

1888. *Sphenopteris pilosa*, Dawson, Geol. Hist. Pl., p. 72, fig. 22F (from 1905 edition).
 1910. ?*Callipteris pilosa* and *P. (Cyathites?) densifolia*, Dawson, Matthew, Nat. Hist. Soc. New Brunswick, vol. 6, pp. 248, 249.

For complete synonymy of *P. Milloni* see Kidston, 1911, p. 50.

The two fragments of foliage described as *Callipteris pilosa* and *Pecopteris densifolia* cannot retain rank as separate species, for they can be matched on different portions of a single leaf when one has larger specimens with which to compare them. The type specimen of Dawson's species *Callipteris pilosa* is in the British Museum collection (V 693) and was sent by him to the Museum as an exchange in 1884. The specimen is not labelled as the type, but comparison of the specimen with Dawson's figure 189, Pl. XVI, in his 1871 report, leaves no room to doubt that his drawing was made from it. (Cf. fig. 14, pl. VII in the present paper.) This specimen has a small printed label of Dawson's with "*Sphenopteris pilosa*" followed by "Erian, St. John" in his handwriting. A second specimen (V 4480) with an identical small printed label has the "*Spheno*" struck through and "*Calli*" written over it. Other specimens of *C. pilosa* are in the St. John Natural History Museum, one of which is shown in fig. 15, pl. VII, of the present paper.

As regards *P. densifolia* of Dawson. The original of his fig. 195, pl. XVII, in the 1871 monograph, which is the type specimen, is in the McGill University collection labelled as "Type 1" by Sir W. Dawson. A photograph of this is given in my pl. VII, fig. 16. It may be at first difficult to recognise that this is really the specimen from which Dawson drew his figure, but the two pinnules marked "X" are those he figured. The original of the second illustration (his fig. 196) is now in the British Museum, V 688. It was sent in a collection of St. John plants in 1884, and is labelled in Sir William Dawson's writing as "Type 2." This is an exceedingly obscure and highly graphitized example, as will be seen from fig. 17, pl. VII, in the present paper. Indeed, from the photograph it is almost impossible to recognise that it is really the original of his fig. 196, pl. XVII, but the comparison of the actual specimen and his drawing prove that that is the case. Not one of these specimens is in a really satisfactory state of preservation, and it was only