one of which is the well characterized genus Cinosternum of Spix. The opportunities I have enjoyed for the examination of the representatives of these genera have satisfied me that the sexual differences among them are such as readily to be mistaken for specific differences, which has actually been done again and again. The tail of the male, for instance, is always much longer than that of the female; the males have sharp asperities between the joints of the hind legs; moreover the color and ornamentation differ considerably. As a genus, however, Cinosternum is easily distinguished. Yet our common Mud-Turtle, (Ozotheca odorata,) has been referred to Cinosternum by some authors, and to Sternothærus by others, until it was placed in the genus Staurotypus by Duméril and Bibron. Having formerly had an opportunity of examining, in Munich, the type on which Wagler founded the genus Staurotypus, I can affirm that our species is by no means generically identical with Wagler's Staurotypus, and still less belongs to Bell's Sternothærus, or to Spix's Cinoster-It constitutes, indeed, a genus for itself, which I have called Ozothecu, the characters of which are intermediate between those of Staurotypus and those of Cinosternum. There are, in the southern parts of our country, other species of this genus, as I have had good opportunity of ascertaining, but I have no hesitation in saying that the characters according to which some of the species now admitted have been established in this family by Wagler, Duméril and Bibron, Gray, and LeConte, may all be found upon specimens of different age, sex, and size, living together in the same pond in our Northern States, so that the true differences of our species are still to be pointed out.

All herpetologists seem to agree about the limits of the genera Emys and Cistudo, though they differ about the name, Canino retaining the name of Terrapene for the group to which Duméril and Bibron assign the name of Emys, and giving the name of Emys to that group which Duméril and Bibron call Cistudo, and which Gray further subdivides into Cistudo proper and Lutremys. The descriptions of our species below will show that the distinction introduced by Gray is truly founded, and that Cistudo and Lutremys are not only sub-genera, but constitute entirely distinct genera belonging even to different sub-families. As the name Cistudo was first assigned to the Cistudo carolina, it is proper it should retain it, while it is equally proper that the group to which Gray assigns the name Lutremys should be called Emys, as it includes the European Emys, upon which the genus Emys was founded by Bron-More than twenty years ago, Canino had already called the attention of herpetologists to this point, and set it all right; yet no one has followed his suggestion, thus far. Accordingly, there exists in North America not a single Emys, properly speaking, among those which have been described under that generic name. Moreover, the species which have been referred to that genus do not, by any means, all belong to one and the same genus.