to Mr. Moffat's remark in the July number of the CANADIAN ENTOMOLOGIST, that the larva of this moth does not always form its pupa in the reed, I wish to say that I have taken between fifty and seventy-five chrysalids this spring, and all of them were in the reeds where the larva had been feeding. I believe that the larva sometimes goes out of the reed and wanders in other directions before going into pupa, but this is not often the case. My friend, Mr. Doll, when breaking an old cedar stump apart last spring, found in it the chrysalis of *A. obliquata*, but the larva had been feeding in the stump. Could that have been the case in Mr. Moffat's instance?

HERMANN H. BREHME, Newark, N. J.

Mailed September 1st.