

was first described by Spix, but under two distinct names. As I have possessed for a long time several living specimens of the species found in Mexico, and of that of Surinam, sent me by Prof. Baird and Mr. C. J. Hering, and compared specimens of the third, I can vouch for the accuracy of the distinctions traced by M. LeConte.

II. *THYROSTERNUM*, *Ag.* The jaws are strong, and well fitted for cutting, but not for crushing. The head is not as broad as in *Cinosternum*; it arches back of the eyes, but is not as wide spread as in *Cinosternum*, and its sides between the eyes and ears are gently curved outward, and have no such sharp angle as in that genus; it is high over the mouth, and its roof there is broad between the eyes, so that the orbits open sidewise and forward, not upward. The nose is long and high; its roof reaches as far forward as the jaw reaches under it, and its sides approach each other downward very fast. The mouth is long and narrow; the outer surface of the jaws curves outward under the eye, and then again turns sharply in to the alveolar edge; and further forward also, under the sides of the nose, it curves far inward, but at the symphysis the jaw is drawn down to a short chisel-edge, and its front surface slants back but little. The vertical alveolar surface is high all round, but especially so at the front end, where it projects downward, and where also it is often raised high up under the nose. The horizontal alveolar surface is broad at the symphysis, and narrowest on each side of it, and widens thence backward; but it is not nearly as broad as in *Cinosternum*. The lower jaw is strong. It gets its strength, not by its thickness, as in *Cinosternum*, but by its height. It is very high all round; sometimes it is drawn far up at the symphysis to a long, slender point. The outer surface at the sides is nearly vertical for some distance below the edge. The alveolar surface of the lower jaw is much narrower than in *Cinosternum*, except at the symphysis, where it is nearly vertical; near the angle it is almost horizontal, but its outer edge rises somewhat. The cutting edges of this jaw pass close within those of the upper

based, and agree with him as to the validity of these species. I have only a few objections to his nomenclature. His *Cin. mexicanum* is identical with Bell's *Cin. shavianum*. Bell's description (*Zool. Journ.* vol. 2, p. 302) is based upon the identical specimen figured by Shaw, from the Leverian Museum, and agrees in every respect with those described by Maj. LeConte, who indeed refers to the same figure of Shaw, also quoted by Bell. (*Shaw, Gen. Zool.* vol. 3, p. 61, pl. 15, erroneously referred to *Staurotypus triporeatus* by Wagler.) The name *Cin. mexicanum*, therefore, must be given up. As to *Cin. longicaudatum* and *brevicaudatum*, I disagree with LeConte in one respect, — he considers

the two species of Spix as distinct; I believe, with Wagler, (*Syst. Amph.* p. 137,) that they are the male and female of the same species. *Cinosternum cruentatum* (*Dum. and Bibr., Arch. Mus.* 1852, vol. 6, p. 238, pl. 16) belongs also to this genus; but, as I had no opportunity of comparing it with the three others, I am unable to say whether it is a distinct species or not. We have thus at least three distinct species of *Cinosternum* proper: *Cin. scorpioides*, *Wagl.*, (*Testudo scorpioides*, *Lin.*) *Cin. shavianum*, *Bell.*, (*Cin. mexicanum*, *LeC.*) and *Cin. longicaudatum*, *Spix.*, (including his *brevicaudatum*.) and perhaps a fourth, *Cin. cruentatum*, *Dum. and Bibr.*