pathological. My restoration will be found in the American *Journal of Science* for October, 1892, and in the *Geological Magazine* for April, 1893.

The third figure given by Mr. Lydekker is a reduced copy of my restoration of *Stegosaurus ungulatus*, published in August, 1891. This reptile he calls Hypsirophus, giving that name priority over Stegosaurus, but without citing any authority for such a statement. A single reference to the literature would have proved this to be a mistake, as Stegosaurus was published by me in 1877, as above stated (*American Journal of Science* (3), vol. xiv. p. 513), while the name Hypsirophus was given by Cope in 1878 (*American Naturalist*, vol. xii. p. 188). Another error of less importance is in regard to the specimen on which the restoration is based, although this was clearly stated in the description accompanying my figure. The type specimen of *Stegosaurus ungulatus* Mr. Lydekker apparently confuses with a second skeleton, of a different species, which was even more perfect when found.

The fourth restoration given is a reduced copy of my figure of the skeleton of *Triceratops prorsus*, which, like the preceding restorations, has already been published by me, both in the *American Journal of Science* and in the *Geological Magazine*. Here again Mr. Lydekker rejects my generic name Triceratops, and even puts that and another genus of mine (Ceratops) as synonyms of Agathaumas without giving any reasons for doing so. The type specimens of the literature would show any candid anatomist that the three forms named, and another which I called Torosaurus, are all distinct genera, separated by well-defined characters. These characters I have given in detail in the *American Journal of Science*, accompanied by accurate figures of the forms I have described (vol. xliii. pp. 81–84, plates ii. and iii., January, 1892).

The remaining restoration given in Fig. 5 represents a well-known skeleton of Iguanodon in the Royal Museum of Belgium. In regard to this figure I have at present nothing to say, except that I have carefully studied the original specimen and those found with it, having made several visits to Brussels for this purpose.

The omissions from this article are perhaps as noteworthy as what it contains. No reference is made to two restorations of American Dinosaurs which I have recently published; Claosaurus from the Cretaceous, and Anchisaurus from the Triassic, although each is based on a nearly perfect skeleton. Both of these restorations have appeared in the *American Journal of Science* and also in the *Geological Magazine* within the past year. Mr. Lydekker likewise omits the restoration of Megalosaurus, which he has lately given to the public, although many palæontologists would be glad to know more about it, especially about the remains on which it is based.

Mr. Lydekker begins his article by referring to the discouragements of palæontologists in the investigation of fossil vertebrates, but ends with some words of encouragement. He might have added that one discouragement to active workers who devote years to exploration and study is to have the results of their labour used without due credit, or disparaged by those who do not understand them.

O. C. MARSH.

Yale University, New Haven, Conn., August 15.

## Insects Attracted by Solanum.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK, in his "British Wild Flowers in Relation to Insects," remarks (p. 133) that *Solanum* is little visited by insects. Darwin, in "Effects of Cross and Self Fertilisation," has some observations (p. 387) to the same effect. It will therefore be useful to record that, however it may be with European species, an abundant *Solanum* of New Mexico is very attractive to insects. The species in question is *S. elæagnifolium*, Cav., which has deep lilac flowers not unlike those of the potato. I was especially successful in capturing interesting aculeate hymenoptera on this plant, as the following list will show. All listed were taken in Las Cruces, and all (except the *Megacilissa*, July 12) on July 13.

*Hymenoptera taken on Solanum elæagnifolium*, 1893.

*Ammophila pruinosa*, Cr. ♀.
,, *varipes*, Cr.
*Anthophora urbana*, Cr. ♀.
*Halictus*, sp. ♀.
*Megacilissa gloriosa*, Fox.
*Melissodes menuacha*, Cr. var.? ♀
*Myzine frontalis*, Cr. MS.
*Mysson texanus*, Cr. ♀.
,, n. sp.
*Odynerus bravo*, Sauss. (new to U.S. fauna).
*Pelopœus servillei*, Lef.
*Plenoculus*, n. sp.
*Sphœrophthalma coccineohirta*, Blake, ♂ var.
*Stizus agilis*, Sm.
,, *flavus*, Cam. (new to U.S. fauna).
*Tachysphex*, sp. ♀.
*Tachytes elongatus*, Cr. ♂.
*Trypoxylon texense*, Sauss.

For the identifications of the species I am indebted to Mr. W. J. Fox.

T. D. A. COCKERELL.

Agricultural College, Las Cruces, New Mexico, U.S.A. August 16.

## Old and New Astronomy.

IN your notice of the "Old and New Astronomy," your reviewer has, I think, misunderstood the passage with respect to reflecting telescopes, on p. 45, which he refers to as indicating that Mr. Proctor supposed that the image in the principal focus of a reflecting telescope was affected with chromatic aberration or false colouring. Section 97, to which I conclude your reviewer refers, evidently refers to the magnified image which enters the eye of an observer when a "*real image* of an object is submitted to microscopical examination."

No one who knew Mr. Proctor could suppose him to make such a mistake; and that he was perfectly well aware that the image thrown by a reflector was not affected with chromatic aberration, would, I think, have been evident to your reviewer if he had read to the bottom of the page, where in Section 101 Mr. Proctor says:—"Newton supposed that it was impossible to get rid of this defect (*i.e.* chromatic aberration), and therefore turned his attention to the construction of reflectors," a clear proof that Mr. Proctor was in no doubt upon the subject, and only referred in the previous passage to the false colouring of an image formed by a lens.

S. D. PROCTOR-SMYTH.

8 Duncairn Street, Belfast, August 23.

MRS. PROCTOR-SMYTH is in error in supposing that my note referred to Section 97 of "Old and New Astronomy." I referred to Section 100, in which the author says "the pencil of light proceeding from a point such as P, Figs. 14, 16, and 18, consists of rays of different refrangibility, and therefore *not converging to a focal point such as p but to a focal line in the axis of the pencil.*" (The italics are mine.) Fig. 18 is a diagram of the formation of a real image by a reflector. The reference to Fig. 18 may have been a slip; if so, it should have been corrected in the completed volume, as otherwise the student, reading the subsequent paragraphs, to which Mrs. Proctor-Smyth refers, is confused as to what the author really means, and is doubtful whether the reflector does or does not suffer from chromatic aberration.

THE REVIEWER.

## Suicide of Rattlesnake.

ANOTHER question raised by the late snake story is, How long does it take to drown snakes? Some of the non-poisonous kind at the Zoological Gardens, in certain states of the weather, are fond of hanging themselves over the edge of their tank, with their heads immersed in the water, for as long as an hour together.

E. L. GARBETT.

August 29.

## *THE EARLY ASTERISMS.*

### I.

NOT very many years ago, when the literature of China and India was as a sealed book, and the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the wedges of Babylonia were