

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