

lived at one time upon the mud flats of Connecticut, it does not yet follow that the footprints under consideration were impressed by typical birds like those to which these tracks have generally been attributed. [See Appendix, Note VI.]

I am led, therefore, to dissent from the conclusions of Dr. Hitchcock, and to contemplate the tridactyl footprints described by him as the vestiges of reptiles—perhaps ornithoid reptiles—whose exact organization has not yet been ascertained. It is certainly one of the wonders of geology that so many thousands of footprints should have been preserved in the sandstones of Connecticut and Massachusetts, and so very few bones discovered of the creatures which made them. In fact, the only traces of bones thus far known were discovered in 1820 at East Windsor, and publicly noticed by Professor Nathan Smith, and more minutely described in 1855 by Dr. Wyman. These bones were *hollow, like those of birds*, and were thought to yield some support to the bird-track theory. But, besides the presumption that the first birds would not possess this endowment of the higher and typical families of the class, it is well known that many Jurassic reptiles—the *Dinosaurians*—were equally possessed of hollow bones. The imperfect condition of these few remains, however, renders it impossible to decide upon their affinities.

The number and character of these footprints are truly wonderful. Dr. Hitchcock formed a grand museum at Amherst College, containing eight thousand tracks. In his report on the "Ichnology of New England," he figured and described from their footprints no less than one hundred and nineteen species of animals, of which thirty-one are regarded as birds, and forty-seven as reptiles and batrachians. These footprints occur in regular series, extending sometimes a distance of several feet over the exposed sur-