grows forward from the front of the beam, where the principal palm begins to expand. This is called brow antler by Cuvier, but it corresponds in situation rather to the sur-antler, there being, properly speaking, no brow antler attached to the root of the beam. The elk has no posterior antler similar to that of the fossil animal, nor does its beam take a similar arched direction, but runs more directly outwards.

Cuvier remarks, that the palm of the fossil horn increases in breadth as it extends outwardly, while that of the elk is broadest next the beam.

The palm of the elk's horn is directed more backwards, while the fossil one extends more in the lateral direction. The antlers of the elk are shorter and more numerous than those of the fossil animals.

As the horns of the fossil animal exceed in size those of the elk, so, on the contrary, does the skull of the latter exceed in size that of the former; the largest heads of the fossil species not exceeding one foot nine inches in length, while the head of the elk is frequently two feet. The fossil head is broader in proportion; its length being to its breadth as two to one; in the elk they are as three to one, according to Parkinson.* The breadth of the skull between the roots of the horns is but four inches in the fossil skulls; in that of the elk in the Society's Museum it is $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches.

Cuvier thinks it probable that the females of the fossil species had horns†, an opinion to which I am very much disposed to subscribe, from having observed that these parts present differences in size and strength, which ap-

* Organic Remains, vol. iii. † Ossemens Fossiles, tom. iv.