millim.), of a much more uniform green tint, with shorter and stouter anal legs. The largest I have seen, a specimen from Omitlente, measures, however, 86 millim.

The specimen of which a coloured figure is given on Tab. II. fig. 2 is from San Andres Tuxtla. It and another were acquired by the British Museum in 1861, and according to a note in the register they were identified by de Saussure himself as *S. tolteca*. They are said, moreover, to be the types of this species. This, however, they clearly are not; for the types of *S. tolteca* came from Cuautla, Vera Cruz, and are said to vary in length from 80–85 millim., whereas the San Andres specimens are 70 and 75 millim. respectively. The smaller one is like the larger, except that the anal legs are thinner and the spinous process on the femur longer. This fact is interesting, inasmuch as the great length of this spinous process is one of the first characters to strike the eye as distinguishing de Saussure's figures of *S. azteca* and *S. otomita*, not to mention *S. maya* from *S. tolteca*. In fact, an examination of the available material seems to me to show that the structure of the anal somite, which usually furnishes trustworthy characters, cannot be safely used as a criterion for distinguishing the so-called species enumerated in the above synonymy. For instance, the pleural process may be longish or quite short, so also may the spinous process on the femur, and the anal legs may be stout and short or longer and thinner. I believe, in fact, that these organs vary considerably with sex and age. On Tab. II. figs. 2 c–2 h I have depicted the anal somite of three specimens of a *Scolopendrea* selected from a large series that was obtained some years back at San Diego, Texas, by Mr. William Taylor. These figures, drawn to the same scale, well illustrate the variations that have just been mentioned. I may add, moreover, that other specimens from the same set further illustrate the same truth, scarcely any two of them being alike. These Texan specimens I cannot distinguish from the Central-American forms named *S. azteca*, *S. tolteca*, &c.; and, so far as I can ascertain, they are nothing but *S. viridis* of Say, which was described from Florida, and, according to Bollman, is spread over the South-eastern States of the Union as far to the north as Tennessee. The last-named author, moreover, distinguishes between *S. viridis*, which is found to the east of the Rocky Mountains, and *S. pachypus* of Kohlrausch, which occurs in California. I have not, unfortunately, seen specimens from California that are at all like *S. viridis*; but the thickness of the anal legs in *S. pachypus*, upon which Bollman relies, is, it appears to me, an untrustworthy character.

The arguments which thus lead me to consider that the Mexican species are to be called *S. viridis* of Say are founded upon the assumption that Wood and Bollman are correct in their identification of *S. viridis*. It must be remembered, however, that the species in question is based upon specimens presenting a most unusual type of coloration—that is, in having a green band down the back. This at least appears to me to be the case from reading Say's description, where he says the posterior segments are margined with yellow. Wood seems to me to have wrongly interpreted this statement,