

## HERPELE.

*Herpele*, Peters, MB. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1879, p. 939.

Eyes hidden below the bones; tentacle globular, in a circular pit, below and somewhat behind the nostril. Rudimentary scales imbedded in the skin near the folds. Mandibulary teeth in two series.

1. *Herpele ochrocephala*.

*Cæcilia ochrocephala*, Cope, Proc. Ac. N. Sc. Philad. 1866, p. 132; Brocchi, Miss. Sc. Mex., Batr. p. 119, t. 21. fig. 1.

*Herpele ochrocephala*, Cope, Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. xxii. p. 279 (1885); Bouleng. P. Z. S. 1895, p. 409.

*Cæcilia polyzona*, Fischer, in Peters, MB. Akad. Wiss. Berlin, 1879, p. 937; Arch. für Naturg. 1880, p. 215, t. 8. figg. 1-4; Bouleng. P. Z. S. 1895, p. 407.

*Hab.* PANAMA (Cope, *Mus. Brit.*).—COLOMBIA.

Habit slender, the circumference of the body being contained from 15 to 19 times in its length. Snout narrow, projecting. 200-209 circular folds, nearly all complete. The inner mandibulary series formed by 10-12 teeth. Tentacle at the lower side of the snout. Yellowish-plumbeous, with the folds darker, and with the head of a lighter colour.

	Fischer No. 1.	Fischer No. 2.	Cope.	Fischer in B.M.	Panama in B.M.
Total length . . .	675 millim.	650 millim.	325 millim.	565 millim.	450 millim.
Circumference . . .	37 „	33 „	...	32 „	30 „
Diameter . . . . .	11 „	11 „	6.4 „	10 „	9 „

The identification of Fischer's *Cæcilia polyzona* with Cope's *Herpele ochrocephala* requires explanation. There are two specimens in the Natural History Museum, one of which is determined as Cope's species, the description by that author well agreeing with it. The other, although a little more slender, clearly belongs to the same species, but it has been received from Fischer's collection, a portion of which was purchased in 1887, after his death, under the name of *C. polyzona*. There can be no doubt that it was so named by him, although it was not one of the two typical specimens from Caceres.

Fischer himself says that his species appeared to be closely allied to Cope's *H. ochrocephala*; but he was misled by the latter's statement that the proportions of this *C. ochrocephala* were near to those of *Siphonops mexicanus*, which, in fact, is one of the most robust species of the order. It is more surprising that Peters should have failed to recognize the pertinence of *C. polyzona* to his genus *Herpele*. But on comparing the accounts given by Peters and Fischer (1879 and 1880) I come to the conclusion that Peters had received from Fischer only the diagnosis, but not the specimens, when he read his paper before the Berlin Academy, and that he did not