

2. *Neotoma ferruginea*. (Tab. XVI.)

Neotoma ferruginea, Tomes, P. Z. S. 1861, p. 282 (descr. orig.)¹; Coues, Proc. Ac. Philad. 1874, p. 175²; Mon. N.-Am. Rodent. p. 22³.

Hab. MEXICO, Tehuantepec (*Sumichrast*, *U.S. Nat. Mus.*³); GUATEMALA, Dueñas (*Salvin*, *Mus. Brit.*¹).

This very handsome Wood-Rat was first obtained by Mr. Salvin in Guatemala, and was fully described by Mr. Tomes¹. Subsequently specimens were forwarded by Sumichrast from the southern parts of Mexico to the United-States Museum, as recorded by Dr. Coues^{2 3}, who remarks that the species furnishes an analogy to *Hesperomys sumichrasti* in its rufous coloration, long dark tail, and partially dusky feet. In the last two of these characters it agrees best with *N. fuscipes*, Cooper, of which it may be regarded as a tropical representative; but its rich ruddy tints are peculiar to itself. Mr. Tomes believed that it also differed from the other species in its dentition; but neither Dr. Coues nor I have been able to confirm the observation, the characters described by Mr. Tomes evidently depending on the age of the specimen described.

Of its habits, which probably agree with those of the last species, nothing has yet been recorded. Mr. Salvin tells me that it is a rare animal near Dueñas, the only place where he found it. During his last visit, in 1873, he was only able to procure one specimen (that now figured); this was brought to him by Indians, who caught it on the banks of the River Guacalate.

6. ARVICOLA.

Arvicola, Lacépède, Mém. de l'Inst. Nat. iii. p. 495 (1801)*.

Hypudæus, Illiger, Prod. Syst. Mamm. p. 87 (1811, nec Keyserling et Blasius).

The characters of this genus, the type of the subfamily *Arvicolinæ*, are so well known that it will be enough to refer to the rhomboidal cranium with divergent supraorbital ridges, rootless or semirooted molars composed of alternate prisms, small fore feet and claws, nearly naked hind feet, and short or moderate tail. The numerous species are mostly characteristic of the Palæarctic and Nearctic faunas; but three have been received from Mexico, belonging to two different subgenera †. They may be recognized by the following diagnoses:—

* It may appear to be inconsistent to retain some of the genera of Lacépède's 'Tableau' while others are rejected as being imperfectly characterized (*suprà*, pp. 3, 6, &c.). It appears to me, however, to be one of those doubtful cases in which discretion may fairly be used for the avoidance of unnecessary changes. *Arvicola* has ever since been in constant use, and has thus established its own legitimacy, while its rejection would cause almost as much confusion as the revival of *Alouatta*, *Sapajou*, and other justly-forgotten terms.

† In the British Museum there are two skins of Voles, obtained in Mexico by Mr. Charlesworth, which appear to belong to a fourth species; but unfortunately the skulls are wanting, and it is therefore impossible to identify them with any certainty.