repose much confidence in the distinct existence of the following species and varieties. Indeed, had I followed my own impressions, I should have regarded some of the varieties, as species. But I prefer to make the number too small, rather than too large.

When I speak of species here, I mean species in oryctology, not in ornithology. And I doubt not, that in perhaps every instance, what I call a species in the former science, would be a genus in the latter; that is to say, these different tracks were made by birds that were generically different.

I am aware, that even where the whole skeletons of birds are found, it is very difficult often to distinguish species. "The difference," says Cuvier, "between two species, is sometimes entirely inappreciable from the skeleton. Even the genera cannot always be distinguished by osteological characters."\* Is it not then presumptuous to speak of distinct species when we have nothing but a mere impression of the foot? I presume that in following the indications derived from this single source, we cannot always avoid confounding several distinct species of birds under a single species of ornithichnites: and observation upon the striking resemblance between the tracks of several living species of birds confirms me in this opinion. But if we take into the account the size and form of the track, and the distance between the successive steps, I am confident we can distinguish, often between those birds that were considerably unlike one another. "The places where birds live, and the manner of their moving forward," says Duméril, "are, so to speak, indicated beforehand by the disposition of their feet. Indeed, it is by the form, the length of the feet, and the disposition of the toes, that birds are divided into six orders, &c."+

## ORNITHICHNITES.

• Ossemens Fossiles, Tome troisieme, p. 524, third edition.

• † Elemens des Sciences Naturelles, Tome II, p. 258, fourth edition.