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Introduction

It is certainly true that everyone who does original work in systematic zoology, either among the living or extinct forms, meets many difficulties at the start in endeavoring to ascertain what others have done before him. The literature of the subject is often discouraging from its extent, and especially from its uncertainty. If work at hand requires the comparison of type specimens, the difficulties greatly increase, and often prevent definite conclusions. The type will frequently be found the most important element in the problem, far more so than the literature, however extensive.

In the choice of specimens worthy of being types, I can only suggest a course that seems to me the proper one. I believe experience has already shown that to make types of incomplete or uncharacteristic specimens is seldom of permanent advantage to an author, and almost always a lasting injury to the branch of science he represents.

O. C. Marsh, 1898

During the past few years the Vertebrate Paleontology Collection of the Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History has undergone extensive recuration. This project, coupled with the addition of the Princeton University fossil vertebrate collection in 1985 and its subsequent reorganization, has greatly enhanced the accessibility and scientific usefulness of all specimens. However, during
recuration it became apparent that significant inconsistencies often exist between original descriptions of material and the corresponding specimens found in the collection. Questions can be raised concerning the provenance and affinities of many specimens. These problems stem from several factors, ranging from original descriptions and data statements that are now known to be inadequate or inaccurate to specimen loss and/or damage. This situation is particularly acute among the type specimens of certain fossil crocodilians. This report provides an up-to-date summary of the available information for each holotype specimen of fossil crocodilian in the Yale Peabody Museum (YPM). Indeed, Recommendation 72 G of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (Ride et al. 1985) suggests that it is the responsibility of each repository to publish a list of the type material in its possession or custody. Recent work on the morphology and systematics of crocodilians provides a sound basis for this review. It is hoped that as curation continues, summaries for other groups of Yale type specimens will also become available.

Systematic and Nomenclatural Procedures

For the sake of continuity and practicality we have tried, in every case, to alter the existing nomenclatural conventions for the concerned taxa as little as possible. However, where taxa had previously been inadequately diagnosed, some nomenclatural revisions have been necessary. A difficulty in this undertaking is that, with the exception of Clark’s recent work (1986), no truly phylogenetic analysis of crocodilians has been completed and specific diagnoses based upon a hierarchic distribution of characters have not always been possible. The original type names and subsequently published revisions are arranged below alphabetically along with discussions of their status and new descriptions where necessary. With regard to the genus Crocodylus, original citations often used the archaic spelling (and junior synonym) Crocodilus. Our first reference to each such occurrence uses the original spelling unaltered. Thereafter, archaic spellings appear in quotes until reassigned to Crocodylus. A brief summary of taxonomic changes follows the reassessment of the fossils.

Abbreviations

AMNH American Museum of Natural History (New York)
YPM Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History (New Haven)

Taxa of Interest

Crocodilus affinis Marsh, 1871a

Holotype YPM 1345.

Accession Number 133.

Catalogue Entry Date 25 January 1910 (Marsh’s original catalogue listed no entry dates for his specimens. In such cases, the date represents the time at which the entry was transferred to the current catalogue).

Horizon Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian), Bridger Formation, probably Bridger B of Matthew (1909) (upper Black’s Fork Member).

Locality Grizzly Buttes, near Fort Bridger, probably in Sec. 28, T14N, R115W, Bridger Basin, Uinta County, Wyoming.

Collectors O. C. Marsh, H. D. Ziegler, A. H. Ewing, E. Whitney; Yale College Scientific Expedition, 1870.

Material A well-preserved skull and mandible (Figs. 1, 2).

Remarks Although Crocodilus [sic] affinis is represented by exceptional material, detailed discussion of its anatomy relative to its
Fig. 1
Top) *Crocodylus affinis*, holotype, YPM 1345, dorsal aspect, scale in centimeters; bottom) same specimen, ventral aspect.
phylogenetic position is difficult since few fine details of phylogenetic significance are preserved, limiting comparisons with extant forms.

Marsh’s (1871a) original description of the type material was augmented by Cope (1884), who referred additional specimens to the taxon. Troxell (1925a), in an early review of the Peabody crocodilians, attempted to include a comparative description but was hampered by a lack of comparative material. Troxell’s (1925a) analysis failed to discuss specific similarities between taxa, but rather concentrated on elucidating minor differences in cranial proportions, and determined little more than that ‘C.’ affinis was not an alligatorid. In light of the then prevailing systematic philosophy, he therefore considered the fossil a crocodylid.

‘Crocodylus’ affinis exhibits a number of primitive features of the Crocodylia. These include a transfrontal ridge (spectacle) anterior to the orbits and a large basisphenoid contribution to the lateral wall of the braincase. Unfortunately, the splenials are not preserved, and indication of a possible foramen intermandibularis oralis is therefore lacking. The posterior angle of the lateral temporal fenestra was apparently formed by the quadratojugal, although poor preservation in this region prohibits definitive examination. The quadratojugal has an extensive dorsal surface lateral to the quadrate’s articular condyle. A small supraoccipital is present on the parietal table. The postorbital of ‘C.’ affinis is relatively narrow. Laterally, the postorbital is shielded from the edge of the parietal table by a hornlike anterior process of the squamosal. The external nares are large and anteriorly oriented.

Interesting features of ‘C.’ affinis are found in the posterior part of the mandible (Fig. 3). The retroarticular fossa on the dorsal surface of the retroarticular process is bipartite, divided along its center by a longitudinal ridge, and the lateral margin of the fossa is
depressed as in crocodyloids. The surangular participates in and extends caudal to the articular fossa, and is widely exposed anteriorly. The articular fossa is also divided; its medial portion is small and extends farther anteriorly than does the lateral part. Ventrally, the articular is abruptly terminated posterovenral to the mandibular fenestra. Anteriorly, the mandibular symphysis is long, extending caudal to the sixth dentary tooth.

The need for extensive revision of the Bridger Crocodylia was recognized by Mook (1933) and Troxell (1925a). At least six crocodilian genera and several species have been reported from the Middle Eocene Bridger Formation of Wyoming (see, e.g., Langston 1975; Mook 1921a, 1941, 1960, 1962; Norell 1988; Steel 1973; Wassersug and Hecht 1967; etc.). Some of these taxa are known from well-preserved material and represent distinct taxa, such as 'Crocodilus' acer Cope 1882 and Brachyuranochampsas zangerli Mook 1962. Other material is very fragmentary. Some taxa are based upon cranial proportions and other subjective size criteria, without careful scrutiny of homologous features in extant taxa or in ontogenetic series.

Our analysis of the Bridger type specimens in the Yale Peabody Museum indicates that only a few represent demonstrably distinct taxa. One of these, Pristichampsus vorax (Troxell 1925a) is discussed below. The taxa 'Crocodilus' affinis, 'Crocodilus' brevicollis Marsh 1871a, 'Crocodilus' grinnelli Marsh 1871a (including 'C.' grinnelli herpichanans Troxell 1925a), and 'Crocodilus' liodon Marsh 1871a, are referable to a single taxon for which the specific name affinis is retained. 'Crocodilus' elliotti Leidy 1870, which is also known from the Bridger beds and is similar dentally, holds nomenclatural precedence to 'C.' affinis. The extremely fragmentary nature of 'C.' elliotti, however, makes it unsatisfactory as the basis for such a ubiquitous form.

'Crocodilus' affinis represents the most common crocodile in the Bridger beds (Cope 1884), and was a large flat-headed crocodilian with large bulbous posterior teeth resembling large extant Crocodylus niloticus. Additional material was referred to 'C.' affinis by Mook (1921b). One such specimen (AMNH 6177) displays the crocodyloid (sensu Norell, in press) synapomorphy of a lost foramen intermandibularis oralis. Other skulls in the Peabody collection, comprising subadult (YPM 246) and large adult specimens (YPM 245, 258, 1352, and an uncatalogued Princeton specimen), are also referable to this taxon, as is the mandibular material (YPM 250 and 251).

All of these specimens are from the Bridger Eocene of Wyoming. The referred material indicates the presence of a large quadratojugal spine as in living Crocodylus and Tomistoma.

Referral of YPM 1345 to the extant genus Crocodylus Laurenti 1768 (=Crocodilus Bonnaterre 1789) is problematic because no unique shared features are evident. However, in light of at least one crocodyloid synapomorphy (the lost intermandibular foramen of the comparative material), the designation 'Crocodilus' (i.e., Crocodylus) is tentatively retained for this taxon.

The Bridger Formation is a thick fluvial sequence representing a myriad of aquatic environments, including not only stream systems but also marshes, ponds, and of course flood plains. The sediments consist primarily of a series of grey and green mudstones and sandstones and, while waterlain, contain a very large percentage of transported volcaniclastics derived from surrounding regions. The character of these rocks combined with the often abundant remains of crocodiles, as well as turtles, fish and freshwater invertebrates, suggests a warm, wet depositional basin (Matthew 1909; McGrew and Sullivan 1970; West 1976).

The first stratigraphic study of the Bridger was that of Matthew (1909) who divided the formation into five subunits. These, lettered bottom to top as A to E, were further subdivided by numerical designations. Wood (1934) later described a lower, Black's Fork Member and an upper, Twin Buttes Member corresponding to Matthew's (1909) A/B and C/D, respectively. The prolific Grizzly Buttes locality lies in Bridger B. The discussions and maps of Matthew (1909), and more recent
work by West (1976), are helpful in identifying the classic Bridger localities, but not all of Marsh’s sites can be relocated.

**Diagnosis** *Crocodylus affinis* Marsh, 1871a. A medium-sized crocodilian, referable to the extant Crocodylia (sensu Clark 1986) on the basis of procoelous vertebrae and choanae bordered entirely by the pterygoids. *C. affinis* is distinguishable by the retention of the primitive features of a spectacle, a quadratojugal spine, infratemporal (subtemporal) fenestrae bordered posterodorsally by the quadratojugal, and a basisphenoid which contributes to the braincase wall and which is dorsoventrally elongate yet not laterally expanded ventral to the otoccipitals. *C. affinis* possesses the unusual derived features of a postorbital separated from the lateral skull border by an anterior process of the squamosal, and a short anteroventral ramus of the articular that terminates in a knob rather than tapering to a point.

**Crocodilus brevicollis** Marsh, 1871a

**Holotype** YPM 1349.

**Accession Number** (?) 249+.

**Catalogue Entry Date** 25 January 1910.

**Horizon** Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian), Bridger Formation, probably Bridger B of Matthew (1909) (upper Black’s Fork Member).

**Locality** Grizzly Buttes, near Fort Bridger, probably in Sec. 28, T14N, R115W, Bridger Basin, Uinta County, Wyoming.

**Crocodilus grinnelli** Marsh, 1871a

**Holotype** YPM 1344.

**Accession Number** 129.

**Catalogue Entry Date** 25 January 1910.

**Horizon** Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian) Bridger Formation.

**Locality** Marsh’s Fork, Bridger Basin, Wyoming.

**Collector** G. B. Grinnell, Yale College Scientific Expedition, 1870.

**Material** A fragmentary skeleton and skull including quadrates, frontal, basioccipital, and mandibular and rostral fragments. Several
fragmentary postcranial elements are also present.  

**Remarks** The preserved elements of *C.* grinnelli are indistinguishable from their counterparts in the type specimen of *C. affinis*. The cranial elements display the preorbital spectacle, a medial crest on the ventral surface of the quadrate, an anterior process of the squamosal along the lateral border of the postorbital, and an elongate, unexpanded basioccipital. The mandibular fragments exhibit the peculiar mosaic of bones forming the articular fossa, with a large participation of the surangular, the bipartite division of the retroarticular process, and the short anteroventral ramus of the articular. As no distinguishing characteristics are obvious in the type material of *C.* grinnelli we consider it a junior synonym of *C. affinis*.

**Crocodilus grinnelli herpichanus** Troxell, 1925a  

**Holotype** YPM 300.  

**Accession Number** 3544.  

**Catalogue Entry Date** 16 September 1926.  

**Horizon** Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian) Bridger Formation, horizon B5 of Matthew (1909) (uppermost Black's Fork Member).  

**Locality** Sage Creek, "in a pocket south of the broad butte," Bridger Basin, Uinta County, Wyoming.  

**Collector** E. L. Troxell, August 1922.  

**Material** A very complete skull and skeleton. The skull has been flattened dorsoventrally.  

**Remarks** This specimen is adequately described by Troxell (1925a). Its completeness provides a sound basis for an understanding of the postcranial characteristics of the taxon. Apparently, however, the specimen was given a subspecific name more out of Troxell's admiration for his preparator, Fred Herpich, and the complete preservation of the fossil than for its morphological uniqueness. Later, Troxell (1925b) referred to this skeleton as a distinct species but without further qualification. Differences between YPM 300 and an expanded concept of *C. affinis* are within the range of variation seen in extant crocodilians. Therefore, *C.* g. herpichanus is a subjective junior synonym of *C. affinis*.

**Crocodilus hartti** Marsh, 1869  

**Holotype** YPM 516.  

**Horizon** Lower Cretaceous (Barremian) Ilhas Formation, Bahia series ("arenaceous shale").  

**Locality** Near Plantaforma Station, on the Bahia and San Francisco Railway, approximately 10 km north of Bahia, Recôncavo (Bahia) Basin, northeast coast of Brazil.  

**Collector** C. F. Hart, 1867.  

**Material** A single isolated tooth lacking root (Fig. 4).  

**Remarks** This tooth, described by Marsh (1869) without illustration, is very large (57 × 21 mm) and robust with a somewhat unusual appearance. A prominent carina occurs along the anterior and posterior sides of the tooth; the lateral surfaces are textured with very fine, crenulated striae, a supposedly diagnostic characteristic. Similar teeth were figured by Allport (1860) from the same freshwater sediments at nearby Fort Monserrate (approximately 6 km southwest of Plantaforma). Another tooth of this type is present in a massive, elongate, terminally expanded mandibular symphysis from the same horizon, near Setubal, Brazil (approximately 10 km north of Plantaforma) (Mawson and Woodward 1907). This mandible and associated skull fragments, a large dorsal
osteoscute, and amphicoelus vertebrae are presumed to represent the same taxon as Marsh’s (1869) isolated tooth.

The accessory material from Setubal, particularly the broad, rectangular osteoscute with its pronounced anterior articulatory peg are ‘goniopholid’ in character and were assigned to *Goniopholis hartti* by Mawson and Woodward (1907). However, this feature is not unique to *Goniopholis* Owen 1841 (1842) and the assignment to *Goniopholis* is not justified.

The fossils are in no way referable to *Crocodylus* (‘*Crocodilus*’). Buffetaut and Taquet (1977), in reviewing the Setubal material, have shown that it is attributable to *Sarcosuchus de Broin* and Taquet 1968, a giant longirostrine form with pholidosaurid affinities. We accept their conclusion that the Yale specimen, although a single tooth, is referable to this taxon on the basis of a shared morphology and should be known as *Sarcosuchus hartti* (Marsh 1869).
Crocodilus herpichanus Troxell, 1925a  
[See Crocodilus grinnelli herpichanus Troxell, 1925a]

Crocodilus liodon Marsh, 1871a
Holotype YPM 1350(b).
Accession Number 131.
Catalogue Entry Date 1923.
Horizon Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian), Bridger Formation, probably Bridger B of Matthew (1909) (upper Black's Fork Member).
Locality Grizzly Buttes, near Fort Bridger, probably in Sec. 28, T14N, R115W, Bridger Basin, Uinta County, Wyoming.
Collector C. T. Ballard, Yale College Scientific Expedition, 1870.
Material A very fragmentary skeleton including several vertebrae, the left quadrate, rostral fragments, and articulars and surangulars.
Remarks 'Crocodilus' liodon shares with the type specimen of C. affinis a divided retroarticular fossa with a depressed lateral lip, a surangular that forms the anterolateral part of the articular fossa, a short and narrow medial surface of the divided articular fossa, and a large dorsal surface of the quadratojugal extending lateral to the quadrates articular condyle. We find no basis for recognizing 'C.' liodon as a distinct taxon, and therefore consider it a junior synonym of C. affinis.

Crocodilus vorax Troxell, 1925a
Holotype YPM 249.
Accession Number 755, box 7.
Catalogue Entry Date 16 September 1926.
Horizon Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian) Bridger Formation ("Greensand formation"), probably Bridger A of Matthew (1909) (lower Black's Fork Member).
Collector J. Heisey, 11 June 1875.
Material A crushed, partial skull and mandible in association with mammalian vertebrae (possibly of Hyrachyus); various limb elements.
Remarks The type skull was accurately figured both by Troxell (1925a) in his description of 'Crocodilus' vorax and by Langston (1975). It is clear from the carnosaur-like (ziphodont) dentition and the laterally compressed nature of the skull that this is a valid species distinct from other Bridger crocodiles. It is not referable to Crocodylus. Although Limnosaurus ziphodon (Marsh 1871a) is most probably identical, typological problems limit the availability of this name. Therefore, Langston (1975) has placed this species within the genus Pristichampsus Gervais 1853, a proposal accepted here.

Crocodilus ziphodon Marsh, 1871a [See Limnosaurus ziphodon (Marsh, 1871a)].

Diplosaurus felix Marsh, 1877
Holotype YPM 517.
Accession Number 986.
Catalogue Entry Date 31 January 1910.
Horizon Upper Jurassic (Kimmeridgian)
Fig. 5
Map of Pakistan showing approximate locality of Gavialis lewisi, YPM 3226, as indicated by cross.

Morrison Formation, clay pebble conglomerate.

Locality Morrison, Colorado.

Collector B. F. Mudge, A. Lakes, and H. C. Beckwith, 1877.

Material The dorsal portion of the skull and associated postcranial fragments, including a partial humerus.

Remarks The taxon was described by Marsh (1877) on the basis of the skull roof's ventral aspect. This surface, exposed only as the heavily weathered ventral surface of the dorsal dermal roofing bones, provided little in the way of diagnostic information. Recent preparation of the material has exposed the dorsal surface of the skull and a more complete description of the material is being undertaken by Langston (personal communication, 1988).

As with many specimens collected before the 20th century, detailed anatomical analysis and comparison with other taxa was lacking from the original description of this fossil. Marsh's (1896, 1897) figure was largely inferential as it depicted the cranial roof which was not exposed until very recently. The
specimen clearly has goniopholid affinities, in sharing with *Goniopholis* a very distinctly shaped premaxillary area. The long thin snout and large external nares with no nasal participation are also distinctive.

*Diplosaurus felix* has frequently been synonymized with *Goniopholis*. Langston (personal communication, 1987) suggests also the possibility of synonymy with the distinct goniopholid taxon *Eutretauranosuchus* Mook 1967. Awaiting detailed redescriptions of this specimen (Langston, in preparation) complete rediagnosis of this specimen is premature. Nevertheless, *Diplosaurus felix* apparently represents a distinct species of medium-sized mesoeucrocodile (sensu Clark 1986).

*Diplosaurus nanus* Marsh, 1895a

Holotype YPM 518.
Fig. 7
*Top*) *Gavialis lewisi*, holotype, YPM 3226, dorsal aspect, scale in centimeters; *bottom*) same specimen, ventral aspect.
Catalogue Entry Date 31 January 1910.

Horizon Middle or Upper Jurassic, Sundance Formation or equivalent ("Baptanodon beds").

Locality Canyon at Sheep Creek (Sage Creek Cañon?), Green River Valley, Utah.

Collector O. C. Marsh, 8 October 1870.

Material A single, poorly preserved right humerus.

Remarks In spite of Marsh's (1895a) confidence in assigning this specimen to a new species, it is unquestionably a nondiagnostic fossil. Diplosaurus nanus should be regarded as a nomen dubium because of the inadequacy of the type.

Gavialis lewisi Lull, 1944

Holotype YPM 3226.

Accession Number 4555.

Catalogue Entry Date 16 January 1945.

Horizon Upper Pliocene Dhok Pathan Formation, Middle Siwalik series.

Locality South of Soan (Sohan) River, east of the Gambir Kas, approximately 12 km southeast of Dhok Pathan village, Punjab (now Rawalpindi Province), northeast border of Pakistan, approximately 33°7' N, 72°28' E (Lull's stated latitude of 32°2' N (1944) does not agree with the placement of the specimen locality on Lewis' field map #43) (Figs. 5, 6).

Collector G. E. Lewis, Yale North India Expedition, 24 April 1932.

Field Number 19.

Material A well-preserved skull lacking the rostrum; posterior mandibular fragments (Figs. 7, 8).

Remarks Gavialis lewisi was described and
figured by Lull (1944). His description and illustration of the species are fairly accurate, but our reanalysis indicates some ambiguities. For instance, Lull's Figure 1 (p. 419) indicates a paired parietal. Examination of the specimen proves, however, that fused parietals are present as in all other eusuchians. The quadratojugal spines are portrayed in Lull (1944) as small bumps; these are actually the broken bases of apparently once large spines. The position of the frontoparietal suture and other sutures on the parietal table are obscure and cannot be accurately traced, nor can sutures within the supratemporal fenestrae. Likewise, most of the palatal sutures portrayed in Lull's (1944) Figure 2 (p. 420) are indiscernible on the specimen. Posteriorly, the basioccipital tubera are not as bulbous nor directed ventrally as shown by Lull. Rather, they are oriented ventrolaterally and are like those of juvenile *Gavialis gangeticus* (Gmelin 1788).

Due to recent interest in gavialid systematics (Buffetaut 1978a; Hecht and Malone 1972), a review of some of the morphologic features distinguishing *G. lewisi* from *G. gangeticus* is in order. Lull (1944) provided a series of comparisons of *G. lewisi* with other gavialids, while Langston (1965) and Buffetaut (1978a) both considered *G. lewisi* to be very closely related to the extant *G. gangeticus*. Our reanalysis of this specimen indicates that *G. lewisi* is only just distinct as a separate species. The lesser development of the basioccipital tubera, the relatively deeper skull, the smaller supratemporal fenestrae, the presence of labia choanali, and the less drastic transition between snout and braincase primarily differentiate *G. lewisi* from the living species.

**Diagnosis** *Gavialis lewisi* Lull, 1944. Advanced gavialid sharing with *G. gangeticus* the derived gavialid features of large, circular orbits with everted borders, maxillae lacking interdental pits, large supratemporal fenestrae, longirostrine skull, homodont dentition, basioccipital tubera, and pterygoid bullae; differs from *G. gangeticus* in possessing labia choanali, a deeper skull, relatively smaller supratemporal fenestrae and basioccipital tubera, large postorbital exposure on the skull's dorsal surface, and a mediadorsal quadrate ridge (modified from Langston 1965 and Lull 1944).

**Gavialis minor** Marsh, 1870

**Holotype** YPM 282.

**Catalogue Entry Date** 16 September 1926.

**Horizon** Eocene (Ypresian) Manasquan Formation ("Greensand").

**Locality** Shark River, Monmouth County, New Jersey.
Collector  Hugh Hurley, 1870.

Material  The fragmentary remains of a skull, including portions of both quadrates, the incomplete parietal, basioccipital/basisphenoid, right postorbital, and right angular; four cervical vertebrae, four partial anterior dorsal vertebrae, one thoracic vertebra, and the biconvex first caudal vertebra (Fig. 9).

Remarks  This taxon is based upon an incomplete skeleton that was never figured. In the original description, Marsh (1870) suggested that the skull was of the "gavial type" and represented an adult of the species. In reality, the remains are too scanty for such a determination; however, the narrow anterior parietal process does suggest that large supratemporal fenestrae (seen in many longirostrine forms) were present, and the extensive ossification of the braincase and vertebrae are characteristic of adult eusuchians. Not discussed in the original description were the primitive eusuchian type of basioccipital/basisphenoid complex—lacking the derived alligatorid features of a deep and laterally constricted braincase floor and a ventrally elongate occipital surface (the latter typical of caimans), and the gavial-like feature [also present in many other fossil longirostrine crocodylomorphs (sensu Norell, in press)] of expanded basal tubera (see, e.g., Hecht and Malone 1972).

The quadrates are short and relatively straight; their articular surfaces are hourglass shaped with inflected medial processes. These conditions are present in several members of the Crocodylia but are not seen in the extant gavial. Marsh (1870) indicated that a characteristic feature of the quadrate of this specimen was the large siphonial foramen present on its medial surface. Actually, this foramen has been enlarged by postmortem breakage. The distal end of the left quadrate exhibits a siphonial foramen that is better preserved than that of the right and, while large, is still within the range of variation seen in extant eusuchians.

The parietal is heavily sculptured and nonpneumatic. Its form indicates that the supraoccipital was excluded from the skull roof, and small ventral depressions just anterior to its posterior margin suggest that it overhung the occipital wall slightly. A large postorbital foramen, similar to that of alligatorids (as well as juvenile crocodilians in general) is present just above the postorbital bar process.

Marsh (1870) believed that the vertebrae of this specimen were peculiar in having transversely ovoid centra; however, this feature is present in many extant eusuchians, especially alligatorids, and in several fossil taxa (see, e.g., Troxell 1925a, fig. 8). The vertebrae are unremarkable and in being procoelous are typical of eusuchian grade crocodilians. Complete fusion and obliteration of suturets between the neural arch and centrum confirm Marsh's (1870) suspicion that the individual was adult.

In assessing the affinities of *Gavialis minor*, Marsh (1870) suggested that it might prove to be generically identical with the much larger *Thecachampsa squankensis* Marsh 1869, also from the Eocene of New Jersey. Sadly, Marsh (1869, 1870) merely noted the existence of material that he ascribed to a new species, *T. squankensis* (under the generic misspelling *Thechochampsa*). He never described the material nor designated a type specimen. It is now impossible to identify this material in the Yale collections. The genus *Thecachampsa* Cope 1867, based on nondiagnostic, isolated teeth from the Miocene of Charles County, Maryland, was itself regarded by Marsh (1870) as unrecognizable, thus YPM 282 was provisionally placed by him in the genus *Gavialis* Oppel 1811.

It is tempting to consider *G. minor* a nomen dubium on the basis of problematic material; however, an adequate diagnosis for the taxon can be presented. We believe that the fossil represents a unique crocodilian worthy of generic distinction although its relationships are difficult to determine without a better but as yet uncompleted phylogenetic depiction of Early Tertiary eusuchians. Obviously, the name *Gavialis* cannot be retained for this specimen, as it possesses not a single unmistakable
Fig. 10
Schematic diagram of *Hallopus victor*, holotype, YPM 1914, combining part and counterpart blocks and illustrating relative positions of bones. 1, sacrum; 2, caudal vertebrae; 3, ribs; 4, chevron; 5, scapula; 6, right humerus; 7, right radius and ulna; 8, left radius and ulna; 9, left radiale and ulnare; 10, left manus; 11, 12, ilia; 13, 14, ischia; 15, left femur; 16, left tibia; 17, left metatarsal II; 18, left metatarsal III; 19, left metatarsal IV; 20, left metatarsal V; 21, right tibia; 22, right fibula; 23, left metatarsal?; 24, pubis?; 25, left calcaneum.

gavial feature. We have chosen to consider the specimen a new, distinct taxon with eusuchian affinities on the basis of its procoelous vertebrae and a recessed postorbital bar. It differs from the Cretaceous eusuchian *Thoracosaurus* Leidy 1852, most notably on the basis of its much narrower interfenestral (parietal) bar. Steel (1973) suggested that this species had crocodyline affinities merely on the basis of Marsh’s (1870)
comparison with *T. squankensis*. Our examination, however, finds no evidence for preferential relationship with any eusuchian group at this time.

**Thecachampoids, new genus**

**Etymology** *Thecachamps + oides* (Latin "like") after earlier comparisons to *Thecachamps*.

**Type Species** *Gavialis minor* Marsh, 1870.

**Diagnosis** *Thecachampoids minor* (Marsh, 1870), new combination. Eusuchian crocodilian distinguished by the unique suite of features of small adult size, large supratemporal fenestrae as in *Thoracosaurus*, narrow parietal bar, relatively large siphonial foramen of the quadrate, basisphenoid lacking basal tubera, floor of braincase shallow and laterally constricted, occipital wall concave, parietal lacking pneumatization, vertebrae procoelous, centra of thoracic vertebrae transversely ovoid. This combination of characters is not found in any other known longirostrine eusuchian.

**Goniopholis felix** (Marsh, 1877) [See *Diplosaurus felix* Marsh, 1877]

**Goniopholis hartti** (Marsh, 1869) [See *Crocodilus hartti* Marsh, 1869]

**Hallopus victor** (Marsh, 1877)

**Holotype** YPM 1914.

**Accession Number** 958.

**Catalogue Entry Date** 10 March 1908.

**Horizon** Probably Middle Jurassic (Callovian), lower Ralston Creek Formation.

**Locality** In float on west side of Oil (Four Mile) Creek, probably below "The Nipple," Garden Park, approximately 5 km north of Cañon City, Freemont County, Colorado (T17S, R70W).

**Collectors** J. Jennings, S. C. Robinson, for D. Baldwin, April 1877.

**Material** Associated, partially articulated skeletal elements contained within part and counterpart matrix blocks: sacrum, pelvis, scapula, incomplete fore and hind limbs, a few fragmentary vertebrae, ribs, and chevrons. A composite diagram of the specimen is provided in Figure 10.

**Remarks** *Hallopus victor*, known only from the type specimen, has been the object of controversy for over 100 years. Originally "described" (Marsh 1877) as a distinct species of the ornithopod dinosaur *Nanosaurus*, this fossil was later (Marsh 1881) transferred to the newly created genus *Hallopus* upon the realization of its unique character, particularly with regard to its large calcaneal tuber. It was, nevertheless, generally considered by Marsh as dinosaurian (although only questionably so in Marsh 1882, 1890), usually as a theropod. The first adequate description of the specimen (Marsh 1890) included a figure of the left hindlimb with its pronounced heel as preserved. This was later supplanted with reconstructions of the fore and hind limbs (Marsh 1895b). Von Huene and Lull (1908) suggested that the animal was not a dinosaur, but rather allied with the Thecodontia, while von Huene (1914) and many subsequent workers classified *Hallopus* as a coelurosaur. The descriptions provided by von Huene and Lull (1908), and especially von Huene (1914), are more detailed than those of Marsh (1877, 1881, 1890) and include additional figures, notably photographs of the matrix blocks (von Huene 1914), yet the identifications of individual bones provided by Marsh (1877, 1881, 1890) now generally appear the more accurate.

The best and most detailed study of *Hallopus* to date was supplied by Walker (1970). In it he confirmed Marsh's (1890)
interpretations of the ischium and sacrum while correcting previous misidentifications of radius, ulna, radiale, and ulnare. Based upon this work, Walker (1970) concluded that *Hallopus* was neither a dinosaur nor a thecodont, but a small, gracile, semiterrestrial crocodylomorph akin to *Pedeticosaurus* Van Hoepen 1915, and *Sphenosuchus* Haughton 1915, and belonging to the suborder Paracrocodylia Walker 1968. Walker (1970) retained the taxon Hallopoa Marsh 1881 as an infraorder.

Whether or not Walker’s (1968, 1970) taxonomy is accepted, it is clear that *Hallopus* represents a derived, cursorial crocodilian (crocodylomorph). The best evidence for this assignment is the crurotarsal ankle joint with a greatly lengthened calcaneal tuber. This form of tarsus excludes *Hallopus* from the dinosaurs, all of which exhibit an advanced mesotarsal condition. Other than in crocodilians, the fully developed crocodyloid-normal configuration of the *Hallopus* tarsus, with the articular peg of the joint on the astragalus and the socket in the calcaneum, is found only in rauisuchids and in the aberrant aetosaurs. All thecodont affinities can be ruled out, however, by the open acetabulum evident in the ilium of *Hallopus*.

Other crocodilian characteristics observable in the present fossil are the elongate proximal carpals, broad sacrum comprising two vertebrae with stout sacral ribs, the flat bladelike ischium (very similar to that of *Protosuchus* Brown 1934), and a metatarsus consisting of lengthy metatarsals I–IV, with a much reduced, clawlike metatarsal V. *Hallopus* resembles pedeticosaurid crocodylomorphs in its long, gracile, hollow-boned limbs, and is particularly noteworthy for its extremely elongate calcaneum, radiale, and ulnare.

The element identified by Walker (1970) as the pubis is very poorly preserved and is actually indeterminate. It more likely represents the impression of the second ischium. Walker (1972) suggested a second candidate for the pubis but this, while more likely, is also questionable. It is a long, thin, rodlike bone with an apparent articular facet and possible obturator notch (seemingly not an artifact) at one end. The opposite end is incomplete. The orientation of the “pubis” is a separate question, however, and the posteriorly rotated position suggested by Walker (1972) is entirely conjectural. Such a reconstruction was evidently influenced by his desire (since abandoned) to place the origin of birds within the Crocodylomorpha.

A second controversy surrounding this specimen involves the question of its stratigraphic provenance and the age of the “Hallopus beds.” Marsh (1891) asserted that these beds lay below his “Atlantosaurus beds” (i.e., Morrison Formation) and were distinct from them. Because of the incomplete state of stratigraphic knowledge of the western interior at the time, Marsh’s (1877, 1881, 1891) estimates of the age of the “Hallopus beds” ranged from uppermost Jurassic to Triassic. Williston (1905), having visited the exact locality, maintained that the fossil block had fallen from an escarpment of red sandstone which he believed to be Triassic. This interpretation stood unchallenged until Schuchert (1939), largely on the basis of correspondence between Marsh and Baldwin, placed the *Hallopus* horizon near the top of the Morrison Formation, a conclusion accepted by Walker (1970).

In fact, contrary to Schuchert (1939), red beds of the type composing the *Hallopus* matrix are unknown from the Morrison at Garden Park or elsewhere. This matrix is not a chocolate brown nodule as insisted upon by Schuchert (1939), but clearly a resistant, mature, red silt with intermittent clasts of red mudstone and a silica cement. Similarly, the oxidized, bone-white nature of the fossil’s preservation is unknown in the Morrison Formation. Nevertheless, it is now also known that Triassic sediments are not present in the Garden Park area, but rather the extensive red beds there are primarily of Pennsylvanian and Permian age. However, at the *Hallopus* locality of Oil Creek Canyon, restricted terrestrial sediments of the Middle Jurassic (Callovian) lower Ralston Creek Formation occur below the Morrison Formation (Berman...
et al. 1980; Fredrickson et al. 1956). More typical gypsiferous marine shales of the upper Ralston Creek Formation occur to the north and east. However, at Garden Park the Ralston Creek sediments consist of red and green siltstones (Mitchell 1957) and most likely represent the source of the *Hallopus* float block.

**Diagnosis** *Hallopus victor* (Marsh, 1877).

*Scapula blade narrow; limb-bones hollow; proximal carpals greatly elongated, in contact throughout their length, proximal carpal joint apparently immobile but distally a roller-joint with the metacarpus, probably no other carpals; metacarpals I and III wedging out proximally, manus small, compressed; iliac blade long and high, curving down behind; femur with 'pseudointernal' trochanter and lesser trochanter, fourth trochanter an inconspicuous narrow ridge, head offset, subspherical; tibia and fibula very slender, longer than femur; tarsus greatly compressed, dorso-lateral process of astragalus visible in lateral view, distal end of fibula posterior to astragalus, calcaneum very narrow, with long tuber; lateral distal tarsal large; pes functionally tridactyl, metatarsals II–IV elongated, firmly fixed together proximally, metatarsal I a long slender splint recessed into metatarsal II, metatarsal V reduced, pointed. (Walker 1970).*

**Hyposaurus ferox** Marsh, 1871

*Holotype* YPM 2794.

*Catalogue Entry Date* 9 July 1937.

*Horizon* Uppermost Cretaceous (Maastrichtian), Hornerstown Formation, "middle marl bed" ("Greensand").

*Locality* Birmingham, New Jersey.

*Material* Two isolated teeth.

**Remarks** Marsh (1871b) presented no figures of these teeth to accompany his assignment of the material to a new species. However, the descriptions of the teeth, particularly that noting one as being long, pointed, strongly ribbed, and bearing a sharp posterior carina, are consistent with the notion that they represent teeth of *Hyposaurus* Owen 1849 (although teeth of such other taxa as *Thoracosaurus*, known from the same deposits, are similar). In any event, it is highly unlikely that a separate species can be diagnosed on the basis of these teeth and we consider this taxon a nomen dubium. Compounding the problem, the material has apparently been lost; a thorough search of the collection failed to produce it.

**Hyposaurus natator** Troxell, 1925

*Holotype* YPM 985.

*Accession Number* 83.

*Catalogue Entry Date* 16 September 1926.

*Horizon* Uppermost Cretaceous (Maastrichtian), Hornerstown Formation, "middle marl bed" ("Greensand").

*Locality* Cream Ridge Marl Company pit, Hornerstown, Monmouth County, New Jersey.

*Collector* J. G. Meirs.

*Material* Partial cranium and mandibles, largely complete postcranial skeleton.

**Remarks** *Hyposaurus natator* was accurately described by Troxell (1925b). Recent analyses have satisfactorily indicated that *Hyposaurus* is a dyrosaurid crocodilian (Buffetaut 1976, 1980), not a goniopholid. In fact, *Hyposaurus natator* is so similar to many Cretaceous and early Tertiary dyrosaurids that little support can be found for its uniqueness. *Hyposaurus natator* shares with North African forms even such subtle features as an anterior spine on the postorbital (see Buffetaut 1978b,

Troxell (1925b) designated YPM 380, an incomplete mandible and fragmentary postcrania, as part of the type material ("heautotype"). YPM 380 represents a second individual from the type locality. It shares the typical dyrosaurid feature of a long thin mandible formed of fused dentaries and splenials that is tubular in shape with procumbent anterior teeth. YPM 380 differs from the North African material described by Buffetaut (1978b, 1980) and the Swedish material of Thevinin (1911) in having deeper interdental pits. This is a feature also found in *Rhabdognathus* Swinton 1930. The relevant area is not preserved in YPM 985. YPM 380 resembles other dyrosaurids in possessing a large pit just anterior to the seventh dentary tooth. Dyrosaurid crocodilians are in need of complete revision, as much of the new material is yet to be described in detail while much of the older material requires redescription. Langston (in press) discusses *Rhabdognathus* in detail and deals with part of the dyrosaurid problem. Awaiting this work, however, we provisionally retain *H. natator* as a distinct species. It should not at this time be specifically equated with *Hyposaurus rogersii* Owen 1849. *H. rogersii*, the type species of the genus, is itself questionably diagnostic, consisting only of a cervical vertebral centrum and an anterior dorsal centrum.

The Cream Ridge–Hornerstown region is a classic fossil locality, having produced many specimens for Marsh, Cope, and Leidy, including numerous types. A marine unit, the Hornerstown Formation is composed almost exclusively of glauconitic sand and probably represents a period of slow, outer shelf deposition. A deep water, low oxygen setting with little terrigenous input has been proposed for the Hornerstown paleoenvironment (Gallagher et al. 1986).

**Diagnosis** *Hyposaurus natator* Troxell, 1925b.

Skull long and converging uniformly to the rostrum, orbits lateral, supratemporal foramen elongated; teeth ridged longitudinally, compressed, pointed, directed outward and forward in the mandible; quadrate strongly bent downward, its condyle undivided by a groove; the vertebral hypapophyses characteristically strong, anterior cervicals narrow, those more distant robust and rounded on the ends [amphiplatyan] vertebral centra unequal in length at top and bottom; neural spines of anterior dorsals of great height, centra of posterior dorsals and lumbars rounded and simple in form, caudals laterally compressed having short ribs; acetabulum deep, femoral articulation posterior rather than ventral in position, "pubic" bone enormously elongated, ischium heavy proximally but with slender, pointed blade, femur-head curved beak-like forward; scapula-blade extended to the fore, its coracoid articulation narrow, coracoid shaft and blade slender and small, deltoïd crest of humerus weak. (Troxell 1925b).

*Hyposaurus natator oweni* Troxell, 1925b

**Holotype** YPM 753.

**Accession Number** 77.

**Catalogue Entry Date** 21 April 1950.

**Horizon** Uppermost Cretaceous (Maastrichian), Hornerstown Formation, "middle marl bed" ("Greensand").

**Locality** West Jersey Marl Company pit, Barnsboro, New Jersey.

**Collector** J. C. Voorhies, 14 January 1870.

**Material** Partial skeleton and fragmentary skull. Also included in the type material is an anterior lower jaw fragment of a second individual.

**Remarks** Troxell (1925b) described
Hyposaurus natator oweni as a subspecies of Hyposaurus natator Troxell 1925b.

Unfortunately, on page 506 of this work, Troxell refers to YPM 753 as Hyposaurus oweni. This specimen is larger (approximately 2x) than the type of H. natator (YPM 985) but shows few characters which may distinguish it. The features of the pelvis discussed by Troxell (1925b) are so poorly preserved that they are of little value. The fused splenials associated with YPM 753 actually belong to another individual. Their small size, slightly larger than those of YPM 985, indicates that they could not have belonged to the present specimen (YPM 753).

The type material of H. natator oweni probably represents a composite of individuals. We view the taxon as undiagnosable. The material is dyrosaurid but its extremely fragmentary nature makes its assignment to any species difficult. Most of it probably pertains to Hyposaurus natator Troxell 1925b.

Hyposaurus oweni Troxell, 1925b [See Hyposaurus natator oweni Troxell, 1925b]

Limnosaurus ziphodon (Marsh, 1871a)

Holotype (?) YPM 1347 and YPM 5890 (possibly also YPM 1348).

Accession Number (?) 136 or 249+.

Catalogue Entry Date 25 January 1910 (possibly also 16 September 1926).

Horizon Eocene (Lutetian, Bridgerian), Bridger Formation, probably Bridger B of Matthew (1909) (upper Black's Fork Member).

Locality Grizzly Buttes, near Fort Bridger, probably in Sec. 28, T14N, R115, Bridger Basin, Uinta County, Wyoming.


Material Specified (Marsh 1871a) only as including ziphodont teeth, a quadrate and other parts of the skull, and dorsal osteosutures.

Remarks Langston (1975) has fully discussed the typological problems associated with this taxon and its possible type material. In summary, the description of 'Crocodilus' ziphodon as a new species by Marsh (1871a) did not include a registry number nor an illustration of the holotype. Similarly, when Marsh (1872) proposed the generic name Limnosaurus for this species after examining "additional remains . . . , since obtained," no information allowing identification of the hypodigm was forthcoming. Troxell (1925a) identified a portion of this material as the extremely fragmentary YPM 1347, but Langston (1975) is correct in asserting that YPM 1347 comprises more than one individual and taxon. Additionally, this material bears the accession number 249+ which conflicts with the presumed date of collection and the expected accession number of 136. Adding to the confusion are several teeth and a scute, associated with YPM 1347, unnumbered, or bearing YPM 1348, which may form part of the type assemblage, whereas the distal end of a right quadrate, part of YPM 1347, has been renumbered as YPM 5890.

If the holotype of Limnosaurus ziphodon is included in this material it cannot be certainly recognized and both 'C.' ziphodon Marsh 1871a and Limnosaurus Marsh 1872 must be regarded as nomina nuda (Langston 1975). However, the quadrate numbered as YPM 5890 and each of the noted ziphodont teeth are characteristic of, and undoubtedly pertain to, Pristichampsus vorax (Troxell 1925a). Because of the preceding difficulties Pristichampsus vorax (Troxell 1925a) is the only name available for North American ziphodont crocodiles.

Macelognathus vagans Marsh, 1884

Holotype YPM 1415.

Accession Number 1394.
Type Fossil Crocodilians in the Yale Peabody Museum

Fig. 11
Left quadrates of *Thoracosaurus*. Dorsal surfaces to left, not to scale. *A*, *Thoracosaurus meirsanus*, holotype, YPM 404; *B*, *Thoracosaurus mullicensis*, holotype, YPM 283.

**Catalogue Entry Date**  24 April 1909.

**Horizon**  Upper Jurassic (Kimmeridgian), Morrison Formation.

**Locality**  Quarry 9, Como Bluff, Albany County, Wyoming (SW ¼ Sec. 12, T22N, R77W).

**Collector**  W. H. Reed, 1880.

**Material**  Partial dentaries (symphysis and anterior portions of mandibular rami).

**Remarks**  A problematic taxon that, when described by Marsh (1884), was made the basis for a new order of reptiles, the Macelognatha. Although Marsh (1884) cryptically suggested that the species was represented by “various remains,” only a pair of dentaries were figured and described, and only these can now be assigned to the type. Ostrom (1971) has redescribed the fossil, referred it to the Crocodylia (traditional usage), and discussed the evidence for its possible association with obviously crocodilian remains. Nevertheless, the fossil differs from known crocodilians in the possession of an unusual, spatulate, edentulous mandibular extremity. This unique specimen is obviously an aberrant form, questionably crocodilian, but neither is it readily referable to any other order.

**Diagnosis**  *Macelognathus vagans* Marsh, 1884. Distinguished from all known crocodilians by a spatulate dentary symphysis with an edentulous extremity; symphysial suture long with splenial participation.

**Nanosaurus victor** Marsh, 1877  [See *Hallopus victor* (Marsh, 1877)].

**Pristichampsus vorax** (Troxell, 1925a)  [See *Crocodilus vorax* Troxell, 1925a and *Limnosaurus ziphodon* (Marsh, 1871a)].

**Sarcosuchus hartti**  (Marsh, 1869)  [See *Crocodilus hartti* Marsh, 1869].

**Thecachampsoideos minor**  (Marsh, 1870), new combination  [See *Gavialis minor* Marsh, 1870]

**Thoracosaurus meirsanus** Troxell, 1925c

**Holotype**  YPM 404.

**Catalogue Entry Date**  16 September 1926.

**Horizon**  Upper Cretaceous (“Greensand”), probably Hornerstown Formation.

**Locality**  Cream Ridge Marl Company pit, Hornerstown, Monmouth County, New Jersey.
Collector  J. G. Meirs.

Material  Cranial fragments including the skull roof, and extremely fragmentary portions of the postcranial skeleton.

Remarks  This material, like so many specimens from the New Jersey Greensand, suffers from degenerative pyrite “disease.” It has been continuously crumbling since its original description. The most complete elements are the reassembled posterior cranial roofing elements. The poor state of preservation renders the specimen unremarkable, as few details can be studied. Consequently, nothing can be added to the original description.

North American Thoracosaurus remains are for the most part extremely fragmentary. Only *T. neocesariensis* (De Kay 1842) is known from adequate material. Carpenter (1983) synonymized *T. meirsanus* and *T. mullicensis* (described below) with *T. neocesariensis*. Though possibly premature, this suggestion is provisionally accepted here; two forms may actually be present.

*T. meirsanus* and *T. mullicensis* exhibit two distinct quadrate morphologies (Troxell 1925c). In YPM 404 (*T. meirsanus*) the quadrate is medially constricted with a laterally oriented articular surface of the medial condyle. Posteriorly, the quadrate is excavated by a large depression. YPM 283, *T. mullicensis*, has a quadrate that is much less hourglass-shaped and lacks a pronounced posterior depression (Fig. 11). Varieties of quadrate shape in crocodilian morphology have been used by several workers (e.g., Langston 1975) in taxonomic studies. The quadrates of *T. neocesariensis* are not preserved, but those of the Swedish *Thoracosaurus scanius* Troedsson 1924 are similar to those of *T. meirsanus*.

We provisionally accept Carpenter’s (1983) synonymy of *T. meirsanus* with *T. mullicensis* and *T. neocesariensis*, pending detailed revision of *Thoracosaurus*, but Carpenter’s diagnosis is based upon ambiguously derived features and complete revision of the entire thoracosaur group and closely related basal eusuchians is required before these taxa can be properly discussed.

**Thoracosaurus mullicensis** Troxell, 1925c

Holotype  YPM 283.

Accession Number  (?) 47 (this number does not agree with locality information).

Catalogue Entry Date  16 September 1926.

Horizon  Upper Cretaceous, “marl beds,” probably Hornerstown Formation.

Locality  Mullica Hill, New Jersey.

Collector  O. C. Marsh, 1872.

Material  Small fragments of skull and postcrania; severely afflicted with pyrite “disease.”

Remarks  Elements of interest preserved include the quadrates (discussed above), a maxillary fragment with three teeth, and several loose teeth. The fluted teeth resemble those illustrated by Troedsson (1924) for *Thoracosaurus* from Sweden. The maxillary teeth display pronounced wear facets. Because the type material is too fragmentary to allow a proper diagnosis, we conditionally accept Carpenter’s (1983) suggestion of synonymy with *T. neocesariensis*. *T. mullicensis*, however, lacks many of the important elements that would allow detailed comparison with other specimens.

**Summary of Taxonomic Changes**

**Synonymies**  *Crocodylus affinis* Marsh, 1871a includes *C. brevicollis* Marsh, 1871a; *C. grinnelli* Marsh, 1871a; *C. herpichanus* Troxell, 1925a; and *C. liodon* Marsh, 1871a.

**New Genus**  *Thecachampsoides minor* for *Gavialis minor* Marsh, 1870.
Nomina Dubia  

Diplosaurus nanus Marsh, 1895a; Hyposaurus ferox Marsh, 1871b; Hyposaurus natator oweni Troxell, 1925b.
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