

bird at present, but my boyhood saw many of them; and for once the bird was obliterated by his background. I should say he was revealed at least fifty times. In other words the imitation, while real, is poetic. The bluejay against blue snow shadows is another case in point. The resemblance and the blending are there, but one has only to reflect that, even in winter, for once the jay is to be looked for against snow, a hundred times he is silhouetted in trees against the sky. That leaves out of account the fact that bluejays live right on through the summer. Why, in the name of common sense, if a bluejay or a wood duck were to be "concealingly coloured," should the rare fortuitous background be chosen for imitation rather than the daily environment? The battleground for opinion is here enormous. I have no intention of entering it, and cite the wood duck and the bluejay merely as examples.

Carried into the world of the larger animals the poetic resemblances, while not less numerous, become more fanciful. One of the most plausible examples is the mottling of the leopard to imitate sun spots in the forest. I am far from saying that this effect does not help in concealment. But from what little I have seen of the leopard (a) he is more likely to be found in dense shade than in spotted shadow; (b) he hunts at night when there is remarkably little sunlight; (c) he has no "natural enemies" from which he could wish to conceal himself.* If this is true of so strikingly poetic a resemblance as "spots" for light and shadow, how much more true is it of more fanciful resemblances. The larger animals move about so constantly,

*Prehistoric man had little use for a leopard outside a trap!