

towards the apex. Valvæ of the ovipositor rather long, lower ones with a rounded tooth.

Coloration green or reddish brown with darker marks. Two velvety stripes run along the lateral keel of pronotum and on the sides of abdomen; hind femora reddish brown, with two indistinct dark spots above and with indefinite dots on the lower keel. Hind tibiæ dirty yellow. Sternum and abdomen yellow below.

	mm.
Length of body	15.5
" pronotum	2.8
" elytra	2
" hind femora	8.6

The female type is from the Eastern shores of the lake Oriu-Nor in the basin of Hoang-ho, 13,900 feet, end of v. to beginning of vi. 1901, collected by Mr. P. K. Kozlov. Two female paratypes and larvæ are from the following localities:—River Bi-tehu in the basin of the Azure River, 14,000 feet, 11. vii. 1900, ♀; valley of the river Djagin-gol, Tibet, 14,300 feet, 1-6. vii. 1900 (larvæ) (*P. K. Kozlov* leg.).

All types and paratypes of the new species described in this paper are in the Zoological Museum of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Leningrad. I am obliged to Mr. B. P. Uvarov for his valuable advice in the preparation of this paper, and I wish to express here my thanks to him for the assistance.

LXIV.—*A Revision of the Genera and Species contained in Lendenfeld's 'Die Chalineen des australischen Gebietes.'*
—II. By MAURICE BURTON, M.Sc.

V. THE GENUS *CHALINISSA*, LENDENFELD, 1887 E, p. 771.

Genotype: *C. dissimilis* (Bowerbank), Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

No genotype has hitherto been named. I here name the first species included in the genus by Lendenfeld as the genotype. The species will be dealt with in the same order as that in which they were tabulated by Lendenfeld (*l. c.*).

1. *Chalinissa dissimilis* for *Isotictya dissimilis*
(Bowerbank), 1866 B.

This is an *Axinella*, so that the genus *Chalinissa* must be now regarded as a synonym of *Axinella*, since this species is the genotype.

2. *Chalinissa lobata* for *Pachychalina lobata*, Ridley, 1884 c.

This is an undoubted *Cladochalina*, possibly synonymous with *C. armigera*.

3. *Chalinissa macrodactyla* for *Pachychalina macrodactyla*,
Ridley, 1884 c.

An undoubted *Chalina* with a characteristic external form and appearance. Other synonyms of the species, which I have discovered by comparing the material at my disposal, are *Chalinorhaphis digitata*, Lendenfeld, *Reniera longimanus*, Dendy, and *R. proxima*, Dendy.

4. *Chalinissa megalorhaphis* for *Pachychalina megalorhaphis*,
Ridley & Dendy, 1887.

A true *Chalina*, differing very little from *Chalina macrodactyla* (*vide supra*).

5. *Chalinissa pedunculata* for *Pachychalina pedunculata*,
Ridley & Dendy, 1887.

A true *Chalina*. There is no special dermal skeleton in this or in the preceding species, so that they are distinctly related to *Chalina oculata* and must be included in the same genus.

6. *Chalinissa gracilis* for *Veluspa polymorpha*, var. *gracilis*,
Maclay, 1870 A.

From the original description and from the examination of numerous specimens from a neighbouring locality identified by Dendy (MSS.) as *Reniera gracilis*, there can be no doubt that this species is merely a synonym of *Reniera cinerea* (*sensu* Burton, 1926 B).

7. *Chalinissa arctica* for *Veluspa polymorpha*, var. *arctica*,
Maclay, 1870 A.

I have seen no example of this species, but from the original description one may reasonably infer it to be a Cladocroce.

8. *Chalinissa digitata* for *Veluspa polymorpha*,
var. *digitata*, Maclay, 1870 A.

I have little hesitation in declaring this a synonym of *Chalina oculata*.

9. *Chalinissa communis* et varr. *flabellum*, *digitata*,
Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

Also *Chalinissa communis*, var. *tenuis*, Thum, 1904 A.

According to Whitelegge (1901 A) the species is very abundant in Australian waters, and, as is not unusual in sponges, it is also very variable. So much is this so that I do not see any reason why the three so-called varieties enumerated above should be used, since they represent only the normal variations of the species. Except for the external form, the species differs little from *Cladochalina armigera* and its allies, and must be included in the same genus.

10. *Chalinissa macropora*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

Closely related to the foregoing, this must be included in the same genus.

11. *Chalinissa tenuifibris*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

Possibly a synonym of *C. communis*, Lendenfeld.

12. *Chalinissa serpens*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

Almost certainly a synonym of *C. communis*.

13. *Chalinissa elegans*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

An undoubted synonym of *C. communis*.

14. *Chalinissa rigida*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

An undoubted synonym of *C. communis*.

15. *Chalinissa elongata*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

An undoubted synonym of *C. communis*.

16. *Chalinissa elongata*, var. *tenuispicula*, Thum, 1904 A.

From the author's description this appears to be nothing more than a further synonym of *C. communis*.

17. *Chalinissa ramosa*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

This, again, may prove to be a synonym of *C. communis*.

18. *Chalinissa megalorhaphis*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

= *Chalina megalorrhaphis*, vide (4).

19. *Chalinissa oblata*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E. (Misprint for
C. lobata.)

This, the *Pachychalina lobata* of Ridley, appears to be

closely related to *Cladochalina subarmigera*, and, provisionally at all events, will be included in the same genus.

20. *Chalinissa macrodactyla*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

= *Chalina macrodactyla*, vide (3).

SUMMARY OF THE SPECIES OF *CHALINISSA* AND THEIR PRESENT SYSTEMATIC POSITION.

- C. dissimilis* = *Axinella dissimilis* (Bowerbank).
C. lobata = *Cladochalina lobata* (Ridley).
C. macrodactyla = *Chalina macrodactyla* (Ridley).
C. megalorrhaphis = *Chalina megalorrhaphis* (Ridley & Dendy).
C. pedunculata = *Chalina pedunculata* (Ridley & Dendy).
C. gracilis = *Reniera cinerea* (Grant).
C. arctica = *Cladocroce arctica* (MacLay).
C. digitata = *Chalina oculata* (Pallas).
C. communis = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. communis, varr. *flabellum*, *digitata*, *tenuis* = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. macropora = *Cladochalina macropora* (Lendenfeld).
C. tenuifibris = *Cladochalina tenuifibris* (Lendenfeld).
C. serpens = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. elegans = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. rigida = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. elongata = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. elongata, var. *tenuispicula* = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).
C. ramosa = *Cladochalina communis* (Lendenfeld).

VI. THE GENUS *PACHYCHALINA*, SCHMIDT, 1868, p. 8.

Genotype: *P. rustica*, Schmidt, l. c.

This, the next genus of the Chalinine sponges, offers some degree of uncertainty as to what its author intended it to include. It is possible to fix characters for the genus which differ from those of *Chalina*, although these, as will be seen, do not agree entirely with the generally accepted ideas pertaining hitherto. I have already (Burton, 1926 A) shown that it is not sufficient to say that the genus *Pachychalina* differs from the genus *Chalina* in that the fibres of the main skeleton contain more rows of spicules, as has hitherto been the case, but that we must find something more definite and stable on which to fix the limits of the genus. Schmidt's

description of the genotype leaves much to be desired. In fact, we may say that for purposes of modern study it is worthless. The hologenotype itself is, for the moment, apparently irretrievably lost, or at most is not available for re-examination. A preparation in the British Museum contains only a few strands of the fibre of the main skeleton, and offers no clue. The species has only been recorded once since, by Topsent (1901 c), who doubtfully referred two small specimens to the species. Here, again, the knowledge gained from Topsent's remarks in this instance do not throw any more light on the matter, from my point of view. Moreover, these specimens have been irretrievably lost, as I have ascertained by inquiries through Professor Topsent himself. The all-important point which must be determined is whether the genotype of this genus possessed a special dermal skeleton or not. I cannot stress the importance of this feature of the anatomy too much as a sound basis of classification in the Chalininae, if not in all sponges. For four years I have devoted special study to the classification of the Haploscleridae in general and to the Chalininae in particular. As a result of this study, it is evident that the Chalinine sponges, however we may subdivide them into genera, belong to two large groups, those like *Chalina oculata* without a special dermal skeleton, and the others with a stout well-developed special dermal skeleton. The former are for the most part somewhat finer in texture, the meshes of the skeleton-fibres are usually smaller and more regular, while the sponges themselves are most abundant in the Northern Hemisphere. The latter are tougher, with much coarser skeleton, and are found chiefly in the Southern Hemisphere. Here we have two comparatively well-marked groups of sponges, whose main distinction rests on the presence or absence of a special dermal skeleton. This latter feature is, like all other characteristics of sponges, subject to a certain amount of variation, but it is never missing from any individual of a species which ordinarily possesses it. This feature, therefore, constitutes a first-class criterion for purposes of classification. These remarks are the result of the study of many hundreds of Chalinine sponges, with special attention paid to the matter of the dermal skeleton. Now Schmidt's account of the genotype leaves us in doubt as to whether it possessed a special dermal skeleton or not. From the only microscopic preparation of the sponge I have seen it is evident that if such a skeleton were absent it would be difficult to separate it from the genus *Chalina*. Topsent's specimens of the species would appear from the

figure (*l. c.* pl. xiii. fig. 4) to be devoid of a dermal skeleton, but this author admits of a doubt concerning the accuracy of his identification. On the other hand, Schmidt (1870, p. 37), reviewing the genus, says, "Die Fasern werden von innen nach aussen zu feiner, gehn nicht in Pinsel aus, sondern bilden ein zarteres Oberflächennetz." This to my mind settles the matter definitely that the second group of Chalinine sponges with the special dermal skeleton was the one for which Schmidt intended his genus *Pachychalina*. Even so, to accept the genus as valid in the present state of uncertainty in which we find it will be to store up possible trouble for the future. In such a preliminary work as this, in which it is only intended to restore some sort of order in the Chalininae with a view to a more intensive study when the quite hopeless confusion now prevailing has been, at least, partially eradicated, it is necessary to make what may eventually prove to be only provisional measures. Although the various species of Chalininae possessing a special dermal skeleton are here all placed indiscriminately into the next valid genus after *Pachychalina* in order of time (namely, *Cladochalina*), it may be found necessary as time goes on to further subdivide them into closely-related but distinct genera. If such a division prove necessary, I am convinced that it will be based on the characters of the dermal skeleton to a very large extent. Since we do not know the character of the dermal skeleton in *Pachychalina*, as Schmidt conceived it to be, and only that it possessed one of some sort, it is clear that to retain *Pachychalina*, although only temporarily, is most likely to prove merely a matter of "postponing the evil day" when it must be abandoned. To save all possibility of further trouble and confusion, I propose to abandon the genus now, taking the absence of exact knowledge of the genotype as my excuse.

The species are dealt with in the same order as that in which they appear in Lendenfeld (1887 b).

1. *Pachychalina grantii* for *Chalina grantii*, Bowerbank.
= *Reniera cinerea*, vide Burton, 1926 b, p. 420.

2. *Pachychalina caulifera*, Vosmaer, 1882 b.
From Lundbeck's (1902) description of this species I can see no other course than to regard it as a synonym of *Chalina oculata*.

3. *Pachychalina compressa*, Schmidt, 1870 a.
= *Homodictya palmata*, vide Lundbeck, 1905, p. 121.

4. *Pachychalina elongata*, Ridley & Dendy, 1887.

A true *Cladochalina*.

5. *Pachychalina excelsa*, Schmidt (1870).

From the meagre information available this might be *Chalina oculata*, but nothing certain can be said.

6. *Pachychalina fibrillosa*, Ehlers, 1870.

From the re-description of Esper's *Spongia fibrillosa* the species would appear to be without a special dermal skeleton, but our knowledge of the species is so small that we can only regard it as a *sp. dub.*

7. *Pachychalina punctata*, Ridley & Dendy, 1887.

The well-developed dermal skeleton of this species renders it a very close ally indeed of *Cladochalina armigera*.

8. *Pachychalina rustica*, Schmidt, 1868.

As already noted this is a *sp. dub.*

9. *Pachychalina spinulosa*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

A true *Cladochalina*.

10. *Pachychalina paucispina*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

This, like several of the succeeding species, is seen to be an obvious synonym of *Cladochalina dendroides* when the holotypes of the two species are compared.

11. *Pachychalina ramulosa* et varr., Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

= *Cladochalina dendroides*.

12. *Pachychalina manus*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

A true *Cladochalina*.

13. *Pachychalina macrospina*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

A true *Cladochalina*.

14. *Pachychalina elegans*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

= *Cladochalina dendroides*.

15. *Pachychalina rigida*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

A true *Cladochalina* and a possible synonym of *C. dendroides*.

16. *Pachychalina oculata*, Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

An undoubted synonym of *Cladochalina elegans*.

SUMMARY OF ALL THE SPECIES OF *PACHYCHALINA* AND THEIR PRESENT SYSTEMATIC POSITION ACCORDING TO THE METHOD OF CLASSIFICATION ADOPTED ABOVE, GIVEN IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER.

P. acapulensis, Wilson, 1904 A = *Cladochalina acapulensis*.

P. affinis, Bronsted, 1924 = *Cladochalina affinis*.

P. alveolopora, Topsent, 1906 B = *Cladochalina alveolopora*.

[This species has a very strong resemblance to *Dactylochalina viridis*, with which I suspect it to be synonymous. I have examined several specimens of this species from the Red Sea, including the holotype, and can without hesitation declare Row's *Ophlitaspongia digitiformis* to be a synonym of it. Possibly all three species are one and the same thing.]

P. amaranthus (Duch. et Mich.), Wilson, 1902 A = *Cladochalina amaranthus*.

P. areolata, Wilson, 1902 A = *Cladochalina areolata*.

P. aurantiaca, Dendy, 1895 = *Cladochalina aurantiaca*, vide Lendenfeld, 1887 E.

P. aurantiaca, var. *dura*, Whitelegge, 1902 A = *Cladochalina aurantiaca*, var. *dura*.

P. australis, Whitelegge, 1906 A = *Cladochalina bilamellata*, Carter.

P. bilamellata, Dendy, 1895 = *Cladochalina bilamellata*, Carter.

[Carter (1885 H) described a sponge from Australia which he believed to be *Spongia bilamellata*, Lamarck. Ridley, 1881 D, showed that this was not the case. Carter's sponge was re-named *Cavochalina bilamellata*, and, although it proved to be a different thing to the Lamarckian species, there is no reason why the name should not stand as a Carter species. Now known as *Cladochalina bilamellata* (Carter), the species is a very common constituent of the Australian sponge-fauna of which the British Museum possesses numerous specimens. It is somewhat variable in external form and appearance, but is always bilamellate or semi-infundibuliform, and the various varieties have been used quite unnecessarily as the basis for the erection of so-called species, all of which must now be regarded as synonyms of Carter's species, and as such they will appear in these pages.]

P. brevispiculata, Dendy, 1905 A = *Cladochalina brevispiculata*.

- P. caulifera*, Vosmaer, 1882 B = *Chalina oculata*.
P. cellulosa, Verrill, 1907 A = *Chalina? cellulosa*.
P. claviformis, Dendy, 1895 (for *Acervochalina claviformis*, Carter) = *Halichondria claviformis*.
P. communis, Whitelegge, 1901 A = *Cladochalina communis*.
P. compressa, Schmidt, 1870 A = *Homorodictya compressa*.
P. conica, Brøndsted, 1924 = ? *Cladochalina conica*.
P. conulosa, Kieschnick, 1898 = *Cladochalina joubini*, Topsent.
P. de buenii, Ferrer, 1921 = *Cladochalina de buenii*.
P. delicatula, Dendy, 1889 C = *Cladochalina delicatula*.
P. densa, Brøndsted, 1923 = ? *Cladochalina densa*.
P. diffusa (Ridley), var. *affinis*, Hentschel, 1912 A = *Cladochalina diffusa*, var. *affinis*.
P. elastica, Verrill, 1907 A = *Chalina? elastica*.
P. elegans, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina dendroides*.
P. elongata, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Cladochalina elongata*.
P. excelsa, Schmidt, 1870 A = *Chalina? excelsa*, sp. dub.
P. fibrosa, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Cladochalina fibrosa*.
P. fibrillosa, Ehlers, 1870 = *Cladochalina fibrillosa*, sp. dub.
P. fragilis, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Cladochalina fragilis*.
P. furcata, Keller, 1889 A = *Chalina viridis*, Keller.
 [I have examined the holotype and find that it differs from *Chalina viridis* in no respect other than the external form.]
P. gracilentia, Ferrer, 1922 (for *Chalina gracilentia*).
 [This is a synonym of *C. limbata*, the genotype of *Acervochalina*, a genus which it will be necessary to revive.]
P. grantii, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Reniera cinerea* (vide supra).
P. hospitalis, Stepiens, 1915 A = *Chalina hospitalis*.
P. irregularis, Swarczewsky, 1905 (for *Cucochalina irregularis*, Czerniavsky) = *Acervochalina limbata*.
P. joubini, Topsent, 1897 A = *Cladochalina joubini*.
P. limbata, Ferrer, 1914 C = *Acervochalina limbata*.
P. lobata, Ridley, 1884 C = *Cladochalina lobata*.
P. luncæ, Brøndsted, 1924 = *Cladochalina luncæ*.
P. macroductyla, Ridley, 1884 C = *Chalina macroductyla* (vide under *Chalinissa*).
P. macrospina, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina macrospina*.
P. magellanica, Thiele, 1905 (I have examined the holotype and find this species to be a *Halichondria*) = *Halichondria magellanica*.
P. manus, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina manus*.
P. megalorhaphis, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Chalina megalorhaphis* (vide under *Chalinissa*).
P. melior, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Cladochalina melior*.

- P. melior*, var. *tubulifera*, Lindgren, 1897 A = *Cladochalina melior*, var. *tubulifera*.
P. micropora, Verrill, 1907 A = *Chalina? micropora*.
P. millepora, Verrill, 1907 A = *Chalina? millepora*.
P. mollis, Wilson, 1902 A = ? *Cladochalina mollis*.
P. montaguii, Ferrer, 1914 C = *Reniera cinerea* (vide Burton, 1926 B).
P. monticulosa, Verrill, 1907 A = *Chalina? monticulosa*.
P. multiformis, var. *manaarensis*, Dendy, 1889 C = *Cladochalina multiformis*, var. *manaarensis*.
P. nigra, Baer, 1905 A.
 [This is certainly not a true member of the Chaliniæ. Its nearest relation appears to be *Phakellia weltneri*, Lendenfeld, also from the coast of Zanzibar. Since it does not conform with the genotype of *Phakellia*, but is most probably an Axinellid, I propose to call it *Axinella? nigra* provisionally.]
P. oculata, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina elegans*.
P. odessana, Kudelin, 1910 A = *Acervochalina odessana*.
 [This is probably a synonym of *A. limbata*.]
P. paucispina, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina dendroides*.
P. pedunculata, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Chalina pedunculata* (vide under *Chalinissa*).
P. punctata, Ridley & Dendy, 1887 = *Cladochalina punctata*.
P. ramosa, Whitelegge, 1906 A = *Cladochalina communis* (vide under *Chalinissa ramosa*).
P. ramulosa, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina dendroides*.
P. reticulosa, Thiele, 1905 A = *Cladochalina reticulosa*.
P. rigida, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina rigida*.
P. rubens (Pallas), Wilson, 1902 A = *Cladochalina rubens*.
P. rustica, Schmidt, 1868 A = sp. dub. (? or *nomen nudum*).
P. schmidtii, Lundbeck, 1902 A = *Chalina schmidtii*.
P. spinilamella, Dendy, 1889 C = *Cladochalina spinilamella*.
P. spinosissima, Dendy, 1887 E = *Cladochalina fibrosa*.
P. spinulosa, Lendenfeld, 1887 E = *Cladochalina spinulosa*.
P. subcylindrica, Dendy, 1905 A = *Cladochalina subcylindrica*.
P. tenella, Dendy, 1905 (for *Chalinella tenella*, Lendenfeld, *g. v.*) = *Cladochalina elegans*.
P. tenera, Thiele, 1905 A = *Reniera ignobilis*, Thiele, *l. c.*
 [The holotype has little spongin, and altogether the skeleton approximates to that which we should call *Renierid*. I can see no essential difference between this species and *R. ignobilis*, and have here regarded them as synonymous.]

P. validissima, Thiele, 1905 A = *Cladochalina validissima*.

[This is a somewhat aberrant *Cladochalina*.]

P. variabilis, Dendy, 1887 D = *Cladochalina variabilis*.

P. magellanica, Thiele, 1905 A.

[This species is an undoubted *Halichondria*, and is probably indistinguishable from *Pellinella conica*, Thiele. Both species recall very strongly the Halichondrias of the Indian Ocean and Australasian waters, most of which have hitherto been assigned to the genera *Reniera*, *Schmidtia*, *Protoschmidtia*, etc., but which differ from *Halichondria panicea*, the genotype of *Halichondria*, chiefly in the smaller size of the spicules. *Reniera cribricutis*, Dendy, *R. semifibrosa*, Dendy, etc., are all good Halichondrias, and resemble very markedly the two species of Thiele referred to above.]

= *Halichondria magellanica*.

LXV.—On a small Collection of Reptiles from Morocco. By Baron G. J. DE FEHÉRVÁRY, Ph.D., F.Z.S. France, H.M. Malta H.S.S., Reader in the R. Hung. Elizabeth University (Pécs), Curator, in charge of the Herpet. Coll., Hung. Nat. Museum (Budapest).

THE Zoological Department of the Hungarian National Museum purchased, about a month ago, a small collection of Reptiles collected in Morocco by a Hungarian fellow of the French Légion des étrangers. Unfortunately, the exact localities have not been designated. The material deserves, however, to be dealt with, partly because of the variation to be observed in the respective species, and partly because of the necessity of completing and deepening our knowledge of the Morocco herpetological fauna.

Agamidæ, Fitz. (1826), emend. Gray (1827) (sensu Blgr.).

Agama bibroni, A. Dum.

(Mus. Hung. Rept. No. 2813/2.)

Two adult specimens, one male and one gravid female. They pretty well agree with Mr. Boulenger's description of the species given in his Catalogue (vol. i. p. 357). A slight divergence from his data might, however, be stated in the following points: ear-opening not larger than the slit formed by the eyelids; third finger very slightly, though visibly, longer than fourth, in the female more so than

in the male; length of fourth and fifth toe somewhat exceeding the distance between hind corner of eye-slit and the nostril; gular region in female as strongly plicated as to form a rather well-defined gular pouch with a distinctly denticulated outline.—The shield bearing the parietal organ is misnamed by Boulenger (*l. c.*) as the occipital, though being the homologon of the interparietal shield in other Lacertilians.—In the male there are two rows of sub-oblong preanal plates, the posterior row presenting very feeble indications of pores.

Coloration olive-brown above, the region from tip of snout to somewhat behind the origin of fore limbs being almost black in the male, the same colour reappearing in the sacral region, between the origin of hind limbs, extending over them as well as over the tail*. In the female the dorsal and lateral surfaces of the head are of a somewhat darker brown, this coloration strictly keeping to the dorsal confines of the skull, *i. e.*, not extending, in the middle region, to the part overlying the vertebral column and bearing the low nuchal crest. Some sepia-brown spots are present on the light dorsal surfaces in both sexes. Lower surfaces of male from tip of snout to about the middle region of sternum of a very dark brown, nearly black, the belly being white, ventral surface of thighs and anal region yellowish, faintly strewn with blackish and greyish dots, the lower side of crures, feet, and tail white, piebald with dark grey to black, this design being due to the fact of every scale presenting, in its middle part, the dark colour, whilst its confines are remaining light. The region between the gular fold and the posterior limit of neck is yellowish, strewn with grey. Lower surfaces of female uniform white, turning into butter-yellow in the region of gular pouch and on the ventral surface of limbs, this colour being especially well marked in anal region and on lower surface of thighs and basis of tail. Eight narrow grey longitudinal stripes of irregular course, and leaving about equal interstices between one another, originating at the grey lower labials and running down to the gular pouch, ending at its anterior limit.

The species seems to be the only *Agama* occurring in Morocco, also referred to in the respective faunistical notes by Boulenger (4), Pellegrin (8, 9, 10), and Zulueta (12).

* I cannot establish whether this coloration is the original one, or perhaps due, at least to a certain extent, to the action of formaldehyde. The specimens figured by Boulenger (4, pl. xiii. fig. 1) do not present like differentiations in their livery.