

when the marks were made, but to two different series, which crossed each other at an angle. One was a print of the right foot, and the other of the left.

The fossil is not the impression of the foot, but the mould of the footprint, and the most distinctly preserved mould is that of the right foot. This by its general form and size resembles the print from the Joggins section, figured by Sir Wm. Dawson in "Acadian Geology," but it is somewhat smaller, somewhat narrower, and the toemarks are straighter and more bird-like.

The following are the dimensions and arrangement of these tracks:

Length of the footprint, . . . . .	21 mm.
Width of the footprint, . . . . .	22 mm.
Width between first and second toe, . . . . .	10 mm.
Width between second and third toe, . . . . .	8 mm.
Width between third and fourth toe, . . . . .	6 mm.

In these footprints the impression is heaviest across from the third toe towards the heel; but it is also somewhat heavily impressed along the outer side, and for half of the length of the track along the inner side.

I could find no trace of a fifth toe on either of these footprints.

This species (if we are right in assuming that the prints are those of fore feet) may be compared with those of *Therapopus heterodactylus*, King, from the anthracite coal measures of Pennsylvania, figured by Sir C. Lyell.  $\frac{n}{r}$

Another track somewhat like it is that described by Dr. Leidy, *Anthracoopus ellangowensis*, also from the coal measures of Pennsylvania. This, too, appears to be a fore-foot, it differs from our species in having the toe-marks more widely spread.

#### BAROPUS, Marsh.

*BAROPUS UNGUIFER*, n. sp. Plate II, fig. 2.

These tracks run in one continuous, though rather irregular series. They are somewhat confused by the print of one foot being placed partly over that of the other.