cingulum, quite distinct from the rest of the crown, in Esthonyx, which is absent in Miolophus, according to Owen. Though this is not alone a generic character, in my opinion it is one of those indicators which generally accompany them. In like manner, Miolophus presents no important distinction from Deltatharium, but the wide internal lobes of the crowns lead me to suspect that such exist.

As to the name Platycherops, it cannot be adopted, as its publication was not accompanied by the distinct generic description which the accepted rules of nomenclature require.

THE BATRACHIA1 OF THE PERMIAN BEDS OF BOHEMIA.

SIR.—In Dr. Fritsch's volume we have the continuation of an extensive work which I have noticed at various times in the "Naturalist" as the successive parts appeared. I desire to add, on this occasion, my renewed commendation of the care and detail with which Dr. Fritsch continues to develope the subject, and my praise for the admirable plates which accompany the text. The species treated of are those which belong to the larger forms of the Rhachitomi, together with some of the intermediate types, such as the Dendrerpetonidæ. Of the greatest interest are two new genera of the order Embolomeri, Chelydosaurus and Sphenosaurus, where the additional vertebral centrum, entire in the type of the order (Cricotus), is divided into three segments, two lateral and an inferior. This is a curious discovery, especially as Sphenosaurus has hitherto been regarded as a reptile.² It also has an important bearing on the value of the order Embolomeri, which Dr. Fritsch is disposed (p. 4) to question. He thinks that the embolomerous vertebral structure is confined to the caudal region in the genus Cricotus, although I have figured it in the lumbar and cervical region of that genus, and described it as found in the dorsal's region. Dr. Fritsch reached this conclusion because he finds that in Archegosaurus the caudal region is embolomerous, and the dorsal region rhachitomous. His discovery of the persistence of the embolomerous condition in the dorsal region of Chelydosaurus and Sphenosaurus might have suggested to him the correctness of my observations on Cricotus. I add here that in Ervors, in which the dorsal vertebræ are rhachitomous, the caudal vertebræ are not embolomerous. So Archegosaurus stands alone in this respect. This determination of the characters of Archegosaurus by Dr. Fritsch is very useful to American palæontologists, as it has hitherto been very imperfectly described. I have stated that there are vertebræ of this type from Lebach in the Museum of Princeton College, New Jersey. As they agree exactly with Dr. Fritsch's figures of Archegosaurus, it is difficult to perceive why he denies the accuracy of my statement in the matter (p. 15). E. D. Cope.

[Re-published at the writer's request from the American Naturalist, June, 1885]

¹ Fauna der Gaskohle in d. Kalksteinen d. Permformation Böhmens. Von Dr. Anton Fritsch, b. ii. heft i.; Praag, 1885.

² These two genera should form a second family of the Embolomeri, characterized

as above, which I call the Sphenosauridæ.

³ Proc. Amer. Philo. Soc. 1884, p. 29.