

clemmys. There is a large yellow spot behind the eyes, two yellow stripes from the orbit backwards, and a very characteristic yellow stripe covering the whole lower jaw. The upper and lower jaws are rounded in front. There are males and females in the collection. The localities where these tortoises were found are Mandeville, La., and Pensacola, Fla. Specimens from Mandeville, La., I consider as the types. Such specimens are also in the collection of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., sent by Mr. G. Kohn, No. 15,511, etc.

2. *Malacoclemmys Kohnii* (sp. nov.).—Three specimens labelled *M. geographica* are in Mr. Kohn's collection. They represent another interesting new species. The form of the shell is much like that of *M. oculifera*. The coloration is totally different, and resembles very much that of *M. Lesueuri*. The skull is quite different from that of *M. geographica*. The alveolar surfaces of the upper jaw do not meet in the middle line as in *M. geographica*: they are not so broad, therefore. They resemble more *M. Lesueuri* in that respect, but are broader. The symphysis of the lower jaw is longer than in that species. The coloration of the head is also quite different from *M. Lesueuri*: there is no big yellow spot behind the eye, but a thin yellow line, which is connected with another one running behind from the upper part of the orbit. The localities where found are Bayou Lafourche, La.; Bayou Teche, St. Martinsville, La.; Pensacola, Fla. I take the Louisiana forms as types. I have named this species in honor of Mr. G. Kohn, who collected the specimens.

From this it is seen that we have now five species of *Malacoclemmys* in the United States,—*M. terrapin*, Schoepff; *M. geographica*, Les.; *M. Lesueuri*, Gray; *M. oculifera*, sp. nov.; *M. Kohnii*, sp. nov.

It is probable that *M. terrapin*, the common diamond-back, shows variations according to different localities, and I should be very glad to get specimens from different points on the coast. The new species will be fully described and figured soon.

G. BAUR.

Clark University, Worcester, Mass., Oct. 27.

Remains of the Primitive Elephant found in Grinnell, Io.

HOWEVER common the remains of the mammoth may have become, there is always more or less interest attached to the discovery of each new individual, however fragmentary, or wherever found. According to vague rumors, the first evidence of the mammoth's remains in Grinnell came to light so early in the history of the town, that it has passed into obscurity; and the bones, treasured for a time as private relics, have simply disappeared, no one knows just when or how. It is not certain whether this doubtful specimen was a distinct individual, or part of the one subsequently found near the same place. The last one alluded to was found in 1884, while breaking ground for the Eagle Block, on the north-east corner of Main Street and Fourth Avenue. This animal, a large adult male, is represented by a tusk (eight feet long and nine inches in diameter), several grinders, lower jaw, and part of zygomatic arch, preserved in the museum of Iowa College. These bones occurred about five feet below the surface, and were in an exceedingly soft and perishable condition, as similarly situated remains usually are; but, owing to the skill of Professor H. W. Parker, the tusk and teeth especially were so well fixed with hardening-mixtures, that they were removed in an exceptionally fine condition. The other bones were naturally more fragmentary. The mandible is represented by a large fragment, including the entire symphyseal region, the left ramus being complete as far as the angle. No limb bones in whole or part were taken out with these fragments, although many bones were seen in the clay passing under the walls of an adjoining block, endangering its foundations if dug out, and consequently left there. Doubtless when other excavations are made on the lots immediately adjoining, other bones will be found. Judging by the condition of the parts now at hand, it is not unreasonable to hope that a skeleton nearly complete may yet be unearthed.

Remains of another *Elephas primigenius* have just come to light, found Oct. 6, 1890, within half a mile of the site of the one of 1884. There is additional interest attached to this one, because of the depth at which it occurred. Workmen, while engaged in

excavating an enormous well to supply the water-tanks of the Iowa Central Railroad, came upon certain badly broken mammoth bones, in the drift clay and pebbles, at a depth of twenty feet. All the bones, save a well-worn molar, were badly comminuted, and all the surroundings lead inevitably to the conclusion that they were transported with the drift in which they occurred. In addition to the small though complete molar, there were limb bones, a scapula, ribs, and a small tusk some five or six inches in diameter. The tusk, however, extended into the sides of the well in such a way that it could not be taken out without danger of a cave-in, and was left. The scapula, when found, was fairly complete, but was almost destroyed in the taking-out, little beside the thickened parts in the region of the glenoid fossa remaining. The few limb bones, owing to their fragmentary condition, coupled with the inexperience of the workmen in digging out such remains, were almost totally destroyed; the proximal end of a tibia, a fragment of the shaft of a femur, and the casts in clay of the medullary cavities of the same, being about all that remains to show for them at all. Although it is by no means uncommon to find skeletons of mammoths close to one another, yet it is less so to find them so far below the surface. ERWIN H. BARBOUR.

Iowa College, Grinnell, Io., Oct. 15.

Photo-Mechanical Work.

I WISH to remove, as far as may be, a wrong impression which your readers get from a short news item in your issue of Oct. 24, p. 231. Speaking of the coming exhibition by the Camera Club, of work by the several photo-mechanical processes, you say that "it is a remarkable fact that in no exhibition have they [photo-mechanical results] been brought together for comparison and study."

This statement is very misleading. In the United States National Museum in Washington, in the Section of Graphic Arts, under Mr. S. R. Koehler's management as curator, a large space (I think about nine hundred square feet of wall and cases) is devoted solely to photo-mechanical work and processes. This collection is both historical and technical; and I am perfectly safe in saying that there is no exhibition or collection of the kind anywhere that comes near it in instructiveness, general excellence, and beauty. In completeness the specimens here brought together form a remarkable whole, extending from the earliest times without a break to the present day.

The Camera Club will, I do not doubt, make a beautiful exhibition of recent photo-mechanical work; but the older necessary steps in the evolution of these arts, most difficult to get and most difficult to present effectively for educational and comparative purposes, are not likely to be represented in New York as they are in the National Museum here.

J. W. OSBORNE.

Washington, D.C., Oct. 30.

MY attention has been called to a note in your issue of Oct. 24, announcing an exhibition of photo-mechanical process-work to be held by the New York Camera Club. In this note it is stated to be "a remarkable fact that in no exhibition have they [i.e., the photo-mechanical processes] been brought together for comparison and study." By referring to the "Classification of Exhibits in the Section of Graphic Arts," of the Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, you will see that considerable space is devoted to the illustration of the processes in question at the institution named. We endeavor not only to illustrate the various processes in their technical aspects and in their results as they are seen to-day, but it is our aim also to bring together an historical series; and I am happy to say that our efforts in this direction have not been quite unsuccessful. Among the specimens illustrating the development of the photo-mechanical processes historically is one by Nicéphore Niepce (1824), while Fox, Talbot, Poitevin, Paul Pretsch, Tessié du Motay, Asser, Toovey, Osborne, Sir Henry James, Davanne, Lemerrier, Pouncy, Bradford (of Boston), and others, are represented by several specimens each. That the workers of to-day, especially those of America, are well represented, goes without saying.

For these results the United States National Museum is largely