# Prey-capture techniques and prey preferences of *Zenodorus durvillei*, *Z. metallescens* and *Z. orbiculatus*, tropical ant-eating jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae) from Australia

# ROBERT R. JACKSON

Department of Zoology University of Canterbury Christchurch, New Zealand

# DAIQIN LI

Department of Biological Sciences National University of Singapore Singapore 119260

Abstract Capture techniques and preferences of Zenodorus durvillei (Walckenaer), Z. metallescens (L. Koch) and Z. orbiculatus, Australian salticids that feed on ants in nature, were studied in the laboratory using a wide variety of ants and other insects. Each species adopted three prey-capture modes: ambush, active pursuit in the open, and gleaning from spider webs. Large ants were sometimes stabbed several times before holding on. A variety of methods were used for testing preference. The potential of using this assortment of methods for assessing strength of preferences is discussed. Each species took dolichoderine, formicine, myrmecine, myrmicine and pseudomyrmecine ants in preference to a variety of other insects (aphids, bugs, caterpillars, crickets, flies, lacewings, mantises, mayflies, midges, mosquitoes, moths, plant and leaf hoppers, and termites). Testing with laboratory-reared spiders showed that the development of preference for ants and ant-specific prey-capture behaviour did not depend on prior experience with ants. Tests with dead, motionless lures showed that each species could distinguish between ants and other types of prey independent of the different movement patterns of the

Z00038 Received 2 November 2000; accepted 8 May 2001 prey. Preferences were intact after 7-day and 14-day fasts, but not after 21-day fasts when prey were outside webs. When prey were in webs, preference for ants persisted even after 21-day fasts. Findings are discussed in relation to other studies on specialised salticids and in relation to the structure and function of the salticid eye.

**Keywords** Spiders; *Zenodorus*; Salticidae; ants; predation; myrmecophagy; prey preferences

# INTRODUCTION

Jumping spiders (Salticidae) have large eyes, acute vision and intricate vision-based predatory strategies (Forster 1982; Land 1969a,b; Blest et al. 1990; Jackson & Pollard 1996). Although these spiders prey on a wide variety of arthropods, ants are avoided by most species despite being abundant in the habitats of most salticids. The ant's defences (e.g., powerful mandibles, poison-injecting stings and formic acid: Eisner 1970; Blum 1981; Holldobler & Wilson 1990) evidently present formidable challenges to most salticid species, but there is a sizeable minority group (the "myrmecophagic salticids") that routinely feed on ants (Li & Jackson thoroughly 1996a). The most studied myrmecophagic salticids are from nine genera, Aelurillus, Chalcotropis, Chrysilla Anasaitis, Habrocestum, Natta (formerly Cyllobelus), Siler, Xenocytaea (formerly Euophrys) and Zenodorus (formerly Pystira) (Edwards et al. 1974; Cutler 1980; Jackson & van Olphen 1991, 1992; Li et al. 1996; Jackson et al. 1998; Li et al. 1999). Although each of these salticids takes ants readily using antspecific prey-capture tactics, each also uses other tactics to take other prey.

Using three types of testing, experimental studies on preferences have been carried out on each of the myrmecophagic species. Regardless of testing method, each myrmecophagic species prefers ants to other prey when well fed, but how hunger influences preference varies. After a 3-week fast, all

Species	Locality I	Description of habitat	Webs used for nesting sites	Webs in which seen taking ants
Zenodorus durvillei (Walckenaer)	Queensland: Cairns, Lake Placid, Crystal Cascades	Rainforest	Badunna insignis (L. Koch) (Desidae), Inola subtilis Davis (Pisauridae), Psilochorus sphaeroides (L. Koch) (Pholcidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)	Badumna insignis (Desidae), Inola subtilis (Pisauridae)
Zenodorus metallescens (L. Koch)	Queensland: Dimbulah, Mareeba	Savanna woodland	Not seen	Badumna candida (Desidae), Badunna insignis (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)
	Northern Territory: Katherine	Savanna woodland Not seen	Not seen	Badumna candida (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)
Zenodorus orbiculatus (Walckenaer)	Queensland: Cairns, Lake Placid Crystal Cascades	Rainforest	Badumna insignis (Desidae), Inola subtilis (Pisauridae), Psilochorus sphaeroides (Pholcidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)	Badumna insignis (Desidae), Inola subtilis (Pisauridae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)
	Queensland: Dimbulah, Mareeba	Savanna woodland	Badumna candida (L. Koch) (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)	Badumna candida (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)
	Northern Territory: Katherine	Savanna woodland	Badumna candida (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)	Badunna candida (Desidae), Cyrtophora sp. (Araneidae)

species tested took prey indiscriminately in all three types of tests. After 2-week fasts, whether the spider continued to take ants in preference to other prey depended on which species was being tested (Jackson & van Olphen 1991, 1992; Li et al. 1991, 1996; Jackson et al. 1998).

For A. canosa (Walckenaer) and Z. orbiculatus (Keyserling), findings after 2week fasts depended on the type of testing adopted; in alternate-day tests, prey were taken indiscriminately, but ants were taken in preference to other insects in simultaneous-presentation tests. After 2week fasts, the other species took ants in preference to other prey in all types of tests (Jackson & van Olphen 1991).

Only one species of Zenodorus, Z. orbiculatus, has been studied before and only with a limited range of prey types (Jackson & van Olphen 1991). Here we show that another two species of Zenodorus are myrmecophagic salticids and that preference for ants is stable for all three species despite testing with a wide range of prey types. We also extend the earlier work by documenting an additional tactic adopted by all three of these species of Zenodorus, the taking of ants from spider webs. Identifying this additional tactic provided a way to investigate prey preference in greater detail than in previous studies.

# STUDY SITES AND GENERAL METHODS

The study site was rainforest for Z. durvillei (Walckenaer), savannah for Z. metallescens (L. Koch) and both for Z. orbiculatus (Table 1). Each species was observed capturing prey in the field. More detailed observations, using laboratory cultures started from specimens collected at each study site, were made in the laboratory both at the National University of Singapore and at the University of Canterbury. Maintenance procedures, cage design, basic testing methods and terminology, which were as in earlier salticid studies (see Jackson & Hallas 1986; Jackson & van Olphen 1991), included the

 Table 1
 Study sites and field data for three species of myrmecophagic salticids in tropical Australia.

Jackson & Li—Ant-eating jumping spiders

convention that expressions "usually" or "often", "sometimes" or "occasionally", and "rarely" or "infrequently" indicate frequencies of occurrence of >80%, 20–80% and <20%, respectively.

# USE OF ALIEN WEBS AS NESTING AND PREDATION SITES IN THE FIELD

Zenodorus durvillei and Z. orbiculatus were frequently found inhabiting webs built by other spiders (Table 1) where they occupied silk nests built on dead leaves or inside the enclosed spaces of rolled-up dead leaves that were hanging as detritus in the webs. This was never observed for Z. metallescens. Females, especially those with eggs, were found nesting in webs. Each of the three species was seen taking ants from webs in nature (Table 1), but they were never seen taking any other type of prey from webs.

# USE OF ALIEN WEBS IN THE LABORATORY

In the laboratory, adult females of each species were set up in large glass tanks with occupied webs of the following spiders: *Badumna candida* (L. Koch), *Badumna longinqua* (L. Koch) and *Inola subtilis* Davies (one salticid and one web-building spider per tank) and kept together for 14 days. During this period, individuals of each salticid species were seen in webs. Individuals of Z. *durvillei* and Z. *orbiculatus*, but no individuals of Z. *metallescens*, built and used nests on dead leaves in the webs (Table 2). None of the salticids oviposited during this period. Living prey (house flies and fruit flies *Musca domestica* and *Drosophila melanogaster*) were always present during the 14-day period.

Each salticid species was seen making forays out of the web and returning, traversing the silk by leaping to and from dead leaves. Walking slowly across the silk in webs of *I. subtilis* was also common, although walking on the silk of *B. candida* or *B. longinqua* was rare. Each salticid and each web-building spider was seen feeding on a fly at least once. When seen feeding, the salticid was always outside and the web-building spider was always inside the web.

The webs of *Badumna* spp., but not the webs of *I. subtilis*, are cribellate and highly adhesive. When occasionally a salticid leapt but missed its target and landed on the silk of *Badumna*, it usually had considerable difficulty extracting itself. No salticids kept with *I. subtilis* or *B. longinqua* died during the 14-day period, but two individuals of *Z. durvillei* and one of *Z. orbiculatus* were seen being preyed on by *B. candida*. Each of these three salticids was attacked and killed by the host spider when it leapt toward a leaf, missed its target and landed on the web.

Salticid	Web-building spider	No. of salticids set up with webs	No. of salticids that were at any time seen in web	No. of salticids that established nests on detritus in web	No. of salticids that died
Zenodorus	Badumna candida	35	15	9	2
durvillei	Badumna longinqua	29	8	5	0
	Inola subtilis	30	8	3	0
Zenodorus	Badumna candida	31	3	0	0
metallescens	Badumna longinqua	26	1	0	0
	Inola subtilis	29	1	0	0
Zenodorus	Badumna candida	33	10	4	2
orbiculatus	Badumna longingua	30	4	2	1
	Inola subtilis	32	12	7	0

**Table 2** Data from tests in which adult females of salticid were kept for 14 days in a glass tank (600 mm  $\times$  380 mm  $\times$  290 mm high) with occupied web of web-building spider.

# **PREY-CAPTURE BEHAVIOUR**

Predatory sequences were similar for the three species. As described in detail elsewhere for Z. orbiculatus (Jackson & van Olphen 1991), when away from webs, there were two modes of prey capture, active pursuit and ambush. Active pursuit was common against all types of prey, but ambushing was adopted almost exclusively against ants.

In active pursuit, the salticid fixated on its prey (i.e., oriented so that its large antero-medial eyes were brought to bear on the prey), approached rapidly, then leapt on to the prey from 4–10 body lengths away, with or without first pausing.

Ambushing was most often from a tree trunk, but occasionally from rocks and boulders. The spider

stood facing downward and, by suddenly lunging downward or making a short leap downward (usually no more than three body lengths), took ants that walked by. The spider kept a dragline fastened to the tree during ambushing attacks and, at the end of a lunge or leap, the spider returned to the position from which it began by stepping backward. Spiders not yet prepared for ambushing sometimes reacted to ants by preparing for an ambushing attack, foregoing the opportunity for active pursuit then, upon seeing an ant, the spider moved closer, positioned itself facing down, and remained stationary until an ant came to within striking distance.

After attacking, spiders tended to hold on to smaller ants and other prey regardless of size. However, larger ants (i.e., ants comparable to the spider's size or larger) were often stabbed (i.e., the

**Table 3** Ant workers (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) used in laboratory as living prey and motionless lures when testing *Zenodorus* spp. for prey preferences.

Subfamily	Tribe	Species H	Body length (mn	n) Origin
Dolichoderinae	Leptomyrmecini	Leptomyrmex erythrocephalus (Fabrici	ius) 9–11	Queensland
	Tapinomini	Iridomyrmex darwinanus (Forel)	2–3	New Zealand
		<i>Tapinoma</i> sp.	2-5	Queensland
Formicinae	Camponotini	Camponotus gigas (Latreille)	6–8	Singapore
		Camponotus sp.	3–6	Queensland, Northern Territory
		Polyrachis bicolor Smith	5-7	Singapore
		Polyrachis sp.	4–7	Queensland
	Melophorini	Notoncus ectatommoides (Forel)	3–4	Queensland
		Prolasius sp.	5-8	Queensland
	Oecophyllini	Oecophylla smaragdina (Fabricius)	7–10	Queensland, Northern Territory, Singapore
	Plagiolepidini	Acropyga sp.	3-6	Singapore
Myrmeciinae		Myrmecia nigriceps Mayr	6-8	Queensland
Myrmicinae		<i>Adlerzia</i> sp.	4–5	Northern Territory
		Crematogaster borneensis André	2–3	Singapore
		Crematogaster sp.	2-4	Queensland
		Epopostruma frosti (Brown)	6–8	Queensland
		Monomorium antarcticum (White)	3–4	New Zealand
		Monomorium sp.	3–8	Queensland, Northern Territory
		Podomyrma sp.	6–7	Northern Territory
		Tetramorium pacificum Mayr	4-5	Queensland
Pseudomyrmecin	ae	Tetraponera puntulata Smith	46	Northern Territory
		Tetraponera sp.	4–6	Singapore

Order	Family	Species	Description	BL (mm)	Origin
Blattodea	Blattellidae	Blattella sp.	Cockroach nymph and adult	48	Singapore
Diptera	Calliphoridae	Calliphora sp.	Blow fly	7-8	Singapore
1	1	Lucillia sp.	Blow fly	7	Queensland
	Chironomidae	Unknown	Midge	2	Queensland
	Culicidae	<i>Culex</i> sp.	Mosquito	4–7	Queensland, Northern Territory
	Dolichopodidae	Unknown	Dolichopodid fly	46	Queensland, Northern Territory, Singapore
	Drosophilidae	Drosophila melanogaster (Meigen)	Fruit fly	2-3	Laboratory culture, Queensland, Singapore
	Muscidae	Musca domestica (L)	House fly	68	Queensland, Laboratory culture, Singapore
	Sciaridae	Sciara sp.	Sciarid fly	2-3	Singapore
	Tipulidae	Gynoplistia sp.	Crane fly	7-10	Queensland
Ephemeroptera	Baetidae	Baetis sp.	Mayfly	5-6	Queensland, Northern Territory
Hemiptera	Aleyrodidae	Aleurodicus dispersus Russell	Whitefly nymph and adult	2	Singapore
1	Aphidae	Brevicoryne brassicae (L.)	Aphid nymph and adult	2	New Żealand
	1	Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Aphid nymph and adult	2	New Zealand
	Cicadellidae	Nephotettix nigropictus (Stål)	Green leaf hopper nymph and adult	25	Laboratory culture
		Unknown	Leaf hopper nymph and adult	25	Queensland, Northern Territory
	Cixiidae	Oliarus sp.	Cixiid nymph and adult	3-4	Queensland, Northern Territory
	Delphacidae	Nilaparvata lugens (Stål)	Brown plant hopper nymph and adult	23	Laboratory culture
	Flatidae	Siphanta sp.	Flatid	5-10	Queensland, Northern Territory, Singapore
	Miridae	Unknown	Mirid bug nymph and adult	23	Queensland, New Zealand
	Ricaniidae	Ricania sp.	Ricaniid adult	10	Singapore
Isoptera	Termitidae	Nasutitermes sp.	Termite worker	3-5	Queensland, Northern Territory
1		Macrotermes gilvus	Termite worker	4	Singapore
Lepidoptera	Geometridae	Unknown	Caterpillar	6-15	Queensland
	Gracilariidae	Calioptilia sp.	Caterpillar	6-10	Singapore
	Noctuidae	Autoba sp.	Moth	10-15	Singapore, Queensland,
		Unknown	Moth	8-9	Northern Territory
	Pyralidae	Eristena sp.	Moth	4-7	Singapore
	Tortricidae	Capua sp.	Caterpillar	9-13	Singapore
Mantodea	Mantidae	Orthodera sp.	Mantis nymph	5-10	Queensland, Northern Territory
Neuroptera	Hemrobiidae	Micromus tasmaniae (Walker)	Lacewing adult	4	New Zealand
Orthoptera	Gryllidae	Metioche maoricum (Walker)	Cricket nymph	46	New Zealand
P		Unknown	Cricket nymph	56	Oueensland
Psocoptera	Ectopscocidae	Ectopsocus californicus	Psocid nymph and adult	3	New Zealand, Singapore
1 Seveptera		Species unknown	Psocid nymph and adult	3	Queensland

# **Table 4**Insects other than ants used as living prey and motionless lures when testing Zenodorus spp. for prey preferences. BL = Body length.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant only	Chose other insect only		Chose neither	McNemar test
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Polyrachis sp.	14	1	9	3	P < 0.001
durvillei		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	20	$\overline{2}$	10	4	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	21	1	9	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	$\bar{2}3$	$\overline{2}$	17	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Tetraponera sp.	21	2	14	4	P < 0.001
		Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Tetramorium pacificum	15	3	3	2	P < 0.01
		Diptera: unknown chironomid	Crematogaster sp.	15	1	3	0	P < 0.001
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Tapinoma sp.	12	2	5	4	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	21	5	6	1	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	14	0	8	4	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Notoncus ectatommoides	9	0	6	3	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Camponotus gigas	20	2	7	6	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	26	5	10	4	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	21	3	5	5	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Monomorium antarcticum	20	7	13	2	P < 0.05
		Orthoptera: unknown	Polyrachis sp.	14	1	9	10	P < 0.001
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	18	5	11	4	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Unknown	Crematogaster sp.	20	2	8	4	P < 0.001
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	22	9	15	2	P < 0.05
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	21	4	14	3	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	23	3	17	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	24	4	13	3	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	13	2	10	0	P < 01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	14	2	10	. 4	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera, Ectopsocus californicus	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	21	6	19	7	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera, Ectopsocus californicus	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	10	10	26	1	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Polyrachis sp.	13	8	21	3	NS
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	5	3	19	Ō	NS
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	8	19	4	NS

Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Blattodea: Blattella sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	14	0	8	5	P < 0.001
metallescens		Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	24	2	9	6	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Myrmecia nigriceps	21	1	6	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	23	4	6	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Leptomyrmex erythrocephalus	22	9	2	5	P < 0.05
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	34	2	8	7	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	29	3	6	6	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis spp.	27	2	16	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Sciara sp.	Camponotus gigas	16	1	6	6	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	14	2	8	1	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Adlerzia sp.	15	2	8	8	P < 0.01 ·
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Tetraponera sp.	12	0	6	5	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Tapinoma sp.	20	2	8	9	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	21	3	9	9	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	9	0	5	4	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	35	4	13	10	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	29	5	9	8	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tapinoma sp.	21	4	7	7	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	10	0	4	8	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Capua sp. larva	Camponotus gigas	12	0	3	9	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: unknown geometrid larva	Prolasius sp.	13	1	5	6	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	13	2	7	6	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	18	3	5	6	P < 0.01
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	17	3	10	2	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	14	1	4	7	P < 0.001
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	21	4	4	4	P < 0.001
		Psocoptera: unknown	Crematogaster sp.	18	3	3	5	P < 0.001
	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	15	3	6	4	P < 0.01
	limited diet4	·						
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	21	5	10	7	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	21	5	5	9	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	15	3	13	5	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	21	7	8	4	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis sp.	19	4	12	6	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	11	1	17	1	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Tetraponera sp.	7	1	7	2	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	12	2	8	4	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	11	2	6	3	P < 0.05
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	23	3	12	9	P < 0.001
		1 0	1 0 1					

Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

305

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant only	Chose other insect only	Chose	Chose neither	McNemar test
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	13	2	11	5	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	18	3	9	6	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	17	2	5	4	P < 0.001
		Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	3	9	6	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	17	4	6	3	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	11	13	20	0	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	15	9	20	5	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	18	11	11	4	NS
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	28	17	20	6	NS
		Hemiptera: Brevicoryne brassicae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	4	3	22	0	NS
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	10	3	10	5	NS
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	9	4	10	3	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tapinoma sp.	14	7	13	4	NS
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	8	15	5	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Camponotus sp.	10	1	2	2	P < 0.01
orbiculatus		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	4	3	5	P < 0.05
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	21	4	9	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	23	4	4	7	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	20	2	4	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	9	1	4	3	P < 0.05
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	12	2	8	4	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Aedes sp.	Camponotus sp.	14	2	9	4	P < 0.0
		Diptera: Sciara sp.	Crematogaster borneensis	8	0	3	5	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Monomorium sp.	12	1	6	1	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	6	0	5	3	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	13	0	3	3	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Ricania sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	0	1	6	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Acropyga sp.	11	1	2	5	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Oecophylla smaragdina	24	5	9	7	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	16	2	6	5	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: <i>Calioptilia</i> sp. larva	Camponotus gigas	11	õ	õ	6	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	8	ŏ	ĩ	ő	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Crematogaster borneensis	9	ŏ	3	4	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	18	3	5	10	P < 0.01
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	13	0	10	9	P < 0.001

New Zealand Journal of Zoology, 2001, Vol. 28

$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	12	7	12	4	P < 0.01
Diptera: unknown dolichopodidCamponotus gigas91142Hemiptera: Hemiptera: unknown miridCrematogaster sp.15184Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adultOecophylla smaragdina111105Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.163140Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum121134Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium antarcticum61172Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium antarcticum61172Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium sp.88281Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium antarcticum88281Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	13	0	10	S	P < 0.01
Hemiptera: Hemiptera: unknown miridCrematogaster sp.15184Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adultOecophylla smaragdina111105Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.163140Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum121134Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium antarcticum61172Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.61172Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	6	Ι	14	0	P < 0.05
Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adultOecophylla smaragdina111105Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.163140Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum121134Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.61172Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium sp.64200Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281etPsocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281		Hemiptera: Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	15	-	8	4	P < 0.001
Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.163140Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum121134Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.61172Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281etPsocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	11	1	10	5	P < 0.01
Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum121134Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Musca domesticaEpopostruma frosti61172Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281et		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Monomorium sp.	16	e	14	0	P < 0.01
Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum1311270Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Musca domesticaEpopostruma frosti61172Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	12	1	13	4	P < 0.01
Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Musca domesticaEpopostruma frosti61172Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281ctc	Starved <sup>2</sup> and	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	13	11	27	0	NS
Diptera: Drosophila melanogasterCrematogaster borneensis52161Diptera: Musca domesticaEpopostruma frosti61172Hemiptera: unknown cicadellidMonomorium sp.64200Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicusMonomorium antarcticum88281ct	limited diet <sup>4</sup>							
Diptera: Musca domestica     Epopostruma frosti     6     1     17     2       Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid     Monomorium sp.     6     4     20     0       Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus     Monomorium antarcticum     8     8     28     1	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	S	0	16	1	NS
Hemiptera:         United and the second state         Monomorium sp.         6         4         20         0         1           Psocoptera:         Ectopsocus californicus         Monomorium antarcticum         8         8         28         1         1           ct         t		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	9	1	17	0	NS
Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus Monomorium antarcticum 8 8 et		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Monomorium sp.	9	4	20	0	SN
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	8	×	28	1	NS
	and limited diet							

spider only briefly penetrated the prey's body with its fangs and did not hold on). Ants that had been stabbed usually ran at least 10-20 mm away. The salticid sometimes followed at a distance of 10-50 mm and made successive stabbing attacks that noticeably weakened the ant. Eventually the spider attacked and held on.

Upon seeing an ant in a web, the salticid approached, usually moving more slowly than during pursuit of prey outside webs and often making frequent pauses of variable duration prior to reaching the web edge. From the edge of the web, the salticid tended to move about, repeatedly orienting toward the ant. If the ant was within a few millimetres of the web edge, the salticid usually leaned out and attacked by lunging (i.e., by rapidly moving its body forward, contacting the ant forcefully and either grabbing hold of it or else stabbing then releasing it). Although salticids did on rare occasions leap into webs and onto ants that were several body lengths away, they usually walked through the web until close enough to lean out and make a lunging attack. When there was detritus in the web, the salticid tended to step (or leap) about primarily on the detritus rather than the web silk. When stepping across on web silk, the salticid usually moved especially slowly, reaching out with forelegs to contact the silk before each step. If the silk was especially adhesive, the salticid backed away. When a detritus pathway was unavailable in a sticky web, salticids usually left the web without attacking the ant.

# METHODS USED FOR PREFERENCE TESTING

Each salticid tested was an adult female or a juvenile that was at least half adult size. Some salticids came from the field. Others came from laboratory rearing in Christchurch from eggs oviposited by spiders collected in the field. However, as there was no statistical evidence that spiders field-collected or laboratory-reared influenced outcomes of experiments, data were pooled.

A wide variety of ants and other insects were used in prey-preference testing (Tables 3 and 4). Laboratory-reared spiders were maintained on a variety of insect prey, but had no prior experience with the insects used in preference tests, or with ants of any species, prior to laboratory testing.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Ate ant	Ate other insect	Ate neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	18	1	6	<i>P</i> < 0.001
durvillei		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	26	3	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Tetraponera sp.	20	4	8	P < 0.01
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	18	1	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	17	4	10	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	16	2	6	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Camponotus gigas	15	2	8	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	23	4	12	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: unknown geometrid larva	Polyrachis sp.	14	1	8	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	17	3	6	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: unknown	Polyrachis sp.	12	Ō	7	P < 0.001
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	22	4	8	P < 0.001
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	16	2	10	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	18	3	3	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	19	3	3	P < 0.001
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	14	3	3	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	19	7	12	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	11	1	2	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	22	5	3	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	15	2	1	<i>P</i> < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	18	11	4	NS
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	7	5	23	NS
		Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	9	4	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	11	11	7	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Blattodea: Blattella sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	11	0	5	<i>P</i> < 0.001
metallescens		Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	25	3	7	P < 0.001
meraneseens		Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Myrmecia nigriceps	15	3	7	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster gigas	31	3	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	24	4	7	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Polyrachis sp.	21	4	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Sciara sp.	Crematogaster gigas	11	ò	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	26	4	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Adlerzia sp.	11	1	6	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Podomyrma sp.	16	1	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	<i>Tetraponera</i> sp.	10	Ō	5	P < 0.001

	Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Tapinoma sp.	23	3	10	P < 0.001	
	Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	18	2	9	P < 0.001	
	Hemiptera: Ricania sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	8	0	5	P < 0.01	
	Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	27	4	10	P < 0.01	
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	21	4	9	P < 0.001	
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tapinoma sp.	22	5	9	P < 0.001	
	Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	14	1	6	P < 0.001	
	Lepidoptera: Capua sp.	Camponotus gigas	15	2	4	<i>P</i> < 0.01	
	Lepidoptera: unknown geometrid larva	Camponotus sp.	13	1	5	P < 0.01	
	Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	2	6	P < 0.01	
	Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	19	3	6	<i>P</i> < 0.001	
	Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	16	1	6	P < 0.001	
	Psocoptera: unknown	Crematogaster sp.	13	1	6	<i>P</i> < 0.01	
	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	16	2	9	P < 0.01	
Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	19	$\overline{2}$	11	P < 0.0001	
Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: <i>Calliphora</i> sp.	Camponotus gigas	12	$\tilde{2}$	3	P < 0.01	
Starvea	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster gigas	21	5	6	P < 0.01	
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	24	4	5	P < 0.001	
	Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Polyrachis sp.	21	6	7	P < 0.01	
	Diptera: <i>Gynoplistia</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	17	4	3	P < 0.01	
	Hemiptera: <i>Macrosiphum euphorbiae</i>	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	13	1	4	P < 0.01	
	Hemiptera: <i>Siphanta</i> sp.	Tetraponera sp.	8	1	3	P < 0.01	
	Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	14	3	3	P < 0.05 P < 0.01	
	Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	13	3	3	P < 0.01 P < 0.05	
	Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	24	6	6	P < 0.05	
	Isoptera: <i>Macrotermes</i> guvus	Camponotus sp.	15	4	5	P < 0.01 P < 0.05	
			10	2	4	P < 0.05 P < 0.05	
	Lepidoptera: <i>Calioptilia</i> sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	10	$\frac{2}{3}$	3	P < 0.03 P < 0.01	
	Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina Tetner en en er	17		4	P < 0.01 P < 0.001	
	Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	10	2	5	P < 0.001 P < 0.05	
	Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina		2			
	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	20	2	6	P < 0.001	
Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	22	4	3	P < 0.001	
Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster gigas	19	13	5	NS	
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	20	15	7	NS	
	Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	6	5	NS	
	Hemiptera: Macrosiphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	8	5	26	NS	
	Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	9	4	4	NS	
	Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	5	2	NS	
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	<i>Tapinoma</i> sp.	14	8	5	NS	
<b>P</b> 4 1 1 3	Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	<i>Tetraponera</i> sp.	15	9	5	NS	
Extra-starved <sup>3</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	10	12	4	NS	

# Table 6Continued

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Ate ant	Ate other insect	Ate neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
Zenodarus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponatus gigas	25	3	8	NS
orbiculatus		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	Ō	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	34	6	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	24	4	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	11	0	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	24	3	6	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Macrosiphum euphorbiae	Monomorium antarcticum	15	2	10	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	12	2	4	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	8	0	4	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Acropyga sp.	13	0	4	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Oecophylla smaragdina	23	4	5	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	25	4	6	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Camponotus gigas	13	2	4	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	1	3	P < 0.01
		Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Crematogaster borneensis	11	0	4	P < 0.001
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	17	3	3	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	23	5	4	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	25	5	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	13	4	3	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: Macrosiphum euphorbiae	Monomorium antarcticum	11	2	12	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	12	2	6	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	3	5	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	9	0	31	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	16	10	9	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	19	15	4	NS
		Hemiptera: Macrosiphum euphorbiae	Monomorium antarcticum	3	5	29	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	4	4	25	NS

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing. <sup>4</sup> Reared on diet of only *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Musca domestica*. (All others reared on varied diet.)

In the earlier study on the preference behaviour of Z. orbiculatus, maintenance prey were almost exclusively Drosophila melanogaster (Meigen) and Musca domestica L. from laboratory culture. Using a subset of each species of Zenodorus, we replicated this feeding regime and used spiders from this subset in selected preference tests. Findings from using the individuals subjected to this special feeding regime (called "limited diet") differed from findings on other individuals, and these data are presented separately.

Three types of tests (alternate-day, simultaneouspresentation and alternative-prey) were undertaken using living prey in the open. Alternate-day and simultaneous-presentation tests followed a paired design (each individual salticid was subjected to two trials per test). Alternate-day and simultaneouspresentation tests were also undertaken using lures in the open and lures in webs.

The goal being to determine whether a salticid took ants in preference to other prey, an ant was always paired with another insect in tests. There were three feeding regimes, "well-fed", "starved" and "extra-starved". Salticids were kept without prey for 7, 14 and 21 days, respectively, prior to testing. For all pairings, each salticid species was tested when well fed. For a portion of the pairings, each species of salticid was also tested when starved and extra-starved.

No individual salticid was used in more than one test of any one type. In each trial, the ant and the other insect were of approximately matching size, and 0.5-1.5 times the size of the salticid.

# Testing for prey preference using living prey

As described elsewhere (Jackson & van Olphen 1991; Li et al. 1996a, 1999), each test was carried out using either a petri dish or a specially made preypreference testing box (hereafter called simply "box"). A trial began when the salticid entered the petri dish or a cell in the box. It ended when either the salticid captured a prey or 15 min had elapsed. However, if the salticid was stalking a prey when the 15-min period had elapsed, observations continued until the predatory sequence was over.

# Alternate-day tests

Each salticid was used in a pair of trials (one type of prey on one day and the other type on the following day). For half of the salticids of each species, the first trial was with an ant (Group A); for the other half, the first trial was with the other type of insect (Group B). Salticids were assigned to Groups A and B at random.

# Simultaneous-presentation tests

Two prey (one ant and one other insect) were put inside a petri dish or box cell. To begin testing, a salticid was allowed to enter. The trial ended when the salticid took one of the two prey (i.e., the salticid was not allowed to take them both). Occasionally, the ant killed the other insect before the salticid made a predatory attack. When this happened, testing was terminated.

## Alternative-prey tests

In one trial, a salticid had access to an ant while feeding on another type of insect. In another trial, on the preceding or succeeding day, the same salticid had access to another type of insect while feeding on an ant. For each combination of prey and salticid species, half of the salticids were feeding on an ant on the first day and half on the other insect on the first day. Salticids were assigned to the two groups at random.

# Data analysis

In alternate-day testing, only those test-pairs in which the salticid took one prey type but not the other provided evidence of preference. In simultaneous-presentation tests, a series of tests in which one type of prey was consistently taken more often than the other provided evidence of preference. In alternative-prey tests, only those testpairs in which the salticid dropped one prey to take the other, but not vice versa, provided evidence of preference.

The prey attacked was recorded as the salticid's choice, but analysing data separately for eating prey, instead of simply attacking it, did not alter the *P*-values given in Tables 4–6. This was because a salticid only rarely failed to eat a prey after attacking it and, in simultaneous-presentation tests, spiders only rarely failed to eat the prey attacked first.

# Testing for prey preference using motionless lures outside webs

Alternate-day and simultaneous-presentation testing was done with lures using apparatus and procedures detailed elsewhere (Li et al. 1996). For alternate-day testing, a single-arm ("linear") wooden platform was used as a choice ramp, whereas the choice ramp for simultaneous-presentation testing was a Yshaped 2-arm wooden platform. The arms were 40 mm wide and angled up at 20°. The single arm

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Drops other insect to attack ant	Drops ant to attack other insect	Drops each to attack other	Drops neither	McNemar test
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	16	0	0	15	P < 0.001
durvillei		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	15	1	0	17	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Tetraponera sp.	12	0	0	16	P < 0.001
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	10	0	0	16	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	9	0	0	18	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	7	0	0	16	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Camponotus gigas	9	0	1	7	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	15	2	0	18	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	8	0	0	16	P < 001
		Orthoptera: unknown	Polyrachis sp.	6	´ 0	0	16	P < 0.01
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	10	0	0	19	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	16	1	0	16	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	15	1	0	18	P < 0.001
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	19	0	0	14	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	9	1	0	20	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	7	0	0	8	P < 0.05
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	. 1	0	29		NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Polyrachis sp.	3	2	0	13	NS
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	2	0	0	24	NS
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp.	Tetraponera sp.	3	1	1	12	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum		0	0	30	NS
Zonodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Blattodea: Blattella sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	9	0	0	8	P < 0.01
metallescens		Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	13	0	0	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	17	2	0	18	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	15	2	1	13	P < 0.01
		Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Polyrachis sp.	21	1	1	13	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Sciara sp.	Camponotus gigas	7	0	0	5	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	8	1	0	17	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Tapinoma sp.	17	0	0	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	12	0	0	5	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	0	0	4	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	13	1	1	10	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	18	1	0	11	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tapinoma sp.	12	0	0	8	P < 0.001

		Lepidoptera: <i>Calioptilia</i> sp. larva Lepidoptera: <i>Capua</i> sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina Camponotus gigas	8 10	0 0	0 0	4 5	<i>P</i> < 0.01 <i>P</i> < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	7	0	0	5	P < 0.01 P < 0.01
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	9	0	0	22	P < 0.01
	limited diet <sup>4</sup>	i socopiera. Letopsocus eurjornicus	monomorium unturcticum	7	0	0	22	1 < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	14	2	0	12	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	11	0	0	19	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	16	1	0	22	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis sp.	16	1	0	24	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	7	0	0	22	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	6	0	0	13	P < 0.05 o
		Hemiptera: Ricania sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	0	0	13	P < 0.05 of $P < 0.01$
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	15	2	1	19	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	14	2	0	12	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	0	0	10	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	10	0	0	14	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	11	1	1	9	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	10	0	0	30	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Camponotus gigas	3	1	0	23	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	5	2	ŏ	24	NS
		Diptera: <i>Gynoplistia</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	3	ī	1	16	NS
		Hemiptera: Macrosyphum euphorbiae	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	1	1	Ō	25	NS
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	$\hat{2}$	ĩ	ŏ	45	NS
		Hemiptera: <i>Ricania</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	$\frac{1}{2}$	Ô	ŏ	17	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tapinoma sp.	5	1	Ő	28	NS
		Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	4	2	ŏ	16	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	1	õ	0	22	NS
- ·	and limited diet <sup>4</sup>			-	0	0	0	<b>D</b> 0.01
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: <i>Gynoplistia</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	0	0	9	P < 0.01
orbiculatus		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	13	2	0	10	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	13	0	0	18	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	13	1	0	14	P < 0.01
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	8	0	0	9	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Camponotus sp.	10	2	0	22	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	6	0	0	12	<i>P</i> < 0.05
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Acropyga sp.	7	0	0	11	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	2	1	12	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Camponotus gigas	6	0	0	16	<i>P</i> < 0.05
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	8	0	0	15	<i>P</i> < 0.01
	Well fed <sup>1</sup> and limited diet <sup>4</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	10	1	0	20	<i>P</i> < 001

Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

continued over page  $\frac{\omega}{\omega}$ 

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	D Ant	Drops other Drops insect to ant to attack attack ant other inse	Drops ant to attack other insect	Drops each to attack other	Drops neither	Drops McNemar neither test
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	7	0	0	11	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	10	1	0	16	P < 0.01
		Diptera: unknown dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	7	0	0	10	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Camponotus sp.	9	0	0	19	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: unknown mirid	Crematogaster sp.	6	1	0	10	P < 0.05
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	8	-	0	12	P < 0.05
	Starved <sup>2</sup> and	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	0	0	0	34	NS
	limited diet <sup>4</sup>		,	Ċ		c	ı e	
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	7	7	0	25	SZ
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	7	0	1	27	NS
		Hemiptera: unknown cicadellid	Camponotus sp.	0	1	0	24	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>1</sup>	Psocoptera: Ectopsocus californicus	Monomorium antarcticum	0	0	0	34	NS
	and limited diet							
<sup>1</sup> Kept withou	t prey for 7 days pric	<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.	ys prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept withou	ut prey for	21 days prio	r to testin	வ்	

Reared on diet of only *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Musca domestica*. (All others reared on varied diet.)

used for alternate-day testing was 100 mm long, whereas each of the two arms (ends of the Y) used for simultaneouspresentation testing was 50 mm long (stem of the Y also 50 mm long). On both types of choice ramps, arms always ended at a "wall" (a 55 mm high, 40 mm wide and 15 mm thick piece of brown wood glued perpendicular to the top end of the arm). The salticid walked up the arm and viewed a lure centred 10 mm in front of the wall.

Lures were made by killing an insect by asphyxiation with  $CO_2$ , placing it in alcohol for 1 h, then mounting it in a lifelike posture on the centre of one side of a disc-shaped piece of cork. The cork was in diameter 1–2 times the body length of the insect. The insect and cork were sprayed with an aerosol plastic adhesive (for preservation and to eliminate the potential of olfactory cues being present on the dead insect) and left to air out for at least 24 h before being used. During testing, salticids were not allowed to contact lures.

Before testing began, the salticid was kept until quiescent in a covered pit near the lower end of the ramp. Tests were allowed to start by removing the cover. Successful tests ended when the spider moved past the threshold on an arm. The threshold was a line 10 mm below where the two arms of the Y-shaped ramp joined (40 mm from the centre of the pit) or a line at the same distance from the pit on the linear ramp. After uncovering the pit, tests were aborted if the salticid failed to come out within 30 min or came out, but then moved off the ramp before reaching the threshold. When tests were aborted, the salticid was tested repeatedly up to four times a day, then on subsequent days, until a successful test was completed or four days of unsuccessful testing elapsed.

# Testing for prey preference using motionless lures in webs

Modified ramps were used. Instead of being rectangular, the wall was round (diameter 172 mm). A cavity (diameter

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant only	Chose other insect only	Chose both	Chose neither	McNemar test
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	25	2	3	10	<i>P</i> < 0.001
durvellei		Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	26	3	5	11	P < 0.001
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	19	1	5	8	P < 0.001
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	18	2	3	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	13	2	5	1	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	13	1	8	6	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	28	5	10	8	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	16	2	6	9	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	22	5	12	4	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	25	5	12	3	P < 0.01
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	24	6	12	5	P < 0.01
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	15	3	8	2	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	10	1	8	0	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	15	3	9	3	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Polyrachis sp.	9	4	18	0	NS
	Entra star toa	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	5	5	20	Ő	NS
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	4	3	$\tilde{20}$	1	NS
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	3	4	18	ō	NS
		Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	8	3	17	2	NS
Zonodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Blattodea: <i>Blattella</i> sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	21	3	3	10	P < 0.001
metallescens	Well Iou	Diptera: <i>Calliphora</i> sp.	Camponotus gigas	27	5	3	11	P < 0.001
meraneseens		Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Myrmecia nigriceps	24	4	3	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	19	2	9	2	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Polyrachis sp.	16	3	9	6	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	20	2	4	11	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	37	6	11	18	P < 0.001
		Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Polyrachis sp.	27	5	16	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: <i>Sciara</i> sp.	Crematogaster gigas	14	1	3	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	24	3	2	9	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	16	2	$\frac{2}{2}$	7	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: <i>Macrotermes gilvus</i>	Acropyga sp.	23	$\frac{2}{2}$	$\frac{2}{6}$	12	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: <i>Macrolermes</i> givus	Camponotus sp.	23	$\frac{2}{3}$	4	11	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: <i>Calioptilia</i> sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	14	0	2	14	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: <i>Capua</i> sp. laiva	Camponotus gigas	12	1	ے 1	8	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: <i>Cuput</i> sp. Lepidoptera: <i>Autoba</i> sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	12	1	2	8	P < 0.01

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant only	Chose other insect only	Chose both	Chose neither	McNemar test
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	19	2	1	8	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	16	0	5	5	P < 0.001
		Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	11	0	6	4	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	25	5	8	5	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	13	2	17	0	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	23	3	10	4	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	37	8	18	13	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis sp.	15	2	8	2	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	19	3	6	3	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	16	3	4	3	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	27	4	11	6	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	22	2	9	7	P < 0.001
		Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	13	2	2	3	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Autoba sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	11	1	4	2	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	1	5	3	P < 0.001
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	14	2	10	5	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	9	1	2	4	P < 0.05
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	4	5	21	1	NS
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	5	2	28	5	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	8	4	34	12	NS
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	7	2	19	2	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	5	1	12	3	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	6	4	21	5	NS
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	7	4	11	2	NS
		Mantodea: <i>Orthodera</i> sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	3	2	21	5	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	20	2	5	6	P < 0.001
orbiculatus		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	25	5	8	11	P < 0.001
0,0101111110		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	26	5	9	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	29	6	5	10	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	26	6	9	10	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	15	2	15	1	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	15	1	3	6	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Aleurodicus dispersus	Acropyga sp.	18	ĩ	2	9	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Oecophylla smaragdina	28	6	10	12	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	23	3	15	5	P < 0.001

New Zealand Journal of Zoology, 2001, Vol. 28

# Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

	Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Oecophylla smaragdina Camponotus sp.	15 11	00	ლ <u>ო</u>	% O	P < 0.01 P < 0.05
Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	21	9	Ξ	5	P < 0.01
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	23	9	10	9	P < 0.01
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	25	Ś	6	6	P < 0.001
	Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	L	0	18	S	P < 0.01
	Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	12	0	10	n	P < 0.01
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	20	ç	18	S	P < 0.001
Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	10	4	25	2	NS
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	13	S	20	S	SN
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	6	4	23	9	NS
	Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	4	4	20	-	NS
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	ŝ	4	24	с	NS
<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days pr	Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.	tys prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept withou	t prey for	21 days pr	ior to testir	ારે.	

170 mm, depth 10 mm) in the wall held an open plastic petri dish with matching diameter and depth. The petri dish contained a vacant web spun by an adult female of *Badumna longinqua*. This Australian species has long been established in New Zealand where its cribellate sheet webs are now commonly found in and around houses. Webs were obtained by maintaining *B. longinqua* females (one per dish for 14 days) without prey, then removing the spiders (without noticeably damaging the webs) and keeping the dishes open for another 7 days. No eggs were present in any of the webs used.

During testing, a lure was positioned in the centre of the web (facing down) in the open petri dish. Lures could readily be kept in place because of the adhesive properties of the cribellate silk spun by *B*. *longinqua*. Positioned in the web were two blank cork disks (same diameter as lure), each half way between the lure and the side of the petri dish (one on the left, one on the right), and equidistant from the bottom and top ends of the dish.

During tests where there were no webs, spiders were not permitted to reach the end of the ramp. However, reaching the end of the ramp was permitted in tests with webs. Two criteria were used for "choice" in tests with webs; approach web and enter web. In these tests, the definition of approaching a web was, as during tests in which there were lures but no webs present, crossing the threshold 40 mm from the pit. Entering a web was defined as leaping from the side of the petri dish toward one of the corks between the side of the dish and the lure.

The Zenodorus species could not move unimpaired across the sticky cribellate silk of *B. longinqua*. Sometimes they placed their legs momentarily on the silk, but approaching lures was always by leaping to a cork rather than by attempting to walk across the web. If the spider left the ramp, went under the ramp or moved below the demarcation line without first leaping toward a cork, only the first criterion for recording a choice was used and the test ended. Otherwise the test ended when the second criterion for choice was met.

# RESULTS

Well-fed and starved spiders that had been reared on a varied diet showed significant preference for ants in alternate-day (Table 5), simultaneouspresentation (Table 6) and alternative-prey tests

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant	Chose other insect	Chose neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Fruit fly, Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	22	2	13	P < 0.001
durvillei		Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	23	2	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	26	5	12	P < 0.001
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	23	2	5	P < 0.001
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	12	0	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	15	1	9	P < 0.010
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	17	1	8	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	22	3	12	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Tetraponera puntulata	16	2	4	P < 0.01
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	19	2	7	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Monomorium antarcticum	14	1	10	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Tapinoma sp.	24	4	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	22	5	6	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	28	6	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	21	3	8	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	13	2	3	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	22	5	7	P < 0.01
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Monomorium antarcticum	13	2	8	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Polyrachis sp.	13	7	6	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	15	11	8	NS
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	10	9	9	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	9	12	7	NS
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	12	11	11	NS
		Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	7	4	NS
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Monomorium antarcticum	17	15	9	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Blattodea: Blattella sp.	Polyrachis bicolor	13	1	9	P < 0.01
metallescens		Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	1	12	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	21	2	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster gigas	25	2	9	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	28	3	8	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis spp.	25	2	7	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	20	2	7	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	13	0	8	P < 0.001

# Table 9 Results from simultaneous-presentation tests using lures. Lure not in web. Zenodorus spp. chose ants more often than other insects.

Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

	Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Adlerzia sp.	19	5	13	<i>P</i> < 0.01
	Hemiptera: <i>Siphanta</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	12	2	4	P < 0.01
	Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	28	4	10	P < 0.001
	Isoptera: <i>Nasutitermes</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	29	4	9	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: <i>Calioptilia</i> sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	16	i	12	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	19	2	9	<i>P</i> < 0.011
	Lepidoptera: unknown noctuid adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	14	1	10	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: <i>Eristena</i> sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	Ó	7	P < 0.001
	Mantodes: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	20	2	17	P < 0.001
	Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	24	3	15	P < 0.001
	Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Polyrachis sp.	11	0	12	P < 0.001
	Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	9	0	6	P < 0.01
Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Calliphora sp.	Camponotus gigas	20	3	6	P < 0.001
	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	22	5	16	P < 0.01
	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster sp.	27	4	5	P < 0.001
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	37	8	12	P < 0.001
	Diptera: Culex sp.	Polyrachis sp.	20	4	4	P < 0.001
	Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	15	2	4	P < 0.01
	Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	13	2	4	P < 0.01
	Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	18	4	4	P < 0.01
	Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Acropyga sp.	23	6	5	P < 0.01
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	26	6	5	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: Calioptilia sp. larva	Oecophylla smaragdina	9	1	5	P < 0.05
	Lepidoptera: Autoba sp. adult	Oecophylla smaragdina	16	2	4	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: unknown noctuid adult	Camponotus sp.	18	2	6	P < 0.001
	Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	14	1	4	P < 0.001
	Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	16	3	10	P < 0.01
	Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	<i>Tapinoma</i> sp.	20	5	8	P < 0.01
	Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Polyrachis sp.	22	3	8	P < 0.001
	Orthoptera: unknown	Oecophylla smaragdina	10	1	5	P < 0.01
Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster gigas	22	10	3	NS
	Diptera: Lucilia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	14	12	6	NS
	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	20	11	4	NS
	Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	17	9	3	NS
	Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	11	5	4	NS
	Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	15	11	2	NS
	Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	17	9	5	NS
	Lepidoptera: unknown noctuid	Camponotus sp.	3	4	22	NS
	Lepidoptera: Eristena sp. adult	Tetraponera sp.	12	5	3	NS

3 NS 3 continued over page 9

Table 9	Continued

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant	Chose other insect	Chose neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	15	10	7	NS
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	20	15	2	NS
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	13	13	3	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Gynoplistia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	17	1	9	P < 0.001
orbiculatus		Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	22	4	14	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	22	1	12	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	29	3	10	P < 0.001
		Diptera: dolichopodid	Camponotus gigas	23	2	12	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	20	2	15	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	25	3	8	P < 0.010
		Isoptera: Macrotermes gilvus	Oecophylla smaragdina	22	2	13	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	27	7	18	P < 0.001
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	11	2	5	P < 0.05
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	13	1	6	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	16	3	6	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	26	3	7	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	23	4	9	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Mirid	Crematogaster sp.	25	6	10	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	21	2	7	P < 0.010
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	24	4	6	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	10	1	2	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Drosophila melanogaster	Crematogaster borneensis	17	10	5	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Epopostruma frosti	19	9	4	NS
		Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	22	17	5	NS
		Hemiptera: Mirid	Crematogaster sp.	17	13	4	NS
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	14	14	6	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	20	19	5	NS
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	12	10	3	NS

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

320

(Table 7) with living prey despite the diverse array of ant species and other prey species we used. However, when extra-starved spiders were tested, findings were not significant in any of the types of tests (Tables 5–7), providing no evidence of preference.

In alternate-day and simultaneous-presentation tests, well-fed and starved salticids reared on a varied diet chose lures made from dead, motionless ants more often than they chose lures made from other kinds of insects, but showed no preference when extra-starved (Tables 8 and 9). Although salticids tended to ignore motionless lures longer than living prey, the behaviour the salticid directed toward lures made from ants and lures made from other insects were otherwise comparable to the salticid's respective prey-capture behaviour against the corresponding living prey.

Findings from testing spiders reared on the limited diet were different (Tables 5–7). When salticids were well fed, there was a pronounced preference for ants in alternate-day, simultaneous-presentation and alternative-prey tests (Tables 5–7). There was also a pronounced preference for ants in simultaneous-presentation tests when salticids were starved (Table 6). However, no preference was evident in alternate-day or alternative-prey tests of starved salticids (Tables 5 and 7).

By both criteria for choice (approached web and entered web), findings from alternate-day testing using lures in webs (Table 10) matched the findings from using lures outside webs (Table 8). That is, well-fed and starved spiders in alternate-day tests chose lures made from ants, whether in or out of webs, more often than they chose lures made from other kinds of insects, but showed no preference when extra-starved.

By both criteria, well-fed and starved spiders in simultaneous-presentation tests chose lures in webs made from ants more often than they chose lures made from other kinds of insects, but showed no preference when extra-starved (Table 11). These findings matched the findings from tests using lures outside webs (Table 9). However, for extrastarved spiders, findings when lures were in webs depended on the criterion used for inferring that the spider made a choice. When the criterion was approaching the web, extra-starved spiders showed no evidence of preference. However, when the criterion was entering the web, extra-starved spiders chose ants more often than other insects (Table 11). Additional data analysis was carried out to look specifically at the relationship between strength of the preference for ants (i.e., strength of the bias toward choosing lures made from ants), the type of test and the criterion for choice. For this, we compared data from tests in which the same pairs of lures (i.e., same two insect species) were used in tests with and without webs present (Tables 12–19). All comparisons were made using chi-square tests of independence with Bonferroni adjustments (Rice 1989; Sokal & Rohlf 1995).

The salticid's tendency to make a choice at all, regardless of which lure was chosen, is considered first. When the criterion for having made a choice was only that the salticid approached the lure, there was no statistical evidence that whether the lure was in or out of a web influenced the salticid's tendency to choose during either alternate-day (Table 12) or simultaneous-presentation testing (Table 13). When the choice-making criterion met by the salticid was to enter the web during tests with lures in webs, and simply approach the lure during tests with lures outside webs, choices were made significantly more often in tests with lures away from webs (Tables 14 and 15). These trends held for each species of Zenodorus, for each pairing of lures and for each of the three hunger states of the spiders.

The influence of whether lures were in or away from webs on the strength of the preference for ant lures is considered next. When the criterion for having made a choice was simply approaching the lure, there was no statistical evidence in alternateday or simultaneous-presentation tests that the strength of the preference for ants, regardless of the salticid's hunger level, depended on whether the ant was in or out of a web (Tables 16 and 17). When the criterion for having made a choice during tests with lures in webs was that the spider entered the web, there was no statistical evidence that the strength of the preference for ants, regardless of the salticid's hunger level, depended on whether the ant was in or out of a web during alternate-day tests (Table 18), but findings from simultaneouspresentation tests depended on hunger level. There was no statistical evidence that the strength of the preference for ants depended on whether the ant was in or away from webs in simultaneous-presentation tests when the salticid was well-fed or starved, but there was a significantly stronger preference for ants when salticids were extra-starved. These conclusions held for each species of Zenodorus and each pairing of two types of lures (Table 19).

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Choice criterion	Chose ant only	Chose other insect only	Chose both	Chose neithe	
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	27	4	11	21	<i>P</i> < 0.001
durvillei				Entered web	8	0	2	53	P < 0.01
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	28	2	16	17	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		-1		Entered web	11	0	1	51	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Monomorium	Approached web	26	4	20	18	P < 0.001
		nigropictus	antarcticum	Entered web	6	0	2	60	P < 0.05
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	29	6	19	14	P < 0.001
		1	1	Entered web	8	0	0	60	P < 0.01
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	<i>Camponotus</i> sp.	Approached web	26	5	20	13	P < 0.001
		I I I	7 1	Entered web	10	0	2	52	<i>P</i> < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Monomorium	Approached web	35	8	19	14	P < 0.001
		nigropictus	antarcticum	Entered web	10	0	1	65	<i>P</i> < 0.001
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	4	5	33	12	NS
		•	-	Entered web	1	0	9	44	NS
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	6	5	31	15	NS
				Entered web	1	0	5	51	NS
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Monomorium	Approached web	6	4	27	13	NS
		nigropictus	antarcticum	Entered web	1	0	6	43	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	28	7	18	22	P < 0.001
orbiculatus			smaragdina	Entered web	8	0	2	65	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	29	5	22	24	P < 0.001
		nigropictus		Entered web	10	0	2	68	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	32	9	19	21	P < 0.001
				Entered web	11	1	2	67	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	23	3	29	14	P < 0.001
			smaragdina	Entered web	9	0	4	56	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	27	7	25	14	P < 0.001
		nigropictus		Entered web	8	0	3	62	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	30	9	27	13	P < 0.001
				Entered web	11	1	8	59	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	9	7	33	14	NS
			smaragdina	Entered web	2	0	13	48	NS

**Table 10**Alternate-day tests using lures. Lures in web of Badumna longinqua. Web in petri dish at end of ramp. Zenodorus spp. chose ants more often than other insects.

		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	4	6	29	15	NS
		nigropictus		Entered web	0	0	13	41	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	5	5	31	14	NS
		1 1	1 1	Entered web	1	0	15	39	NS
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	32	10	7	25	P < 0.001
metallescens		*	× 1	Entered web	11	0	0	53	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	33	14	8	24	P < 0.01
				Entered web	8	0	0	71	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	39	17	12	17	P < 0.01
				Entered web	19	3	0	63	P < 0.001
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	33	9	7	22	P < 0.001
		-	antarcticum	Entered web	11	0	0	60	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	35	11	13	20	P < 0.001
		-		Entered web	16	2	0	61	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	37	13	15	17	P < 0.001
				Entered web	20	2	0	60	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	33	10	18	22	P < 0.001
				Entered web	15	3	1	64	P < 0.01
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	35	10	17	20	P < 0.001
			antarcticum	Entered web	16	1	1	64	P < 0.001
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	3	5	37	15	NS
				Entered web	1	0	15	44	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	8	7	35	17	NS
				Entered web	1	0	15	51	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	4	6	35	15	NS
				Entered web	0	0	20	40	NS
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	4	4	36	19	NS
			antarcticum	Entered web	0	0	16	47	NS

<sup>1</sup>Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup>Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup>Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing. Approached web: came close to the lure while still on ramp. Entered web: leapt from side of petri dish to cork between side of dish and lure (see text).

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Choice criterion	Chose ant	Chose other insect	Chose neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	34	10	30	<i>P</i> < 0.001
durvillei		-	-	Entered web	13	0	61	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	38	12	28	P < 0.001
		· ·	antarcticum	Entered web	10	0	68	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	35	11	25	P < 0.001
		*	· ·	Entered web	15	0	56	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex	Approached web	31	9	20	P < 0.001
			darwinanus	Entered web	8	0	52	P < 0.01
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	39	15	23	P < 0.01
		-	-	Entered web	11	1	65	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	36	13	23	<i>P</i> < 0.01
			antarcticum	Entered web	17	0	55	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	38	12	21	P < 0.001
		•	· ·	Entered web	12	0	59	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex	Approached web	35	10	25	P < 0.001
			darwinanus	Entered web	11	0	59	<i>P</i> < 0.001
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	Approached web	30	23	15	NS
		,	-	Entered web	21	1	46	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	32	24	15	NS
			antarcticum	Entered web	9	0	62	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	33	24	18	NS
		•	· ·	Entered web	20	0	55	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex	Approached web	29	20	19	NS
			darwinanus	Entered web	11	0	57	P < 0.001
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	36	12	22	P < 0.001
orbiculatus			smaragdina	Entered web	14	2	54	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	36	10	25	P < 0.001
		nigropictus		Entered web	10	0	61	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	32	12	29	P < 0.01
		1	0 1	Entered web	12	0	61	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	43	20	19	P < 0.01
				Entered web	22	5	55	P < 0.01
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	35	10	29	P < 0.001
		•	· ·	Entered web	15	1	58	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	42	16	25	P < 0.001
		*	smaragdina	Entered web	21	2	60	P < 0.001

 Table 11
 Simultaneous-presentation tests using lures. Lure in web of Badumna longinqua. Web in petri dish at end of ramp. Zenodorus spp. chose ants more often than other insects. Tests from using lures. All salticids well fed.

New Zealand Journal of Zoology, 2001, Vol. 28

324

		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	39	11	22	P < 0.001
				Entered web	12	0	60	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	37	5	28	P < 0.001
				Entered web	16	0	54	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	38	15	21	P < 0.01
		1 1	, ,	Entered web	20	2	52	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	37	13	20	P < 0.001
			r otyraenio opi	Entered web	9	0	61	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla	Approached web	29	24	15	NS
			smaragdina	Entered web	14	Õ	51	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	30	21	14	NS
		Hemptera. Reprotenta mgropietas	Cumponotus sp.	Entered web	19	21	44	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	Approached web	25	21	12	NS
		memplera. minu	Cremulogusier sp.	11			48	
		Landard Manufidance and	Communication and	Entered web	10	0		P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	27	25	12	NS
				Entered web	15	3	46	P < 0.01 ,
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	30	23	15	NS
	1			Entered web	11	0	57	P < 0.001
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	32	12	27	P < 0.01
metallescens				Entered web	11	0	60	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla	Approached web	35	14	30	P < 0.01
			smaragdina	Entered web	13	0	66	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	30	10	26	P < 0.01
				Entered web	10	0	56	P < 0.001
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	34	13	29	P < 0.01
		- r	<i>I</i>	Entered web	13	2	61	P < 0.01
		Mantodes: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	37	11	27	P < 0.001
			antarcticum	Entered web	12	0	63	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	Approached web	36	12	23	P < 0.001
		reuroptera. mieromus rusmamae	rupinonu sp.	Entered web	10	0	63	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla	Approached web	35	15	28	P < 0.01
		Orgiopiera. Menoche maoricum	smaragdina	Entered web	11	0	28 71	P < 0.001
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica			36	12	24	P < 0.001 P < 0001
	Starveu-	Dipiera. Musca aomestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web				
		Distance I. III an	0 1 11	Entered web	13	1	67 25	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla	Approached web	38	13	25	P < 0.001
			smaragdina	Entered web	16	2	58	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	31	11	24	P < 0.01
				Entered web	10	0	58	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	38	17	21	P < 0.01
				Entered web	19	3	56	P < 0.001
		Mantodes: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	35	10	21	P < 0.001
			antarcticum	Entered web	10	0	54	P < 0.01

continued over page

325

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Choice criterion	Chose ant	Chose other insect	Chose neither	Test of Goodness of Fit
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	Approached web	29	10	20	P < 0.01
		L		Entered web	9	0	50	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla	Approached web	31	10	20	P < 0.01
			smaragdina	Entered web	8	0	53	P < 0.01
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	Approached web	36	22	17	NS
				Entered web	21	1	53	P < 0.001
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla	Approached web	22	16	21	NS
			smaragdina	Entered web	9	0	50	P < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	26	18	18	NS
				Entered web	13	1	48	P < 0.01
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	Approached web	24	24	23	NS
				Entered web	13	0	58	P < 0.001
		Mantodes: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium	Approached web	26	20	21	NS
			antarcticum	Entered web	9	0	58	P < 0.01
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	<i>Tapinoma</i> sp.	Approached web	23	20	15	NS
				Entered web	9	0	49	P < 0.01
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla	Approached web	21	16	10	NS
			smaragdina	Entered web	8	0	39	P < 0.01

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

# Jackson & Li—Ant-eating jumping spiders

Table 12 Additional analysis of data from alternate-day tests. Choosing in tests with lures in web defined as
moving toward web (not necessarily entering web). All comparisons (tests of independence for each row) NS.
For data and sample sizes, see Tables 7 and 9

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose <sup>4</sup> a prey in tests using lures away from web:	Chose <sup>4</sup> a prey in tests using lures s in webs
Zenodorus durvillei	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	76%	67%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	77%	73%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	71%	72%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	86%	79%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	93%	80%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	86%	82%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	88%	78%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	84%	74%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	81%	74%
Zenodorus orbiculatus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	80%	71%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	78%	70%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	85%	74%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	81%	80%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	83%	81%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	89%	84%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	86%	78%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	82%	72%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	91%	75%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	75%	66%
metallescens		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp	. 80%	70%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	76%	80%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	81%	69%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	83%	75%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp		79%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	83%	73%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	96%	76%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	75%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Crematogaster sp		75%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	75%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	84%	70%

<sup>1</sup>Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup>Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup>Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing. <sup>4</sup>Chose: met criterion for choice in at least one trial in the pair of trials carried out on each individual salticid.

# 328

Table 13Additional analysis of data from simultaneous-presentation tests. Choosing in tests with lures in webdefined as moving toward web (not necessarily entering web). All comparisons (tests of independence for each row)NS. For data and sample sizes, see Tables 8 and 10.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect		•	Chose a prey in ests using es in webs
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	71%	59%
durvillei		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	72%	64%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	64%	65%
		Hemiptera: Delphacidae, Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	69%	63%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	79%	70%
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	82%	68%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	83%	70%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	79%	64%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	<i>Prolasius</i> sp.	76%	78%
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	68%	79%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	75%	76%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	68%	72%
Zenodorus orbiculatus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	65%	69%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	78%	65%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	59%	60%
		Isoptera: <i>Nasutitermes</i> sp. Neuroptera:	<i>Camponotus</i> sp. <i>Polyrachis</i> sp.	65% 70%	77% 61%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Micromus tasmaniae	Qaaankulla umanadi	na 64%	70%
	Starveu-	Diptera: <i>Musca domestica</i> Hemiptera: <i>Nephotettix nigropictus</i>	Oecophylla smaragdi Camponotus sp.	77%	70% 69%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	76%	60%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	82%	72%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	85%	71%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdi	na 87%	78%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	82%	78%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	88%	79%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	89%	81%
	1	Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	88%	78%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	62%
metallescens		Diptera: fly, Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdi		62%
		Hemiptera: <i>Siphanta</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	78%	61%
		Isoptera: <i>Nasutitermes</i> sp. Mantodea: <i>Orthodera</i> sp.	Camponotus sp. Monomorium antarcticum	67% 56%	62% 64%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	64%	68%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	64%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	67%
					continued

continued

Jackson & Li—Ant-eating jumping spiders

# Table 13Continued

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	test	ose a pre s using li way fror webs	ures a prey in
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	63%	67%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	85%	64%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	72%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	66%	68%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	76%	66%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	76%	67%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	89%	77%
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	81%	64%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	93%	71%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	79%	68%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	78%	70%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	95%	74%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	90%	79%

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

**Table 14**Additional analysis of data from alternate-day tests using lures. Choosing lures in web defined by enteringweb. All comparisons (tests of independence for each row) P < 0.001. For data and sample sizes, see Tables 7 and 9.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect		Chose <sup>4</sup> a prey in ests using lures away from webs l	
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	76%	16%
durvillei		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	77%	19%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	71%	12%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	93%	12%
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	93%	19%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	86%	16%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	88%	19%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	96%	11%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	81%	14%
Zenodorus orbiculatus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	80%	13%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	97%	15%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	89%	17%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smarage	dina 81%	19%

continued over page

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect		hose <sup>4</sup> a prey i sts using lure away from webs	
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	83%	15%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	89%	25%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragd	ina 86%	24%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	97%	24%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	91%	29%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	75%	14%
metallescens		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	80%	10%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	76%	26%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	81%	15%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	83%	23%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	88%	27%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	83%	23%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	96%	22%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	27%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Crematogaster sp.	86%	24%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	33%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	84%	25%

Table 14Continued

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing, <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing, <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing. <sup>4</sup> Chose: met criterion for choice in at least one test in the pair of tests carried out on each individual salticid.

Table 15Additional analysis of data from simultaneous-presentation tests using lures. Choosing in tests with luresin web defined as entering web. All comparisons (tests of independence for each row) P < 0.001. For data and samplesizes, see Tables 8 and 10.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Cho	se a prey in using lures away from webs	a prey in
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	71%	18%
durvillei		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	72%	13%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	64%	21%
		Hemiptera: Delphacidae, Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	69%	13%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	79%	16%
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	82%	24%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	83%	28%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	79%	16%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	76%	32%
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	68%	13%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	75%	27%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	68%	16%

330

continued

# Table 15Continued

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Cho	ose a prey in using lures away from webs	s a prey in
			······		
Zenodorus orbiculatus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: <i>Musca domestica</i> Hemiptera: <i>Nephotettix nigropictus</i>	Oecophylla smaragdina Camponotus sp.	65% 78%	23% 14%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	59%	16%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	65%	33%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	70%	22%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	64%	28%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	77%	17%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	76%	23%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	83%	30%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	85%	13%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	87%	21%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	82%	32%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	88%	17%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	89%	28%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	88%	16%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	15%
metallescens		Diptera: fly, <i>Lucillia</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	57%	16%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	78%	15%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	67%	20%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum		16%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	64%	14%
	2	Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	13%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	79%	17%
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	63%	24%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	85%	15%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	37%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum		16%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	76%	15%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Oecophylla smaragdina	76%	13%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	89%	29%
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	81%	15%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	93%	23%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	79%	18%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticun		13%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	87%	16% 17%
		Orthoptera: <i>Metioche maoricum</i>	Oecophylla smaragdina	90%	11%

<sup>1</sup>Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup>Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup>Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

**Table 16** Additional analysis of data from alternate-day tests using lures. No evidence that strength of preference for ants depends on whether lure is in a web or away from webs (tests of independence NS for all rows). Data in this table are from only those test pairs in which salticid chose prey in a single test (see Tables 7 and 9). Choosing in tests with lures in web defined as moving toward web (not necessarily entering web).

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	nose ant in te using lures away from webs	ests Chose ant in tests using lures in webs
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	90%	87%
durvillei		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	90%	93%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticun	ı 87%	87%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	<i>Prolasius</i> sp.	83%	83%
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	83%	84%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticun	n 91%	81%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	50%	44%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	57%	55%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticun	ı 43%	60%
Zendorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	83%	80%
orbiculatus		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	88%	85%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	88%	78%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	83%	88%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	100%	79%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	87%	77%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	69%	56%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	50%	40%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	43%	50%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	86%	76%
metallescens		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	84%	70%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	90%	70%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum		79%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	82%	76%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	84%	74%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	92%	77%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum		78%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	67%	37%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	83%	53%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	60%	40%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	ı 60%	50%

<sup>1</sup>Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup>Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup>Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

Table 17Additional analysis of data from simultaneous-presentation tests using lures. No evidence that strength ofpreference for ants depends on whether lure is in a web or away from webs (tests of independence NS for all rows).Data in table are from only those tests in which salticid chose prey (see Tables 8 and 10). Choosing in tests with luresin web defined as moving toward web (not necessarily entering web).

				Chose ant in te using lures awa	
	Hunger			from	tests using
Salticid	state	Other insect	Ant	webs	lures in webs
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	92%	77%
durvillei		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticu	m 84%	76%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	94%	76%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus		77%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	82%	72%
	Starved	Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticu		78%
		Hemiptera: bug	Crematogaster sp.	87%	76%
		Hemiptera:	Iridomyrmex darwinanus		78%
		Nilaparvata lugens	Indomytmex dat windhad	5 6170	1070
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>		Prolasius sp.	58%	57%
	Extra-starveu		Monomorium antarcticu		57%
		Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.		43%	58%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.		59%
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus		
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	75%
orbiculatus		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	89%	78%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	91%	73%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	79%	68%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	93%	78%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	73%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	91%	78%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	81%	88%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	72%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	91%	74%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>		Oecophylla smaragdina	56%	55%
	Entra Star rea	Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	50%	59%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	57%	54%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	51%	52%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	55%	58%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	90%	73%
metallescens		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	94%	71%
metanescens		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	75%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	88%	72%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticu		77%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	89%	75%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Polyrachis sp.	100%	70%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	82%	75%
	Starrou	Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	81%	75%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	81%	74%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp. Camponotus sp.	81%	69%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticu		78%
		maniouca. Ormoueru sp.	monumonum unurcucu		

continued over page

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant in te using lures aw from webs	
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	80%	74%
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Polyrachis sp.	91%	76%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	65%	62%
		Diptera: <i>Lucillia</i> sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	54%	58%
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	58%	59%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	65%	50%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticu	m 60%	57%
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	57%	50%
		Orthoptera: <i>Metioche maoricum</i>	Oecophylla smaragdina	50%	57%

# Table 17Continued

<sup>1</sup>Kept without prey for 5 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup>Kept without prey for 15 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup>Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

**Table 18** Additional analysis of data from alternate-day tests using lures. No evidence that strength of preference for ants depends on whether lure is in a web or away from webs (tests of independence NS for all rows). Data in this table are from only those test pairs in which salticid chose prey in a single test (see Tables 7 and 9). Choosing in tests with lures in web defined as entering web.

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant in test using lures away from webs	ts Chose ant in tests using lures in webs
Zenodorus durvillei	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	90%	100%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	90%	100%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	n 87%	100%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	83%	100%
		Ephemeroptera: Baetis sp.	Camponotus sp.	83%	100%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticur	n 91%	100%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Prolasius sp.	50%	100%
		Ephemeroptera: <i>Baetis</i> sp.	Camponotus sp.	57%	100%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Monomorium antarcticum	n 43%	100%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	83%	100%
orbiculatus		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	88%	100%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	88%	92%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	83%	100%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	100%	100%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	87%	92%

continued

## Table 18 Continued

Salticid	Hunger state	Other insect	Ant	Chose ant in te using lures away from webs	sts Chose ant in tests using lures in webs
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	69%	100%
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	50%	100%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	43%	100%
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	86%	100%
metallescens	i	Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	89%	100%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	90%	86%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticur	n 100%	100%
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	82%	89%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	84%	91%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	92%	83%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	n 87%	94%
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	67%	100%
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	83%	100%
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	60%	100%
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticur	n 60%	100%

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

Table 19Additional analysis of data from simultaneous-presentation tests using lures. No evidence that strength of<br/>preference for ants depends on whether lure is in a web or away from webs when salticid is well fed or starved. For<br/>extra-starved salticids, preference for ants stronger when lure is in a web. Data in this table are from only tests in which<br/>spider chose prey (see Tables 8 and 10). Choosing in tests with lures in web defined as entering web.

		Other insect	Cho	se ant in tests using lur		
Salticid	Hunger state		Ant	away from webs	in webs	- of indepen- dence
Zenodorus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera:	Monomorium sp.	92%	100%	NS
durvillei		<i>Musca domestica</i> Diptera: <i>Culex</i> sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	ı 84%	100%	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid Hemiptera:	Crematogaster sp.	94%	100%	NS
		Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	94%	100%	NS
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	82%	92%	NS
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticun	ı 81%	100%	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	87%	100%	NS
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	81%	100%	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Monomorium sp.	58%	86%	P < 0.01
		Diptera: Culex sp.	Monomorium antarcticun	ı 53%	100%	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	43%	100%	P < 0.001
		Hemiptera: Nilaparvata lugens	Iridomyrmex darwinanus	52%	100%	P < 0.01

continued over page

		Other insect	Chos	se ant in tests using lure		
Salticid	Hunger state		Ant	away from webs	in webs	of indepen- dence
Zenodorus orbiculatus	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	87%	NS
orbiculdus		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	89%	100%	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	91%	100%	NS
		Isoptera:	Camponotus sp.	79%	81%	NS
		Nasutitermes sp. Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	93%	94%	NS
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Micromus iasmaniae Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina	85%	91%	NS
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	91%	100%	NS
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	81%	100%	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	91%	NS
	2	Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	91%	100%	NS
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Oecophylla smaragdina		100%	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Hemiptera: Nephotettix nigropictus	Camponotus sp.	50%	81%	<i>P</i> < 0.01
		Hemiptera: mirid	Crematogaster sp.	57%	100%	P < 0.05
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	51%	83%	P < 0.05
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Polyrachis sp.	55%	100%	<i>P</i> < 0.05
Zenodorus metallescer	Well fed <sup>1</sup>	Diptera:	Polyrachis sp. Musca domestica	90%	100%	NS
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina		100%	NS
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	86%	100%	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	88%	87%	NS
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	91%	100%	NS
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	89%	100%	NS
		Orthoptera: <i>Metioche maoricum</i>	Polyrachis sp.	100%	100%	<i>P</i> < 0.05
	Starved <sup>2</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	82%	93%	NS
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina		89%	NS
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	81%	100%	NS
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	81%	86%	NS
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticum	84%	100%	NS
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	80%	100%	NS
		Orthoptera: Metioche maoricum	Polyrachis sp.	91%	100%	NS

 Table 19
 Continued

336

continued

# Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

#### Table 19Continued

Salticid		Other insect	Chose ant in tests using lures Tes			
	Hunger state		Ant	way from webs	in webs	indepen- dence
	Extra-starved <sup>3</sup>	Diptera: Musca domestica	Polyrachis sp.	65%	95%	P < 0.05
		Diptera: Lucillia sp.	Oecophylla smaragdina	54%	100%	P < 0.05
		Hemiptera: Siphanta sp.	Camponotus sp.	58%	93%	P < 0.05
		Isoptera: Nasutitermes sp.	Camponotus sp.	65%	100%	P < 0.05
		Mantodea: Orthodera sp.	Monomorium antarcticu	m 60%	100%	P < 0.001
		Neuroptera: Micromus tasmaniae	Tapinoma sp.	57%	100%	P < 0.05
		Orthoptera: <i>Metioche maoricum</i>	Oecophylla smaragdina	50%	100%	P < 0.05

<sup>1</sup> Kept without prey for 7 days prior to testing. <sup>2</sup> Kept without prey for 14 days prior to testing. <sup>3</sup> Kept without prey for 21 days prior to testing.

# DISCUSSION

#### Specialisation in myrmecophagic salticids

All ants belong to a single family, Formicidae, in the order Hymenoptera. About 9000 species in 297 genera have been described. Twelve subfamilies are recognised, for most of which there is further division into tribes (Holldobler & Wilson 1990). In the present study, we used 17 genera from five subfamilies (Table 2), with representatives from two and four tribes of Dolichoderinae and Formicinae, respectively. Six of the genera were formicines, another six were myrmicines, three were dolichoderines, one was a myrmecine and one was a pseudomyrmecine.

The other insects came from ten orders (Table 2). We used an especially wide variety of Diptera (8 families represented), Hemiptera (8 families) and Lepidoptera (5 families). Hemiptera is divided into three suborders, and we used representatives of each: Stenorrhyncha (Aleyrodidae, Aphidae), Auchenorrhyncha (Cicadellidae, Cixiidae, Delphacidae, Flatidae, Ricaniidae) and Heteroptera (Miridae). Lepidoptera included both larvae (i.e., caterpillars) and adults. Otherwise, all holometabolous insects used were adults. The hemimetabolous insects we used included both adults and nymphs. Despite the wide range of ant species and other insects used, the three species of Zenodorus consistently chose ants more often than other prey.

Zenodorus durvillei, Z. metallescens and Z. orbiculatus, along with 21 species previously studied (Edwards et al., 1974; Cutler 1980; Jackson & van Olphen 1991, 1992; Jackson et al. 1998; Li et al. 1996, 1999), appear to be exceptions to the rule that salticids are averse to ants as prey (Bristowe 1941). "Myrmecophagic" is an appropriate term for these 24 species. It might also be appropriate to call these species "ant-specialists", but the term "specialist" can be applied to a variety of adaptations in a predator. Clarifying precisely how myrmecophagic salticids have become specialised on ants is one of our long-term goals.

One way in which myrmecophagic salticids are "specialists" is by having diets that are special: unlike the majority of salticids, they readily feed on ants. However, no myrmecophagic species are known to feed exclusively on ants. Instead, each of the 24 species studied also feeds on a wide range of other prey both in the laboratory and in nature (Jackson & van Olphen 1991, 1992; Jackson et al. 1998; Li et al. 1996, 1999).

Another way in which myrmecophagic species are specialised is by adopting special prey-capture tactics against ants. These tactics are preprogrammed (i.e., not dependent on prior experience with ants), consistent with these species having become adapted over evolutionary time to their unusual prey. However, details of prey-capture behaviour vary among the species. The higher order systematics of salticids is poorly understood, but the 24 myrmecophagic species can be assigned at least tentatively to three subfamilies, Aelurillinae (Aelurillus), Euophrynae (Chalcotropis, Anasaitis, Habrocestum, Xenocytaea, and Zenodorus) and Heliophanae (Chrysilla, Natta, and Siler). The myrmecophagic heliophanines routinely attack ants from directly behind in stab-and-release sequences. Greater variation is evident in the myrmecophagic euophryines and aelurillines. Aelurillus spp., Anasaitis canosa, Habrocestum pulex, and Xenocytaea spp. (formerly Euophrys spp.) manoeuvre to attack ants head-on. In Chalcotropis, small ants are attacked from more or less any orientation, but attacks on large ants are consistently oriented head-on. When in active pursuit, the capture behaviour of Zenodorus durvillei, Z. metallescens and Z. orbiculatus against ants and other insects is more or less the same. However, active pursuit is but one of three prey-capture tactics used by these three species, with the other two (ambushing and taking prey from the webs of other spiders) being deployed primarily against ants.

Use of different prey-capture tactics for different kinds of prey is a conditional predatory strategy, an example of predatory versatility (Curio 1976). Pronounced predatory versatility is also found in araneophagic (spider-eating) spartaeine salticids (Jackson, 1992a). In common with ants, spiders tend to be especially dangerous prey for a salticid, and it appears that inclusion of unusual and dangerous prey in a salticid's diet has favoured the evolution of especially pronounced predatory versatility (Jackson 1992a,b; Li & Jackson 1996a). This is consistent with general theory that predicts preyspecific adaptations will be found primarily when predators take exceptionally dangerous prey (Brodie & Brodie 1999).

# Influence of hunger on strength of preference

When well-fed (i.e., after a fast of only 1 week), the three species of *Zenodorus*, along with the other 21 myrmecophagic species that have been studied (Jackson & van Olphen 1991, 1992; Jackson et al. 1998; Li et al. 1996, 1999), showed consistent preference for ants over other insects in three types of tests. Like prey-specific capture behaviour, the preferences of these species appear to be preprogrammed (i.e., preference did not depend on prior experience with ants). However, there appears to be considerable interspecific variation in how longer fasting periods affect preference. In earlier studies *Chrysilla lauta*, *Corythalia canosa*, *Natta* spp., *Siler* spp., and *Zenodorus orbiculatus* (Li et al. 1996) took ants and other insects indiscriminately after a 2-week fast. In *Aelurillus* spp., *Chalcotropis* spp., *Habrocestum pulex*, and *Xenocytaeae* spp., preference for ants was still pronounced after a 2week fast. However, after a 3-week fast, all species tested took ants and other insects indiscriminately. Why the effects of fasting on preference vary interspecifically is poorly understood. However, maintenance diet appears to be an important variable.

In the earlier study of Z. orbiculatus (Jackson & van Olphen 1991), the diet used for maintenance feeding was primarily *Drosophila melanogaster* and *Musca domestica*. Most individuals in the present study were reared on a wider array of insects. However, when we replicated the diet used in the previous study, the outcome in preference tests was consistent with the earlier findings.

Regardless of diet, Zenodorus orbiculatus that had fasted for 2 weeks took ants in preference to other prey in simultaneous-presentation tests, but diet influenced findings in alternate-day tests. Salticids maintained on a varied diet took ants in preference to other insects in alternate-day tests after 2-week fasts, but salticids maintained on a limited diet took ants and other prey indiscriminately after a 2-week fast. These comparisons suggest that, as assays of preference, simultaneous-presentation tests are more sensitive than alternate-day tests. More specifically, they suggest that the preferences of salticids break down under the stress of hunger and that diet affects how severely fasting will stress a spider.

Except when nutritionally stressed, predators are expected to select more profitable prey (Stephens & Krebs 1986), and preference for ants suggests that ants are for myrmecophagic salticids nutritionally more profitable than other potential prey. More specifically, models based on optimal foraging and risk-sensitivity theory (Pyke et al. 1977; Caraco et al. 1980; McNamara & Houston 1990) suggest that selective foraging becomes disadvantageous when prey become scarce and predators become nutritionally stressed. A common prediction is that, when nutritionally-stressed, predators will switch from highly selective to more or less indiscriminate foraging. Findings here and from earlier experiments on myrmecophagic and araneophagic

#### Jackson & Li-Ant-eating jumping spiders

salticids (Li & Jackson 1996a) are consistent with this prediction, showing that pronounced preference for ants and spiders, respectively, changes to indiscriminate feeding after lengthy pre-test fasts. Findings from rearing *Zenodorus* spp. on a limited diet suggest that a diet of *D. melanogaster* and *M. domestica* alone is nutritionally deficient. This diet evidently impairs the ability of individuals to withstand the stress of a 2-week fast, with these individuals after 2 weeks becoming more or less equivalent to individuals on a better diet after a 3week fast.

The behaviour of choosing one prey over another is a behavioural adaptation and distinctly different from the question of what prey are taken by a predator in nature (its diet) and also distinctly different from the question of what behaviour a predator uses to capture prey. Although not a logical necessity, in *Zenodorus* spp. and all other myrmecophagic salticids that have been studied, diet, capture behaviour and preference have converged. Diet, capture behaviour and preference have also been studied, and shown to have converged, in four genera of araneophagic salticids.

Using a variety of testing methods provides the potential for assessing the strength of preferences. Simultaneous-presentation testing might be envisaged as the most straight-forward assay for preference and the type of testing most likely to reveal any preference that might be present. This is because, in these tests, the salticid has access to two potential prey at the same time and can make a choice during a single test interval to take one while the other is present.

Alternate-day testing might be envisaged as more demanding because in these tests a spider's inclination to take each type of prey is assessed in isolation from the other prey. Spiders that are especially inclined to take one type of prey (when only this one type of prey is available) and relatively disinclined to take the other type (when only this other type of prey is available) provide evidence of preference. The rationale for viewing this as more demanding is the idea that a spider might prefer one type of prey over another but not be willing to pass up an opportunity to take the less preferred prey when only the less preferred prey is available at the time.

Alternative-prey tests might be envisaged as even more demanding because spiders are offered a second prey after they have already captured and begun feeding on the first. Showing preference in these tests requires that the spider release an already secured prey to capture an alternative.

Each of these three testing methods has been used in studies on all 24 species of myrmecophagic salticids. Regardless of testing method, whenever a preference has been shown, it has been a preference for ants. Findings from araneophagic salticids are more variable. The same three methods (alternate-day, simultaneous-presentation and alternative-prey testing) have been used in studies on Brettus, Cocalus, Cyrba and Portia (Jackson et al. 1998; Li & Jackson 1996b; Li et al. 1996, 1999), four genera of araneophagic salticids. By two criteria, alternate-day testing and simultaneouspresentation testing, all araneophagic salticids studied have been shown to have a significant preference for spiders over other prey. Findings from alternative-prey testing have revealed a significant preference for spiders in Portia, but no significant preference in the other three genera. This has been interpreted as showing that Portia more strongly than Brettus, Cocalus and Cyrba prefers spiders, with alternative-prey testing being the type of testing that resolves this difference among the genera.

Findings from testing Zenodorus spp. kept on a limited maintenance diet support the hypothesis that alternate-day testing is a more demanding assay of preference than simultaneous-presentation testing. When well-fed, all three types of testing revealed significant preference for ants regardless of maintenance diet. When the spiders had been maintained on the standard diet (i.e., a variety of insects), but starved Zenodorus that had been maintained on the limited diet (i.e., only D. melanogaster and M. domestica) took ants in preference to other prey in only the simultaneouspresentation tests. Starved Zenodorus that had been maintained on a limited diet resembled extra-starved Zenodorus when alternate-day and alternative prey tests were used: they appeared to take prey indiscriminately.

Starved spiders that had been maintained on the limited diet appeared to have been stressed nutritionally to a level sufficient to mitigate against expressing preference in alternate-day and alternative-prey tests, but insufficiently to override preference in simultaneous-presentation tests. Extra-starved spiders, even when they had been maintained on the standard diet, may have been stressed nutritionally to a level where discriminating between preferred and non-preferred prey is no longer optimal in the situations simulated in any of these three types of tests.

## Taking prey from webs

Zenodorus adopted a prey-capture tactic not known for other myrmecophagic salticids: it attacked ants by entering spider webs. Zenodorus durvillei and Z. orbiculata not only prey on ants they find in alien webs but also use webs as nesting sites. Ants are extraordinarily abundant in the tropics (Holldobler & Wilson 1990) and they are routinely found in the webs of a wide variety of spiders. Most salticids probably stay out of other spiders' webs, but there are numerous exceptions (Jackson 1986). The most extensively studied exceptions are the web-invading araneophagic spartaeines.

Among salticids, only spartaeines are known to make aggressive-mimicry signals, and these signals are reserved primarily for spider prey. However, despite their preferred prey being spiders, webinvading spartaeines opportunistically take the insects from the alien webs they invade (Jackson 1992b). Only rarely, and briefly, do spartaeines make aggressive-mimicry signals when pursuing insects in webs (Jackson & Hallas 1986). There are, however, salticids other than spartaeines, that take spiders and insects from alien webs (Jackson & Pollard 1996). Few details are available for most of these, but prey-capture usually appears to be achieved by leaping into the web.

Zenodorus durvillei, Z. metallescens and Z. orbiculatus appear to be the first salticids for which predation on ants in webs has been documented. The webs Zenodorus spp. invaded included the very sticky cribellate webs of Badumna spp. Web-invading spartaeines can move freely through cribellate webs because the cribellate glue in these webs does not adhere to the spartaeine's cuticle (Jackson & Pollard 1996), but close contact with cribellate silk is detrimental to Zenodorus spp. They get stuck. Movement through cribellate webs by Zenodorus spp. appears to depend largely on skill at using detritus in the web as a path.

#### Web invasion and preference strength

Web invasion gave us an additional assay for assessing preference strength. When the criterion for having chosen a prey was web entry in tests with webs present, but only approaching prey in the absence of webs, our test spiders often failed to choose at all when the prey was in a web, although choosing a prey was common whenever prey was outside webs. Compared with stalking and leaping on prey found outside webs, entering a web to capture prey would appear to demand a higher level of commitment by the salticid. Entering a web, for instance, is likely to be especially risky and especially likely to take much time.

When the criterion for "preference" was entering a web, even extra-starved Zenodorus spp. showed preference for ants in simultaneous-presentation testing. This is the only assay that was effective at showing a preference when salticids were extrastarved, consistent with web invasion being an especially demanding assay of preference.

# Visual acuity

Zenodorus spp. stalked and attacked motionless lures using the same prey-specific capture behaviour observed in tests with live, motile prey and also consistently chose ants in preference to other prey regardless of whether tests were with live, motile prey or dead, motionless lures. This held despite the wide array of ants and other insects used.

These and earlier findings illustrate the remarkable acuity of the salticid eye (see Harland & Jackson 2000). Even in the absence of prey movement, optical cues alone permit these myrmecophagic salticids to distinguish ants from bugs, cockroaches, crickets, flies, lacewings, mantises, plant and leaf hoppers, psocids and mayflies. Even termites, which humans often mistake for ants, were distinguished by the *Zenodorus* spp. from ants in the absence of cues from different movement patterns.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Peter Johns (Zoology Department, University of Canterbury) and Bert Barrion (International Rice Research Institute) for assistance with identifying insects. This research was supported by the grants from the National University of Singapore Academic Research Fund (RP3981307 and 3991306) and the Marsden Fund of the New Zealand Royal Society (UOC512).

#### REFERENCES

- Blest, A. D.; O'Carroll, D. C.; Carter, M. 1990: Comparative ultrastructure of Layer I receptor mosaics in principal eyes of jumping spiders: the evolution of regular arrays of light guides. *Cell* and Tissue Research 262: 445–460.
- Blum, M. S. 1981: Chemical defenses of arthropods. New York, Academic Press.
- Bristowe, W. S. 1941: The comity of spiders. Vol. 2. London, Collins.
- Brodie, E. D. III.; Brodie, E. D. Jr. 1999: Predatory-prey arms races. *BioScience* 49: 557–568.

- Caraco, E. L.; Martindale, S.; Whittam, T. S. 1980: An empirical demonstration of risk-sensitive foraging preferences. *Animal Behaviour* 28: 820–830.
- Curio, E. 1976: The ethology of predation. Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- Cutler, B. 1980: Ant predation by *Habrocestum pulex* (Hentz) (Araneae: Salticidae). *Zoologisches Anzeiger 204*: 97–101.
- Edwards, G. B.; Carroll, J. F.; Whitcomb, W. H. 1974: Stoidis aurata (Araneae: Salticidae), a spider predator on ants. Florida Entomologist 57: 337– 346.
- Eisner, T. 1970: Chemical defense against predation in arthropods. *In*: Chemical ecology. Sondheimer, E.; Simeone, J. B. *ed.* New York, Academic Press.
- Forster, L. M. 1982: Vision and prey-catching strategies in jumping spiders. *American Scientist* 70: 165– 175.
- Harland, D. P.; Jackson, R. R. 2000: Eight-legged cats and how they see – a review of recent work on jumping spiders. *Cimbebasia* 16: 231–240.
- Holldobler, B.; Wilson, E. O. 1990: The ants. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press.
- Jackson, R. R. 1986: Web building, predatory versatility, and the evolution of the Salticidae. *In*: Spiders: webs, behavior, and evolution. Shear, W.A. *ed*. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press. Pp. 232–268.
- Jackson, R. R. 1992a: Conditional strategies and interpopulation variation in the behaviour of jumping spiders. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology 19*: 99–111.
- Jackson, R. R. 1992b: Eight-legged tricksters. *BioScience* 42: 590–598.
- Jackson, R. R.; Hallas, S. E. A. 1986: Comparative biology of Portia africana, P. albimana, P. fimbriata, P. labiata, and P. shultzi, araneophagic, webbuilding jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae): utilization of webs, predatory versatility, and intraspecific interactions. New Zealand Journal of Zoology 13: 423–489
- Jackson, R. R.; Pollard, S. D. 1996: Predatory behavior of jumping spiders. Annual Review of Entomology 41: 287–308.
- Jackson, R. R.; van Olphen, A. 1991: Prey-capture techniques and prey preferences of *Corythalia canosa* and *Pystira orbiculata*, ant-eating jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). Journal of Zoology, London 223: 577–591.
- Jackson, R. R.; Li, D.; Barrion, A. T.; Edwards, G. B. 1998: Prey-catching techniques and prey preferences of nine species of ant-eating jumping spider (Araneae: Salticidae) from the Philippines. *New Zealand Journal of Zoology* 25: 249–272.

- Jackson, R. R.; van Olphen, A. 1992: Prey-capture techniques and prey preferences of *Chrysilla*, *Natta* and *Siler*, ant-eating jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae) from Kenya and Sri Lanka. *Journal of Zoology*, *London* 227: 163–170.
- Land, M. F. 1969a: Structure of the retinae of the principal eyes of jumping spiders (Salticidae: Dendryphantinae) in relation to visual optics. *Journal of Experimental Biology 51*: 443–470.
- Land, M. F. 1969b: Movements of the retinae of jumping spiders (Salticidae) in response to visual stimuli. *Journal of Experimental Biology 51*: 471–493.
- Land, M. F. 1985: The morphology and optics of spider eyes. *In*: Neurobiology of arachnids. Barth, F. G. ed. Berlin, Springer-Verlag. Pp. 53–78.
- Li, D.; Jackson, R. R. 1996a: Prey-specific capture behaviour and prey preferences of myrmecophagic and araneophagic jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae). *Revue Suisse Zoologie Hors Serie*: 423–436.
- Li, D.; Jackson, R. R. 1996b: Prey preferences of *Portia fimbriata*, a web-building araneophagic jumping spider (Araneae: Salticidae) from Queensland. *Journal of Insect Behavior 9*: 613–642.
- Li, D.; Jackson, R. R.; Cutler, B. 1996: Prey-capture techniques and prey preferences of *Habrocestum pulex*, an ant-eating jumping spider (Araneae: Salticidae) from North America. *Journal of Zoology, London 240*: 455–462.
- Li, D.; Jackson, R. R. 1997: Influence of diet on survivorship and growth in *Portia fimbriata*, an araneophagic jumping spider (Araneae: Salticidae). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 75: 1652–1658.
- Li, D.; Jackson, R. R.; Harland, D. P. 1999: Prey-capture techniques and prey preferences of *Aelurillus aeruginosus, A. cognatus*, and *A. kochi*, ant-eating jumping spiders (Araneae: Salticidae) from Israel. *Israel Journal of Zoology\_45*: 341–359.
- McNamara, J. M.; Houston, A. I. 1990: The starvationpredation trade-off and some behavioral and ecological consequences. *In*: Behavioral mechanisms of food selection. Hughes, R. N. *ed.* Berlin, Springer-Verlag.
- Pyke, G. H.; Pulliam, H. R.; Charnov, E. L. 1977: Optimal foraging: a selective review of theory and tests. *Quarterly Review of Biology* 52: 137–154.
- Rice, W. R. 1989: Analysing tables of statistical tests. *Evolution 43*: 223–225.
- Sokal, R. R.; Rohlf, F. J. 1995: Biometry: the principles and practice of statistics in biological research. New York, Freeman.
- Stephens, D. W.; Krebs, J. R. 1986: Foraging theory. Princeton, N.J., Princeton University Press.