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INTRODUCTION

The late Miocene fauna described here represents the earliest step in a sequence of late Tertiary faunas studied as a part of a long range investigation into the interrelationships of the factors of faunal change. The study is deliberately provincial to reduce biogeographic effects and to allow independent time controls to be developed through detailed geologic mapping.

The concept of the bulk fauna is used to indicate the entire fauna of the Northern Great Basin at any particular time. The association or community is the basic unit of study, the bulk fauna is the whole of which the associations are the overlapping parts.

The recognition and description of associations are dependent on quantitative data. Thus excavation must be carried out in such a way that useful quantitative information is retrieved. Previous studies of late Miocene, Barstovian, occurrences in the immediate area of study, Skull Spring (Gazin 1932), Sucker Creek (Scharf 1935), and in nearby areas, Virgin Valley (Merriam 1911), Beatty Butte (Wallace 1946), Mascall (Downs 1956), were based on float materials and limited excavations, lumped together as faunas. These studies provide material and conclusions useful in the taxonomic assignment of species occurring in samples but do not contribute quantitative data nor do they reflect the environmental diversity apparently present.

This report is based on excavations made to provide the type of data required for paleoecological study. The large amount of new material recovered, particularly small mammals, has involved more taxonomic work than was originally anticipated. The occurrence and systematics are thus presented here as a separate report as will also be the case with the Pliocene faunas, which make up the remainder of the sequence. The paleoecological considerations of the entire sequence, Barstovian to Blancan, will form a final report. The insectivores from both the Miocene and Pliocene faunas were studied by J. H. Hutchison and are separately reported on by him (1966, 1968). Shotwell (1967 A & B) has previously described the cricetine and geomyoid rodents from these localities. The geology has been studied by L. R. Kittleman and associates. The stratigraphy (Kittleman et al., 1965) and geologic map (Kittleman et al., 1967) are published separately.
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Figure 1. General location map.

OCCURRENCES

Previously known Barstovian collections from the Northern Great Basin are all very similar, representing possibly two associations; one which might be termed the Merychippus-Dromomeryx association and the other, usually more poorly represented, the Hypohippus-Ticholestus association. None of the expected members of a pond-bank association, so common in the Pliocene, were known such as beavers, Peromyscus, turtles, fish, etc. The paleobotanical evidence indicated, however, that such an association could be expected. The problem then was not only to find suitable sites for the excavation of quantitatively useful samples of those associations which were obviously present, but to also find samples of other associations which were expected and to find them within the geographic limitations imposed.

Together a number of the known Barstovian localities, including Skull Springs and Beatty Buttes and many other less well known sites, form a large contiguous area in southeastern, south central Oregon and northern Nevada. Within this large area no post-Barstovian sediments occur although post-Barstovian igneous rocks are present. Younger sediments are encountered in numerous localities peripheral to this area but lower topographically. This line of evidence led to a working hypothesis that the topographically higher area of thin Barstovian sediments had been continually high since the Barstovian and that the peripheral younger sediments represented the location of a number of small, and some rather large basins. Typically when descending into these basins from the "Barstovian high" Hemphillian sediments were first encountered in contact with those of Barstovian age. If the basin had been deeply cut, Clarendonian sediments were seen and finally Barstovian again but of different lithology than those on the high. In some of these basins still earlier rocks were present. The Barstovian sediments in the basins on the west and southwest side of the "high" had been carefully examined. This was disappointing in that they commonly consist of diatomite and
Figure 2. North end of Quartz Basin.

very fine ash. Very few vertebrates were to be seen in them, however, plant fossils were frequently present. The same failure had occurred on the north side of the Barstovian high in the Juntura Basin (see Shotwell 1963). To the east, in Malheur County it was believed that an extensive series of Barstovian sediments were present, however, the area was virtually unknown and relatively inaccessible. On the east and south it is bounded by the 1000 ft. deep Owyhee gorge occupied by a reservoir. On the north it is nearly isolated by a deep east-west branch canyon occupied by Dry Creek. On the west the distance from any sort of all-weather road had discouraged previous investigations. Study of air-photos of the area showed the sediments to be apparently fine grained but probably not diatomites. This then seemed to be the mostly likely area in which we might expect to find the associations of mammals we felt were missing and would be expected to be best developed in a lowland environment.

In the spring of 1960 two attempts were made to reconnoiter the area. The first one aborted due to a sudden thaw of a heavy snowfall and a fire in our vehicle. The second one was successful in that we reached the area and found evidence that a Barstovian stream-bank association was present and apparently abundantly represented. This was in the northern end of Quartz Basin. In the summer of 1960 a base camp was established a few miles to the west at the then unoccupied Page Ranch.

From the Page Ranch camp three geologists mapped the surrounding area, while the author and seven students made test excavations in Quartz Basin to the east and Juniper Creek Canyon to the west.

Quartz Basin is an erosional feature excavated in the lower members of the Deer Butte formation. The south and east borders of the basin are composed of low hills of the Red Butte and Orlando Springs Members while the west and northern borders consist of the some-
what higher hills of the Holdout and Quartz Mountain Members. The basin is shallow and drains into the Owyhee River to the south and the Owyhee Reservoir to the east over a thousand feet lower topographically. Vegetation in the basin is sparse and consists primarily of grasses with low brush around the borders of the basin and along drainage courses. There are no permanent streams in the basin although a year round spring, Ferguson Spring, flows at its northwest edge. The floor of the basin is between 3700-3800 feet in elevation with the surrounding hills at 4000 feet. Quartz Mountain rises from the west side of the basin to a height of over 5100 feet.

Fossils were collected from the Holdout Member of the Deer Butte Formation at sixteen localities along the northwest border of Quartz Basin. The Holdout Member is overlain by the Quartz Mountain Member. One of these localities, UOloc 2465, was developed into a quarry which produced a quantitative sample from a productive level less than a foot thick. Some faunal elements were recovered from the other localities which did not occur in the quarry. These are described in order to provide a more complete faunal list although they will not appear in the eventual quantitative analysis which is restricted to UOloc 2465.

The productive level of the Quartz Basin locality was completely removed, sacked and hauled about 8 miles to the Page Ranch where it was alternately soaked in the stock pond and dried in the sun using screens of 14 x 18 mesh. The concentrate from this screening was hauled to the museum where the bone was segregated from the remaining matrix. A little over three tons of productive level was so worked using 80 screens.

An additional small sample was taken from the east end of the quarry in the fall of 1965 and submitted to the kerosene treatment (see Wilson 1965) and 24 mesh screen in order to derive an estimate of the difference in results.
Figure 4. Locality UOloc 2465 Quartz Basin.

Figure 5. Locality UOloc 2495 Red Basin.
which might be expected due to the variation in this recovery technique which had been applied in subsequent excavations.

Float material is abundant in a number of localities in the vicinity of Skull Springs and in Red Basin. The description of the Skull Springs Fauna (Gazin 1932) is based on such material from Red Basin indicating that a rather complete faunal list, at least of the larger mammals, may be obtained in this way. However, such material presents serious handicaps to any quantitative analysis other than very crude estimates. To acquire quantitatively useful samples searches for possible excavation sites in this area were made during the course of seven field seasons. These efforts were for short periods of time but produced little in the way of encouragement. Assuming that a concerted effort over a longer single period of time would be successful, a large camp was established at Miller's Cow Camp on Dry Creek in the summer of 1961. A number of productive areas, north, east, and south of this point were examined. Eventually a dry wash in the northern half of Red Basin was examined in which large amounts of fragmental and complete vertebrate skeletal elements were found, UOloc 2493. Preliminary excavation produced specimens in place but also indicated that much of the concentration was already gone probably represented by the float as a lag deposit from the sediment removed by the dry wash. To test this conclusion another excavation was started just to the east and above the dry wash in the thin soil (UOloc 2495). Weathered specimens were soon encountered in the soil horizon and once unweathered sediment was reached a considerable amount of material was obviously present. Sagebrush was then cleared away and excavation started on the site. Screening of the well consolidated matrix was attempted using wetting and drying but was completely unsuccessful. Excavation was carried out by removing blocks of sediment whenever specimens
Figure 8. Locality map.

Antelope Flat 117'45 N 125'13 W

RED BASIN 117'30 N 125'13 W

SKULL SPRINGS 117'30 N 125'13 W

MILLER'S CORNER 117'30 N 125'13 W

LA RANCH 117'30 N 125'13 W

Bucchich Bobcat 117'30 N 125'13 W
the contact is in an area of about 1000 ft of
relief and very difficult to reach and work in.
Apparently at no point is the relationship of
the Littlefield Rhyolite and the Deer Butte For­
mation unquestionable. The Quartz Mountain
Member of the Deer Butte appears to, at least
in part, overlie the Littlefield Rhyolite but may
actually interfinger with it. Thus the Butte
Creek Volcanic Sandstone containing the Red
Basin faunule and the Deer Butte Formation
with the included Quartz Basin faunule appear
 to occupy similar stratigraphic positions.

A previously described fauna, the Sucker
Creek fauna (Scharf 1935), is not involved di­
rectly in the present report but is significant in
any discussion of faunas of this region. This
fauna occurs in the Sucker Creek Formation
(see Kittleman et al., 1965). Both the Sucker
Creek Formation and the Deer Butte Formation
are in the Owyhee “trough.” Their stratigraph­
ic relationships are, however, complex. The
Deer Butte Formation overlies the Owyhee Ba­
salt in its northern and eastern extent. The Owy­
hee Basalt overlies a rhyolite at Owyhee Dam
which in its southeastward extent appears to
overlie the Sucker Creek Formation. Upper
members of the Deer Butte Formation unques­
tionably overlie the Sucker Creek Formation
to the northeast and the lower members overlie
the Leslie Gulch Ash-Flow Tuff, a member high
in the Sucker Creek Formation, to the south.
The field evidence thus indicates that all of the
Deer Butte Formation lies stratigraphically
above the Sucker Creek Formation (see Kittle­
man et al., 1965, 1967).

The physical geology of the region thus indi­
cates that the Red Basin and Quartz Basin lo­
calities occur at about the same stratigraphic
level whereas the Sucker Creek localities ap­
pear much lower in the local section.

FAUNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Thirty six species of mammals were col­
lected in Red Basin of which thirty three were
found in the main quarry, UOloc 2495. Twenty
two species were previously known from Red
Basin as the Skull Springs fauna (Gazin 1932,
Hall 1931, Bode 1934, Downs 1956). Five of
the previously recorded species were not rec­
ognized in our collections; four carnivores,
Pliocyn, Euoplocyn, Hemicyon, and Tomic­
tus and a chalicother. The total known Skull
Springs fauna thus includes forty two species.
About one half of these are insectivores or ro­
dents. Fourteen species collected in Red Basin
were previously unknown in the Northern Great
Basin.

Quartz Basin localities produced thirty four
species of mammals, of which thirty one were
recovered from the main quarry UOloc 2465.
Seventeen species occurring in Quartz Basin
were previously unknown in the Northern Great
Basin.

The Quartz Basin localities were deliberate­
ly established to reveal an aspect of the North­
ern Great Basin fauna previously unknown but

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Red Basin</th>
<th>Quartz Basin</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsupalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivora</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagomorpha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proboscidea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perissodactyla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 14 Red Basin, 17 Quartz Basin, 5 Both, 25 Total
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Red Basin All Sites</th>
<th>Red Basin 2495</th>
<th>Red Basin 2497</th>
<th>Quartz Basin All Sites</th>
<th>Quartz Basin 2465</th>
<th>Sp. in Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsupiala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didelphid sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutamias incertae sedis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lantamotherium sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muterix cf. latidens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystiixius pacificus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapuloides ripofodiator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domoinoides sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scapulonxerus simplicidentis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scalopina sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archyoscepter longirostris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talyndius incertae sedis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradoxemius relictus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteromys sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allusivorex acricenters</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingentoxeres tumidens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagomorpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypolagus sp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liolatius alexandrae</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoporus cf. laevis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protorxemius malheuensis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spermophilus thyrsus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutamias sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuticapterus sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monosaulax typicus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monosaulax progressus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monosaulax sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adijlanaqua quarttae</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudotheridomys pagei</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peridomys xerogenensis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protolathia sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peromyscus pagei</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peromyscus sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macropus xanthus sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomarctus kelloggi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomarctus rufocomus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canis sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pliocyon sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euoplophenyx sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemicyon sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphicyon cf. frendus</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martes gaziini</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustela sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachygnorus sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassetus sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudouelsius sp.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
believed to be present. The representation of mammals is quite different between Quartz Basin and Red Basin. Of the total sixty three species known from the two areas only nine are positively recognized in both, four insectivores, three rodents, one carnivore and one artiodactyl. Five others, are poorly represented. Generic assignment may be sound but species assignment is not reliable either at both basins or in one or the other. In numbers of specimens, large mammals are more abundant at Red Basin and small mammals at Quartz Basin. However, this apparently does not account for the low resemblance between the two faunas. Forty different species of small mammals are known in the two faunas, twenty at Red Basin and twenty one at Quartz Basin, but only eight species are common to both faunas (see Table 3). Sciurimorph rodents are rare in the Quartz Basin fauna whereas six species of six genera are present at Red Basin. Seven species of six genera of myomorph rodents occur in Quartz Basin whereas only three are present at Red Basin, all are species found at Quartz Basin. (see Table 4) Fifteen species of insectivores occur in the two basins but only four are common to both areas. Each basin has nine species of insectivores represented. (see Table 5)

In general the carnivores of Quartz Basin are small and those of Red Basin large. Ungulates are represented by eight species at Quartz Basin. Three species are apparently present in both basins although two of these are questionable.

The large ungulates with their associated large carnivores of Red Basin are not common at Quartz Basin. Insectivores, rodents, small carnivores and the smaller ungulates are best represented. Three of the sixteen genera of mammals in common to Quartz Basin and Red Basin are represented by different species. *Monosaulax*, *Merychippus* and *Merycodus*. The species of two of these genera are well enough known to allow comparisons to be made which may be of value in better understanding the relation-

### TABLE 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Red Basin All Sites</th>
<th>Red Basin 2495</th>
<th>Red Basin 2497</th>
<th>Quartz Basin All Sites</th>
<th>Quartz Basin 2465</th>
<th>Speci Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proboscidea Mastodont</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perissodactyla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hypohippus cf. osborni</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merychippus relictus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merychippus brevidonatus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalicotheridae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aphelops sp.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudotapirinae</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ticholeptus obliquidens</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camelid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dromomeryx borealis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rakomeryx americanus</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merycodus cf. nevadensis</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Merycodus sp.</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3
**Resemblance of the Red Basin and Quartz Basin Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Red Basin</th>
<th>Quartz Basin</th>
<th>Species in Common</th>
<th>Resemblance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsupalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivora</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagomorpha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proboscidea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perissodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
**Resemblance of the Red Basin and Quartz Basin Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Red Basin</th>
<th>Quartz Basin</th>
<th>Species in Common</th>
<th>Resemblance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsupalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivora</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagomorpha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proboscidea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perissodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5
**Resemblance of the Red Basin and Quartz Basin Samples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Red Basin</th>
<th>Quartz Basin</th>
<th>Species in Common</th>
<th>Resemblance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marsupalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insectivora</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagomorpha</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodentia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnivora</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proboscidea</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perissodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artiodactyla</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ships between the faunas. *Monosaulax typicus* is found at Red Basin. *Monosaulax progressus* is present at Quartz Basin. These two beavers are of the same size and height of crown. The striids of the lower fourth premolar are more persistent in *M. progressus* and it possesses a short parastrid not seen in *M. typicus.* However, the degree of development of stria and striids on the molars are similar in the two species. Accessory lakes appear on the teeth of *M. progressus* and a buttress-like stylid is on the anterior face of the lower fourth premolar. The presence of a parastrid on the premolar of *M. progressus* might suggest advancement over *M. typicus* but in this case it appears to be a function of the more complex nature of the occlusal pattern of the teeth of *M. progressus* and more probably reflects diversity in the genus rather than phylogenetic trends.

*Merychippus seversus,* common in the Red Basin fauna and *M. brevidontus,* a rare form there, are unknown at Quartz Basin. *M. relictus* and *M. sp.* (comparable to *M. californicus*) are present at Quartz Basin and not at Red Basin. The teeth of *M. brevidontus* are very low crowned and tend to be complicated. Those of *M. seversus* are higher crowned but less complicated. They represent horses of about the same size. *M. sp.* of Quartz Basin is a high crowned species, similar to the High Rock Canyon *M. cf. californicus.* *M. relictus* is a small horse only poorly known at other localities. It is present, however, in the Crooked River Basin of Central Oregon along with *M. seversus* and possibly in the Mascall. *M. seversus* and *M. californicus* are considered by Downs (1961) to demonstrate steps in a microevolutionary trend. This is, of course, in part dependent on the temporal relations of these species. Downs considers the Crooked Creek, Gateway, Skull Springs, Beatty Buttes, Sucker Creek, Virgin Valley and Mascall, the sources of the *M. seversus* samples, to be equivalent in age and all older than the High Rock Canyon or North Coalinga faunas from which the *M. californicus* samples were obtained. This time relationship, however, is primarily based on the equid fauna (Downs 1956, p. 325) and thus is circumspect at best, certainly not independent evidence as is suggested in his later paper (Downs 1961, p. 58). The *M. seversus-M. californicus* "microevolutionary trends" are said by Downs (1961, p. 58) to confirm the "control character trends" in the *Merychippus-Nannippus* line. This is not surprising since the *Merychippus-Nannippus* "control character trends" were obviously the basis for the establishment of the temporal order of the *M. seversus-M. californicus* "sequence." Downs (1961, p. 60) allows that *M. seversus* and *M. californicus* may represent two parallel lines of development but rejects this as an alternative because he recognized no supporting evidence. Downs gives no evidence that *M. californicus* is younger than *M. seversus* nor does he recognize the likelihood that they are not directly related.

Such "sequences" as *Merychippus-Nannippus* (see Stirton 1947) are picked in the first place to show what they are purported to prove. For instance if a *Merychippus-Hippolion* sequence had been chosen no increase in height of crown over the Coalinga *Merychippus* would be evident. The time order of the forms shown is not established by any means. No two of the elements in the sequence even occur in the same depositional basin or biogeographic area. They represent specimens from Oregon, California, Nebraska, Kansas, and Texas. It is my opinion that five of the Miocene specimens represent "stages of evolution" which were probably contemporaneous or even reversed in time sequence. Certainly only three steps are present in the Pliocene part of the sequence. The so called "control character trends" really have no time control. The order of stages in the sequence is determined largely by the "control character trends." The sequence is not a sequence but is based on the assumption that a continuous gradual progressive change is the evolutionary rule. This same "sequence" is then used as a demonstration of the truth of this assumption.

The use of "control character trends" of such sequences as *Merychippus-Nannippus* to
temporally order species within a genus seems unsound to me for the following reasons:

1. Temporal controls are not based on independent sources of information but usually are circuitous.
2. Where absolute dates are available they do not confirm the temporal relationships proposed within provincial ages and even reverse some trends.
3. Such an approach ignores the probability of contemporaneous diversification of characters, something rather common in living mammals. Thus biogeographic and environmental differences are not allowed.

The stratigraphic evidence indicates that the Red Basin, *Merychippus severus*, and the Quartz Basin *Merychippus sp.* are probably contemporaries. Additional evidence is supplied by the occurrence of *Merychippus sp.* in the Butte Creek Volcanic Sandstone at locality 2471 between Red Basin and Quartz Basin. The mutual occurrence of *M. relictus* and *M. severus* in the Mascall fauna and the occurrence of *M. relictus* at Quartz Basin further supports this conclusion.

The differences between the Red Basin and Quartz Basin collections are thus not due to differences in age but most probably reflect synchronous diversity in the mammalian fauna of the region in the Barstovian.

It was suggested earlier that two associations were apparently represented in the previously known samples of the Barstovian Northern Great Basin fauna, the *Merychippus-Dromomeryx* and *Hypohippus-Ticholeptus* associations. The names are derived from the common large mammals present. Previous collections, because of their composite nature, masked the differences but do show that if such associations are real they represented adjacent habitats. Early in the excavation of the main quarry at Red Basin UOloc 2495 it was obvious that *Merychippus* and *Dromomeryx* were the most common large mammals present. *Hypohippus* and *Ticholeptus* were not recognized from there until the sample was being prepared and then were very rare. A search was begun by part of the crew, as soon as the nature of the quarry was evident, to seek out a site which might produce the expected *Hypohippus-Ticholeptus* association. In this we were only partially successful. Such an occurrence was found but it was not possible to retrieve a quantitatively useful sample. This locality, UOloc 2497, was in a massive volcanic sandstone quite unlike the lithology at UOloc 2495, but within the thin Butte Creek Volcanic Sandstone. Scattered about on the surface were a number of specimens, many partly or wholly incased in concretions. Immediately above this massive sandstone was a conglomerate which also produced fossil vertebrates, some of which had weathered out. Excavation in the conglomerate produced a number of specimens, including *M. severus*, preserved much differently than those encountered in and on the sandstone below. This difference in preservation allowed a simple means of recognizing float from the overlying conglomerate and segregating it from the specimens derived from the sandstone. Only eleven species of mammals were present in the massive sandstone sample. Only three of the species recognized were not present in the large sample from UOloc 2495, *Liodontia furlongi*, a mastodont, and *Parahippus avus*. *Merychippus severus* abundant at UOloc 2495 was questionably present and no *Dromomeryx* specimens were found. Complete dentitions of *Hypohippus* and *Ticholeptus* were present and were best represented among the isolated teeth and partial elements. This occurrence strongly suggests that a *Hypohippus-Ticholeptus* association existed, however, *in situ* specimens led me to believe that a local concentration was not present but that the material was homogeneously dispersed throughout the outcrop exposed. No quantitative sample is thus available. A collection of similarly preserved specimens was made by James at Massacre Lake, Nevada and possibly represents this or a very similar association.

The collections described here thus represent at least three associations within the total fauna...
of the Barstovian of the Northern Great Basin. The nature of these associations and their quantitative attributes will be discussed later in a more appropriate context.

If the various collections referred to here represent different aspects of the same total fauna it seems inappropriate to refer to them as separate faunas. Rather than re-defining faunas and faunules I will discuss them by locality with the understanding that they all are part of the Skull Spring fauna. Eventually some more realistic basis will have to be developed for reference to mammalian collections.

The birds and lower vertebrates from the localities discussed here will be described separately at a later date.

**SYSTEMATICS**

**ORDER MAMMALIA**

**FAMILY DIDELPHIDAE**

(Fig. 9)

A single upper molar from U0loc 2465, Quartz Basin, U022684, apparently represents a didelphid near the size of *Didelphis*. The posterior labial portion of the tooth is missing. The protocone is prominent. The paracone and metacone are present, the paracone is slightly the larger of the two cusps. At least one stylar cusp may have been present at the anterior edge of the labial side of the tooth but abrasion has nearly removed it. A much smaller one appears to be just posterior to it and another just anterior to the point of breakage. The transverse diameter of the tooth is 6.1 mm. An estimate of the anterior-posterior diameter is 4 mm. Until more complete material is available the assignment of this specimen must be tentative.

**ORDER INSECTIVORA**

The insectivores were studied by J. H. Hutchison. His studies of the shrews and moles have been previously published (1966, 1968). His work on the Erinaceidae and Metacodontidae (1964) is included here.

**SUPERFAMILY ERINACEOIDEA**

**FAMILY ERINACEIDAE**

**Subfamily Echinosoricinae**

**LANTANOThERIUM** sp. indet.

(Fig. 10 A, B)

This genus is represented in the Northern Great Basin by only one specimen, U024283, from Red Basin, U0loc 2495. The specimen consists of a slightly worn left second molar. There is a prominent paralophid and high trigonid. The metaconid and protoconid are opposite each other transversely as are the hypoconid and entoconid. The protoconid and metaconid are of equal height with the entoconid only slightly lower. The tooth is less stout than...
in *L. longirostrae* and *Ocajila makpiyahe* but otherwise heavier than in other species of *Lantanotherium*. The talonid is slightly narrower than the trigonid. The tooth is 2.38 mm long and 1.77 mm wide.

Of the North American *Lantanotherium*, the Red Basin specimen seems to resemble most closely *L. sawini* (James, 1963) and the form from the Bopesta Formation (Webb, 1961) in the transversely opposite placement of the protoconid and metaconid. The relative width of the talonid to trigonid in the Red Basin specimen more closely approaches the condition of *L. sawini*, however the hypoconid is closer to the metaconid than it appears to be in James' illustration (Fig. 18, p. 56) of *L. sawini*. In this latter respect the Oregon specimen resembles its contemporary from the Bopesta. To make any assignments as to specific relationships on such small differences would be fruitless until the variation within *Lantanotherium* has been demonstrated.

**ERINACEIDAE incertae sedis**

(Fig. 10 C-H)

Two complete upper fourth premolars (UO 22348-UO22349) and the talon of another (U022347), two second or third upper molars (UO22004, UO22062), and one adult (UO 22305) and one unerupted (UO21971) second lower molar of an apparently undescribed erinaceid were present in the Quartz Basin sample, U0loc 2465. Each specimen seems to represent an animal roughly the size of *Lantanotherium sawini*. These three isolated groups of teeth are here tentatively considered to represent the same species largely on the basis of

**Figure 10.** Erinaceidae, *Lantanotherium sp.* left M2, UO24283 Red Basin, A labial view, B occlusal view x 10. Erinaceidae incertae sedis, Quartz Basin, left M2 UO 22305, C labial view, D occlusal view x 10, left P4 UO 22349, E occlusal view, F lingual view x 10, right M2 or 3 UO 22062, G occlusal view, H lingual view x 10.
similar form, relatively equivalent expected size, and exclusion on the basis of size, mutual-
ity, or morphology from assignment to other
forms in the fauna.

The P4 is shaped somewhat like that of
Sorex. At first it was thought this tooth belonged
to a shrew judging from the deeply emargin-
ated posterior border and the lack of a hypo-
cone, but the massive roots and their similarity
of coalition to those of the M2 in conjunction
with the massive appearance of the enamel sug-
gest erinaceid affinities. The paracone is similar
to that of Erinaceus. There is no external cin-
gulum, but a small ridge arises about halfway
down the paracone and joins the labial extrem-
ity of the anterior cingulum to form a small
anterior extension (parastyle?). The protocone
is a small swelling of the anterolabial extremi-
y of the tooth quite close to the base of the para-
cone and separated from it by only a small
notch. The posterior portion of the tooth slopes
down sharply from the protocone and ectoloph.
There is no hypocone, in fact, the region where
it might be expected is depressed in relation to
the general slope of the talon. This depression
is elongate and parallel to the lingual border
of the tooth. It appears to be the result of occlu-
sion. The posterior border is sharply indented
as in Sorex. There is no posterior cingulum,
although the occlusal (?) depression appears
to create one. The three roots are beneath the
center of the ectoloph, anterior region of the
paracone, and the talon respectively. All are
strongly interconnected with each other by
strong crests which fuse at the vertical axis of
the tooth.

The numerical assignment of the two molar
teeth is difficult since some lines of erinaceids
tend to greatly reduce or lose the M3. In such
species the M3 then approaches a structural
similarity to the M3 of other erinaceids. The
complex morphology of the fossils in company
with a reduced hypocone suggest a modified
M3. This tooth is somewhat like the M3 of Gale-
rix, but the development of the hypocone results
in an inflated posterolingual border. The proto-
cone is large and also inflated as in Erinaceus
and Meterix; it is joined by ridges to the meta-
cone and anterior cingulum. The slight rise and
swelling on the anterior ridge probably repre-
sents the protocone. The portion of the cingu-
lum immediately lingual to the parastyle re-
sembles the anterior ridge of the protocone. The
paracone is set in from the labial margin and
slightly concave labially which results in the
formation of ridges connecting it to the para-
style and mesostyle. The parastyle is prominent
and as high as the metacone. The external cir-
gulum extending from the parastyle loses its
identity beyond the low mesostyle. The meta-
cone is similar to the paracone but is slightly
convex labially. The hypocone is transversely
elongated, low, and inflated. It connects labial-
ly with the posterior ridge from the protocone
forming a slight eminence probably represent-
ing the metastyle, which, in turn, joins the
base of the metacone. In both specimens the
roots have been broken away immediately be-
low the base of the crown. The lack of wear and
fairly, thin root walls indicate the relatively re-
cent eruption of the teeth.

The M2 is more than half as wide as long
(see Table 6) and bulbous (exodaenodont?) in
appearance. The metaconid and protoconid, as
well as the entoconid and hypoconid, are di-
rectly opposite each other transversely. The
talonid is longer and lower than the trigonid
but about equal in width. The hypoconid and
entoconid are joined by a broad hypolophid
and also connected to the cusps anterior to them
by the inflated crista obliqua and entolophid
respectively. The trigonid is crowded and
perched on the tooth. The paracone is com-
pressed and continuous with the protocone as
in Lantaratherium. The labial walls of the
crown are quite prominent. The walls of the
crown are quite prominent.
author showed the high degree of confluence of the roots as in the P₄ and M₂ of this form. Lack of better material and positive association make naming and speculation as to its affinities premature.

**TABLE 6**

**MEASUREMENTS OF THE TEETH OF ERINACEID incertae sedis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P₄: UO 22545</td>
<td>2.7e</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P₄: UO 33489</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂: UO 22004</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂: UO 22062</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂: UO 21974*</td>
<td>2.4e</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂: UO 22305</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated measurement.  
* Unerupted tooth.

**SUPERFAMILY SORICOIDEA**  
**FAMILY METACODONTIDAE**

**METERIX** cf. *M. LATIDENS* Hall

Several teeth and a few mandibular fragments of *Meterix* were recovered from Quartz Basin, UOloc 2465. The skull material is being studied by S. David Webb who has at his disposal the type as well as a fine collection of jaws and teeth from Stewart Springs, Nevada. The Quartz Basin material represents the first *Meterix* from Oregon as well as its most northerly occurrence. A number of peculiar limb bones of an insectivore of the size of *Meterix* were also recovered from the Quartz Basin site. The fragmentary humeri were soon recognized to be identical to a humeral fragment from Stewart Springs described by Reed and Downs (1958) as a “mammal of unknown affinities.” The University of California at Berkeley has subsequently reworked the Stewart Springs localities by washing techniques to yield many new specimens of *Meterix* but no additional humeri. There are, however, specimens of a peculiar radius, femur, tibia-fibula, astragalus, and calcaneum which are essentially identical to the above mentioned homologous elements from Quartz Basin. The author believes that the post-craniol elements represent a single from on the basis of (1) recurrent association from the two sites, (2) relative size, (3) relative abundance, and (4) relative adaptive similarity. The association of the cranial elements of *Meterix* with the post-cranial elements is based on the first three of these criteria. *Meterix* is also present in the sample from Red Basin.

Hutchison is preparing a report on the osteology of *Meterix* in which he will describe the Quartz Basin and Red Basin specimens as well as those from other Great Basin localities.

**ORDER LAGOMORPHA**  
**FAMILY LEPORIDAE**

**HYPOLAGUS** sp.

A single upper P₄ or M₁, smaller than *H. vetus* but about the same size as the larger specimens of *H. furloa*, was collected at UOloc 2453 Quartz Basin. The re-entrant is crenulated. Dawson (1958) assigned upper teeth from the Tonopah fauna to *H. parviplicatus*, a species originally described from the Virgin Valley fauna. The Quartz Basin specimen is only slightly smaller than these. Transverse measurement = 3.75 mm. At locality 2465, Quartz Basin a fragmental tibia representing a small species of *Hypolagus* was found.

**ORDER RODENTIA**  
**SUBORDER SCIUROMORPHA**

**LIODONTIA ALEXANDRAE** (Furlong 1910)

Previously known material from the Skull Springs fauna is described in Gazin (1932) and reviewed by Shotwell (1958). Additional material was collected at UOloc 2459, Red Basin.

**FAMILY MYLAGAULIDAE**

**MYLAGAULUS** cf. *LAEVIS*

The Red Basin material was described by Gazin (1932) and reviewed by Shotwell (1958). Additional material was collected at UOloc 2439, Red Basin.
FAMILY SCIURIDAE

PROTOSPERMOPHILUS MALHEURENSIS (Gazin 1932)  (Fig. 11 A-C)

The type and previously assigned specimens of this species do not include elements of the lower dentition. Isolated lower molars and premolars from Red Basin UOloc 2495 are assigned here primarily on the basis of size and characters expected in the lower dentition, using the lower dentition of other species of Protospermophilus as a guide.

The lower fourth premolar is subrounded, quadrate, in occlusal outline and slightly narrower transversely at the anterior end than the posterior. Anteroconid, mesoconid, entoconid, and mesostylid are all distinct. The parametaconid and protoconid are in close contact. No protolophid or metalophid is evident. The posterolophid curves slightly and terminates at the high entoconid.

The lower first or second molar is rhomboidal in occlusal outline. The protolophid does not connect to the protocone in some specimens but bypasses it anteriorly, in others it is complete. The metalophid is low but complete. A small mesoconid is present on the ectolophid. Parametaconid, protoconid, and hypoconid are nearly equal in size, although the parametaconid is highest. The entoconid is buried in the gently curving posterolophid but is distinct. A small mesostylid is present. In some specimens it appears as two small cusps, in others as a prominent single cusp.

The lower third molar is represented by three well worn specimens so that all the characteristics are not clear. A small mesostylid and slightly larger mesoconid can be recognized. The protolophid is apparently complete and the metalophid very short. The tooth is broad at the small entoconid and tapers posteriorly to the hypoconid.

One lower incisor is assigned to this species. In transverse section it is ovoid, flattened medially. The enamel is crenulated. An upper incisor is also present with crenulated enamel. It is ovoid in transverse section, flattened mediately. Black (1963) indicates measurements for the upper incisor of the type specimen of P. malheurensis taken from specimen No. 129. However, the type has no incisors so the measurements must have referred to the alveoli.

SPERMOPHILUS TEPHRUS (Gazin 1932)  (Fig. 11 D-K)


The lower dentition of this species was not represented in the material which was used in the original description. Since the present material was collected from the same stratigraphic unit and since uppers which can be assigned to S. tephrus also are present the assignment of the specimens described here is warranted. Three deciduous lower fourth premolars are in the collection. In this tooth the protoconid and parametaconid are conjointed at their base. The upper portions of these cusps are connected by a short metalophid and protolophid forming a small elevated trigonid basin. The hypoconid is about the same size as the protoconid. The posterolophid curves in a circular arc ending just short of the parametaconid. The tooth is much broader posteriorly than anteriorly. In the lower fourth premolar the protolophids is incomplete whereas the metalophids is complete. The small trigonid basin thus opens anteriorly into a groove extending down the anterior face of the tooth. The protoconid and hypoconid are of equal size and separated by a rather straight ectolophid apparently without a mesoconid. The posterolophid forms a parabolic arc and is low just before it connects with the parametaconid. The posterior...
TABLE 7
MEASUREMENTS OF THE DENTITION OF Protospermophilus malheurensis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lower dentition</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P₃</td>
<td>U024238</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁₇</td>
<td>U024236</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024404</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024260</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>U024251</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024251</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024240</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₃</td>
<td>U024260</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024248</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>U024426</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>upper dentition</th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D₄</td>
<td>U024221</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₄</td>
<td>U024215</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024441</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>U024422</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

portion of the tooth is much wider than the anterior.

In the lower first and second molars the protoconid and parametacristid are of about equal size while the hypoconid is smaller. The protolophid connects low and indirectly on the protoconid producing a prominent groove and cusp at that point. The metalophid is very short and only meets a broadened protolophid from the parametacristid. A trench-like open trigonid basin is formed. The ectolophid is straight and on some specimens has a mesostylid. The posterolophid curves gently around to the entoconid which is submerged in it. Some specimens have a small mesostylid. A poorly developed mesostylid is present on some specimens.

Three fragmental lower incisors are present in the collection. Two of the specimens have 4-6 distinct longitudinal grooves near the middle of the enamel face while one has crenulations which are crudely aligned. These crenulations may, in part, represent abraded grooves since the specimen shows some evidence of abrasion.

The type specimen and synonym type specimen display worn and damaged teeth. The new material thus provides some additional data concerning these teeth.

The upper deciduous fourth premolar differs markedly from the permanent fourth premolar in the presence of a large parastyle. The anterior cingulum connects high on the parastyle and low on the protocone. The anterior valley is thus closed off lingually. No protoconule is present but a metaconule is. The metaloph curves anteriorly connecting low on the protocone. A mesostylid is present on the shoulder of the paracone. The central valley is broad at its midpoint. The posterior cingulum is well developed bordering a narrow posterior valley. Two of the specimens have no roots and two have highly divergent roots indicating the deciduous nature of the teeth. The broad parastyle on the deciduous dentition of a form having a much reduced parastyle on the permanent tooth is to be expected since this is characteristic in living sciurids.

Neither of the upper fourth premolars in the collection have mesostyles which occur on the original material. However, the appearance of mesostyles is variable and their absence on the present material does not negate its assignment to the known species. The parastyle is low and poorly developed. The anterior cingulum is low and appears as a narrow shelf low on the anterior side of the tooth. The protoloph is sinuous and a protoconule is either not present or completely incorporated in the protoloph which connects low on the broad protocone. A mesostylid is present on one specimen and only poorly developed on the other. The metaloph
is quite narrow at its connection low on the protocone. The posterior cingulum is prominent and may incorporate the hypocone. The cingulum is higher and somewhat broader at this point.

The upper first and second molars are nearly quadrate in outline. The protocone is large and dominates all the other features of the tooth. The parastyle is not separable from the anterior cingulum which is strong and connects abruptly into the protocone adding to the quadrate occlusal outline. The posterior cingulum also contacts the protocone abruptly, a swelling at this point may represent the hypocone. The anterior valley is broader than the posterior. The protoloph drops sharply to a point low on the protocone where it makes a narrow connection. A small protoconule is present on some specimens. A broad mesostyle is present. The metaloph appears to terminate in a relatively large metaconule; however, on some specimens a low narrow connection occurs just beyond the metaconule.

There is no metaloph on the third upper molar. The protoloph is straight and connects low on the protocone. The anterior cingulum is complete and borders a narrow valley. The protocone is bulbous. The posterior cingulum forms an abrupt angle with the protocone and is semicircular in occlusal outline, the talon basin being expanded.

The upper incisors in the type material are crenulated but the tip near the broken end of one on CIT 334 reveals longitudinal grooves. Upper incisors in the new material are finely crenulated. This species is similar in dention to the living Spermophilus beecheyi.

Figure 11. Sciurids, Red Basin, Protospermophilus malheurensis, A P4 U024355, B M1 or 2 U024404, C M1 or 2 U024261, Spermophilus tephrus, D DP4 U024410, E P4 U024211, F M1 or 2 U024218, G M1 U024419, H DP, U026056, I P4, U0 26653, J M1 or 2, U024266, K M3, U0 24231, Sciuropterus sp., L P4, U024269, occlusal view, M lateral view, N P4 U0 24590 all x 5.
TABLE 8
MEASUREMENTS OF THE DENTITION OF Spermophilus tephrus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lower dentition</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024377</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U026056</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U026055</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024256</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024240</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024250</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024246</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024231</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024242</td>
<td>2.12a</td>
<td>2.08a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024255</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024254</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024253</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper dentition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024408</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024219</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024420</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024232</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024211</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024214</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1 or 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024218</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024219</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024220</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024223</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024229</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024234</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024410</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024230</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024220</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024412</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024216</td>
<td>2.00a</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024212</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024418</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024419</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U027159</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U027165</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U027163</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U027158</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U027163</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black (1963) considered the type skulls of Citellus ridgewayi and Sciurus tephrus to represent the same squirrel and so placed them in a single species. The name chosen was apparently determined by page priority in Gazin's original description of the material. However, the characteristics of this form are more distinct on the former species C. ridgewayi. In using the genus Spermophilus I am simply following Hall and Kelson (1959) in its apparent priority over Citellus.

**Spermophilus cf. Tephrus**

A scapholunar and two astragali from Quartz Basin locality 2465 represent a small species of spermophilid near S. beecheyi in characteristics. These are the only specimens assigned to the sciuridae from Quartz Basin.

**Eutamias sp.**

A single upper fourth premolar of a very small sciurid occurs in the collection from Red Basin, UOloc 2495. The specimen is moderately worn. The parastyle is low. The anterior cingulum extends about one half the transverse width of the tooth. The protoloph is straight whereas the metaloph curves anteriorly joining the protocone at about the same point. Proto or metaconules are apparently not present. It is not possible to determine the nature of the posterior cingulum or whether a mesostyle was present or not. The occlusal outline of the tooth and its size suggests *Eutamias*.

**Sciuropeterus sp.**

(Fig. 11 L-N)

Five teeth or tooth fragments represent this genus in the collection from Red Basin UOloc 2495. They include a little worn lower fourth premolar, two little worn upper fourth premolars, a fragment of an upper first or second molar and a heavily worn upper third molar.
In the lower fourth premolar the parametaconid is the largest cusp and is situated more anteriorly than the protoconid. It exposes a flattened face to the talonid basin. The parametaconid and protoconid are closely appressed. A small accessory cusp appears on the anterior lingual face of the parametaconid which may represent a much reduced anterocoonid. There is a groove separating it from the protoconid. The posterolophid is high and terminates at the prominent entoconid. A mesostyle is present as well as a prominent mesoconid. The ectolophid is situated well in from the border of the tooth and is relatively high. The floor of the talonid basin is rugose and crenulated.

The parastyle is the largest cusp of the upper fourth premolar. The anterior cingulum is low and connects the lingual border of the parastyle to the protocone. The anterior valley is therefore open. The protoloph is straight with apparently no protoconule. The metaloph curves slightly anteriorly and only weakly connects to the protocone. A metaconule is present. The paracone and metacone are of about the same size. The posterior cingulum extends nearly straight from the posterior side of the metacone to the hypocone. A mesostyle is present. The tooth is complicated by the development of numerous protolophules and metalophules. Lophules are also present on the parastyle, protocone and posterior cingulum. In one specimen the posterior valley is completely blocked in two places by lophules. Several prominent lophules extend into the central valley and anterior valley from the protocone. The highest development is in the posteriorly directed metaconule. The smaller of these two specimens is either an unerupted tooth or possibly a deciduous tooth. It consists of only the enamel cap.

Several species of Sciuropterus were described by James (1963) as the first known from North America. The present material is larger than James’ material and apparently more complicated especially in regards to the posterior valley of the upper fourth premolar.

In these two characteristics it is closer to S. albomarginatus judging by James’ review. The hypocone does not seem to be as prominent in the new material as in James’ specimens but this may only reflect differences in stage of wear. Whether or not the Tertiary specimens assigned to Sciuropterus are really flying squirrels in habits is not known. The assignment to Sciuropterus is a convenience in the same way that assignments in the past of Tertiary specimens to Sciurus and Citellus was convenient. The occurrence of complicated teeth in paromyids (see Wood 1962) and the marmot Marmota nevadensis elicits caution in any conclusions from this occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U024269</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024390</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U024270</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suborder Castorimorpha
Family Castoridae
Subfamily Castoroidinae

**MONOSAULAX TYPICUS** n. sp. (Fig. 12)

**TYPE**: U021677, left mandible with incisor, P4-M3, palate with left P4-M3, M3 and right p4-M3.

**HYPOTHESIS**: U020751, right mandible with complete dentition; U024395, fragmental left mandible with P3-M3; U024394, fragmental left mandible with P3-M3; U024392, fragmental right mandible with P3-M3; U024393, crushed skull with complete dentition; U021558, anterior portion of skull with complete dentition.

**TYPE LOCALITY**: U02102495, Red Basin

**DIAGNOSIS**: Small species in which the hypoflexus and paraflexus bypass in the upper fourth premolar resulting in a deep pre-paraflexus area in the occlusal pattern. Lingual striids and labial striae not persistent. Fossettids of the lower teeth tend to be straight. Secondary fossettids and fossettes rarely present. Incisors with rounded enamel face.
DESCRIPTION: No metastriid or parastriid is present even in unerupted lower fourth premolars. The mesostriid is very short but the hypostriid extends well down the enamel crown. The base of the tooth is not exposed on any of the available specimens. In early wear the para, meso, and meta fossettids are straight and of nearly equal length. In one specimen the metafossettid is represented by two lakes. In an unerupted specimen there is a notch opening into the parafossettid anteriorly. In this same specimen there is a prominent invagination of the anterior border of the parafossettid into the lake. The parafossettid of some specimens is crescentic. The lower first and second molars are quite similar. The mesostriid is very short and the metastriid only slightly shorter. The para, meso, and meta fossettids are parallel and straight and about the same length in early wear. In the course of wear the parafossettid becomes very small and is the first lake lost from the occlusal pattern. Soon after the metafossettid is also lost. Late in wear only the large hypofossettid and a very small mesofossettid remain. The anteroposterior diameter reduces with the loss of the fossettids while the transverse diameter remains little changed. Occasionally the parafossettid is slightly curved. The third lower molar is a little smaller and shorter crowned than the others. The fossettids are unequal in size with the parafossettid much larger than the other lingual lakes. The mesofossettid is the smallest.

The upper fourth premolar is the largest tooth of the superior cheek tooth series. The labial stria of this tooth are closed in all the available specimens even those in apparent early wear. The parafossettid is straight and bypasses the hypoflexus. The mesofossettid is straight labially but at about the middle of the tooth it curves sharply posteriorly. The metafossettite is straight and small. The upper first and second molars also have closed labial stria in all the available specimens suggesting that they are very short in unworn teeth. The parafossettide and hypofossettide abut. The parafossettide is quite small. The mesofossettide curves posteriorly at its lingual end but not as sharply as in the upper fourth premolar and tends to be more symmetrical. The metafossettide is small and straight. In well worn specimens the metafossettide is absent and the parafossettide very small.

By very late wear only the meso and hypofossettides are present. The anterior-posterior diameter of the tooth is greatly reduced in the course of wear. The third upper molar is shorter crowned and smaller than the others. The metastria opens posteriorly and the metafossettide appears to be more persistent than in the other molars. A small secondary fossettide appears between the labial ends of the para and mesofossettides.

COMPARISONS: Only three previously described species of North American Monosaulax approach M. typicus in its small size, M. complexus, M. curtis and M. n. sp. Wilson (1960). Of these only M. n. sp. Wilson from Quarry A in Martin Canyon, Colorado is adequately described. Comparison of upper and lower dentitions of the Colorado species, (augmented by Wilson's description), with the Red Basin species reveals a number of similarities and differences. The two species have similar heights of crown and about equally persistent stria and striids. Secondary fossettides are either not as common or not as persistent in the Oregon species as in the one from Colorado. In the upper fourth premolars of the Colorado species the hypoflexus and paraflexus abut but in M. typicus they bypass. This emphasizes the larger proparafossettid segment of the occlusal surface present in the Oregon species. In the upper cheek teeth of the Colorado species the mesofossettide is symmetrically crescentic whereas in M. typicus the mesofossettide is crescentic but asymmetrical, the lingual portion extending...
### TABLE 9
**Measurements of Lower Dentition of Monosaulax typicus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teeth</th>
<th>U021677</th>
<th>U020741</th>
<th>U024394</th>
<th>U024395</th>
<th>U024392</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.95a</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>2.62a</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4-M3</td>
<td>12.73</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>12.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AP, Tr, occlusal diameter
a—damaged, Hypo, Mes, Meta indicate striid lengths

### TABLE 10
**Measurements of the Upper Dentition of Monosaulax typicus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teeth</th>
<th>U021550L</th>
<th>U021550R</th>
<th>U021677L</th>
<th>U021677R</th>
<th>U024393L</th>
<th>U024393R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>3.40a</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4-M3</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>8.88</td>
<td>8.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5-M5</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
much further posteriorly than the labial. These two species appear to represent a similar stage of evolution.

Specimens of Monosaulax from Nevada and Oregon have previously been recognized and assigned to the species M. pansus (Douglas 1901, Stirton 1935). This is apparently a much larger species than M. typicus and also higher crowned. It lacks the secondary fossettes seen in the Colorado species but otherwise differs from the new species in some of the same characteristics as does the Colorado species.

**MONOSAULAX PROGRESSUS** n. sp.

(Fig. 13-15)

**TYPE**: U021713, right mandible with P4-M3; incisor and ascending ramus missing.

**HYPODYM**: U019864, right mandible fragment including M1-M3; U019870, right mandible fragment including P4-M2; U019871, left mandible fragment including P4-M1; U019860, right mandible fragment including P4-M3; U019876, maxilla fragment with M2-M3; U019873, palate with left and right P4-M3; U021714 palate with left P4-M3 and right P4-M3; U026686 maxilla fragment with P4-M4; U019863 maxilla fragment with M1-M2.

**TYPE LOCALITY**: UOloc 2465 Quartz Basin

**DIAGNOSIS**: Small species with a short parastriid present on the lower fourth premolar which differs from all other previously described species. A strong buttress-like stylid occurs on the anterior face of the lower fourth premolar. On the upper fourth premolar there is a strong anterior lingual groove on the anterior face of the tooth. Secondary fossettes are present in early wear. Incisors with rounded enamel face.

**DESCRIPTION**: In addition to the hypodym, ninety-five isolated teeth and a number of skeletal elements are present in the collection from the type locality.

In the lower dentition the deciduous fourth premolar has no parastrid. The mesostriid and hypostrid are complete. The pattern is dominated by a large metafossettid and equally large parafossettid. The border of the parafossettid is complicated by a number of enamel invaginations into the mesoflexid originating from the mesostriid. The permanent lower fourth premolar has a short parastrid. The mesostriid is more than three fourths the height of the enamel crown. The hypostrid is full length. A well developed buttress-like style extends up the anterior face of the tooth and is reflected in the occlusal pattern after early wear. In early wear a small invagination of enamel projects from the anterior wall of the paraflexid, the metafossettid is very large and only separated by a narrow ridge of enamel from the hypoflexid, and roots are not yet developed. In some specimens a small invagination appears just labial to the stylid on the anterior face of the tooth and results in a small secondary fossettid in the occlusal pattern in early wear. At the same stage of wear another secondary fossettid occurs on the mesostrid.

The first and second lower molars are similar and difficult to separate when isolated from the mandible. In very early wear parastrid, metastrid, mesostrid and hypostrid are all open. Of the lingual striids the mesostrid is the most persistent. The para and metastrids are much less persistent, the metastrid being very short lived. The hypostrid extends nearly to the base of the enamel. Eventually the parafossettid and the metafossettid are lost through wear further shortening the anterior-posterior diameter of the tooth becomes shorter at the occlusal surface. Eventually the parafossettid and the metafossettid are lost through wear further shortening the anterior-posterior diameter of the tooth becomes shorter at the occlusal surface. In addition to the primary fossettids a secondary fossettid occurs in early wear antero-lingual to the parafossettid. All the fossettids and flexids are very nearly straight.

The parafossettid is ordinarily the longest of the lingual fossettids and in the first lower molar often curves slightly anteriorly at its labial end. The third lower molar is similar to the other molars but shorter crowned.

In the upper dentition the deciduous fourth premolar is molariform in overall appearance.
Figure 13. *Monosaulax progressus* n.sp., Quartz Basin. A mandible P-M, UO21713 dorsal view x 2.5, B occlusal view dentition x 2.5, C lateral view x 2.5, D medial view x 2.5, E palate UO19879 ventral view x 2.5, F palate UO21714 ventral view x 2.5, G DP, UO22905 occlusal view x 5, H DP, UO22999 occlusal view x 5.
### TABLE 11
**Measurements of the Fourth Lower Premolar of Monosaulax progressus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>Hypo</th>
<th>Meso</th>
<th>Para</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO22953</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22956</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22955</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22954a</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22966</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22943</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AP, Tr greatest diameters**

**HC—Height of crown on lingual side, Hypo, Meso, Para indicate striid lengths**

### TABLE 12
**Measurements of Lower Dentition of Monosaulax progressus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UO21713</th>
<th>UO19860</th>
<th>UO19871</th>
<th>UO19876</th>
<th>UO19864</th>
<th>UO19870</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P₄</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₁</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.59a</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₂</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hypo</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M₃</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meso</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Para</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P₄, M₂, P₃, M₃, Met—Occlusal measurements**

**AP, Tr—Occlusal measurements**

**a. damaged, Hypo, Meso, Para, Met, indicate striid lengths**
the parafossette and hypoflexus abut in early wear but bypass in later wear. The parastria is short, less than one half the height of the enamel crown. There is a hook-shaped extension of the paracone into the mesoflexus. The occlusal outline of the tooth is square but it is oriented diagonally in the maxilla. In the permanent upper fourth premolar the labial stria are all short. The metastria is nearly equal and only about 1 mm in length in very early wear. Secondary fossettes occur on each of the transverse lophs, at the parastyle posterior to the paracone and anterior to the mesostyle in early stages of wear. There is a shallow but prominent groove on the anterior lingual face of the tooth which is reflected in the occlusal pattern at most stages of wear. The hypoflexus bypasses the paraflexus. The paraflexus, hypoflexus and metafossette are all straight but become irregular in late wear. The mesofossette is slightly curved asymmetrically. The lingual portion extends posteriorly parallel to the posterior border of the hypoflexus. The fourth premolar is much larger than the other upper cheek teeth.

In the upper first and second molars the parastria is very short closing early in wear. The mesostria is less than 1 mm long and the metastria is apparently closed at all stages of wear. The hypostria is nearly the full length of the enamel crown. Unlike the upper fourth premolar the hypoflexus and the parafossette abut in the upper molars. A secondary fossette appears between the mesoflexus and parafossette in early wear. In unworn teeth this fossette opens labially. An anterior extension of the mesostyle nearly closes off the mesoflexus on some specimens and forms a loop connecting to the posterior border of the mesoflexus resulting in a secondary fossette. In other specimens a small style appears in the mesoflexus at the point of connection of the subsidiary loph. In early wear the occlusal pattern is reduced to a shortened straight parafossette, crescentic mesofossette, straight metafossette and a relatively straight hypoflexus. With wear the parafossette becomes shorter and the hypoflexus longer accompanied by a reduction in the anterior-posterior diameter of the occlusal surface. The parafossette and metafossette are lost before the base of the hypostria is reached. The third upper molar is similar in pattern to the first and second but is smaller. The anterior-posterior diameter of the occlusal pattern is not so drastically reduced in the course of wear. The metafossette and parafossette are apparently more persistent.

Comparisons: The Quartz Basin species differs from all previously known species of Monosaulax in the appearance of a short parastriid on the lower fourth premolar, a strongly developed stylid on the anterior face of the lower fourth premolar and a strong anterior lingual groove on the face of the upper fourth premolar. It is a small species comparable in size to M. typicus, M. n. sp. Wilson, M. curtis and M. complexus. The character of the fossettes and fossettids is similar to M. typicus but secondary fossettes are present as in M. n. sp. Wilson. Complications of the basic enamel pattern occur in early wear but are not similar to those present in the known specimens of M. complexus and do not persist with wear. The striids of the lower fourth premolar are longer than other species of Monosaulax but this is not true of the other teeth, nor is the height of crown significantly greater.

Li (1962, 1963) has described two new species of Monosaulax from China and Inner Mongolia. M. changpeiensis exhibits secondary
Table 13
Measurements of the Fourth Upper Premolar
or Monosaulax progressus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
<th>Hypo</th>
<th>Meso</th>
<th>Para</th>
<th>Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U019867</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U022891</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U022946</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U022948</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AP, Tr, greatest diameter, Hypo, Meso, Para, Met indicate stria lengths.

Table 14
Measurements of Upper Dentition
or Monosaulax progressus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specimen</th>
<th>P4 AP</th>
<th>P4 Tr</th>
<th>P4 Hypo</th>
<th>M1 AP</th>
<th>M1 Tr</th>
<th>M1 Hypo</th>
<th>M2 AP</th>
<th>M2 Tr</th>
<th>M2 Hypo</th>
<th>M3 AP</th>
<th>M3 Tr</th>
<th>M3 Hypo</th>
<th>P4-M3 AP</th>
<th>P4-M3 Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U021714L</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.12a</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U021714R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U019873L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U019873R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U026666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U019862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AP, Tr, occlusal
a-damaged, Hypo, Para, Meso, indicate stria lengths.

Figure 15. Monosaulax progressus n.sp., Quartz Basin, variations in wear upper fourth premolars, A U019867 occlusal view, B labial view, C lingual view, D U019862 occlusal view, E antero labial view, F U022945 occlusal view, G labial view, H lingual view, I U022951 occlusal view, J labial view, K lingual view, all x 5.

Discussion: In early wear the lower dentition superficially resembles that of Eucastor. The transit "rabbit pattern" of the lower fourth premolar and the straight fossettids give this effect. The deciduous lower premolar is, however, similar to other species of Monosaulax in its fossettids, lacks a parafossettid and is considerably larger than either of the species described here. M. tungurensis is higher crowned than M. changpeiensis, has parafossettids as well as secondary fossettids. It is also a larger species. Li considers M. changpeiensis to represent an earlier evolutionary stage than M. tungurensis.
single lingual striid. The stria and striids of the molars are short as in other species of Monosaulax. In size this species compares closely with the known smaller species of Monosaulax. The characteristics which distinguish this species from all previously known species of Monosaulax also distinguish it from all known species of Eucastor. In addition the molars do not exhibit the S pattern at any stage of wear because of the persistence of the parafossette, (parafossettid) and the early closure of the mesoflexus (mesoflexid). These points argue for the inclusion of this species in Monosaulax rather than Eucastor. If the diagnoses of these genera as presented by Stirton (1935) are followed literally, M. progressus could not be assigned to either genus. I believe the best assignment at this time is to the genus Monosaulax. The Eucastor-like characteristics present on this low crowned form suggest parallelism rather than transition.

Foot elements of a castoroid beaver nearly thirty percent larger than Monosaulax progressus are also present in the Quartz Basin collection from locality 2465. No significant differences are to be seen between these elements and comparable specimens representing M. progressus other than size. Since a much larger species of Monosaulax is known from the Virgin Valley fauna (Stirton 1935) to the south it is not surprising to see a large castoroid in the Quartz Basin fauna. Monosaulax is not the only castoroid beaver that could be expected at this time and place or of the indicated size. The assignment is thus a very tentative one.

SUPERFAMILY DIPODOIDEA
FAMILY ZAPODIDAE
Subfamily Sicistinae
MACROGNATHOMYS sp.
(Fig. 16)

In the Quartz Basin fauna (UOloc 2465) a very small sicistine rodent is present. It is represented by a mandible fragment including a M1 and a maxilla fragment including P4-M1. The lower first molar has a small anteroconid but it is connected to the protoconid by a narrow lophid. There is a low but definite ectolophid which extends to the margin of the tooth. A prominent mesostylid is present but is not connected to the short mesolophid, rather an accessory lophid connects the mesostylid to the base of the metaconid. A prominent hypoconulid is present on the posterior cingulum. This cingulum terminates in a stylar cusp. Two accessory lophids are present in the post entoconid valley. The tooth is only slightly smaller than that of Plesiosminthus clivosus Galbreath (1953) (see also Wilson 1960). It differs from P. clivosus in the connected anteroconid, presence of an ectolophid and in the presence of accessory lophids.

The upper fourth premolar is nearly round. On the posterior labial side there is a prominent cusp bounded by two valleys. This elongated
cusp and its adjacent valleys occupies the labial half of the tooth. The lingual half is nearly as high as the prominent cusp and has three small cusps on it. This is somewhat different than the P₄ of P. clivosus in which the pattern is much simpler.

The first upper molar has a prominent anteroloph with an expansion, probably the anterocone. The mesostyle is strongly connected to the central portion of the tooth by a mesoloph and to the paracone by a short cingulum. The metacone is connected by two metalophs, one of which is much smaller than the other and branched. The posterior cingulum connects the metacone and hypocone and has an additional pair of short accessory lophs connecting to the metacone. These lophs do not occur on the M₁ of P. clivosus. The presently known material of both species is too scanty to thoroughly evaluate the differences noted between the Quartz Basin species and P. clivosus. If the available material is representative of them then the Quartz Basin species may represent a form intermediate between P. clivosus and Macrognathomyx nanus Hall (1930).

**Order Carnivora**

**Superfamily Canoidea**

**Family Canidae**

**TOMARCTUS**

(cf. Kellogg) (Merriam 1911)

(Fig. 17 E, F)

Several mandible fragments, including teeth, two maxilla fragments and several isolated teeth in the Red Basin collection represent a canid with narrower and slightly smaller teeth than Tomarctus rurestris. The mandibles although slightly crushed are much lighter than T. rurestris. The metaconid of the lower first molar is proportionally larger on this canid than on T. rurestris but the heel is very similar. In these characteristics this material agrees with T. kelloggi from the Virgin Valley fauna. In using the combination Tomarctus kelloggi I follow Matthew (1924) and Green (1948). Green in his assignment suggests that this broad genus gave rise to Osteoborus and Canis. The specimens assigned here to T. kelloggi show striking similarity to Hemphillian species referred to Canis.

**TOMARCTUS cf. RURESTRIS**

(Condon 1896)

(Fig. 17A)

A mandible (UO24191), lacking only the anterior ventral portion, with P₄-M₁ present and a maxilla fragment (UO24192) including the P₄ apparently represent an old individual of Tomarctus rurestris. Isolated teeth and a badly crushed palate are also assigned to this species. These specimens exhibit the heavy jaw, rather broad cheek teeth, and strong curvature of the ventral border of the mandible seen in T. rurestris. Measurements of the teeth are close to those of the type specimen. Previously known material from the Skull Springs fauna was assigned to T. brevirostris by Gazin (1932). Subsequently Downs (1956) assigned the material to T. rurestris after restudying the type.

**Canid sp.**

A very small canid is represented at UOloc 2465, Quart Basin, by a fragmental M₁ in a mandible fragment, a canine and a premolar. The size of these isolated elements indicates a small canid about the size of Urocyon. The M₁, UO19762, lacks the heel so that without these characteristics the assignment of the species must be provisional. The trigonid of the M₁ exhibits a high protoconid, much higher than the paraconid, and a small metaconid closely appressed to the protoconid. There is no labial or lingual cingula. The M₁ is estimated as having been 11 mm long when complete. The mandible below the M₁ is 10 mm deep. The canine, UO
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26748, is laterally compressed. The premolar, U026749, has a prominent heel with a small cusp close to the posterior border. This small canid differs from *Urocyon* in the lack of an accessory cusp on the labial side of the protoconid. The available materials allows only a family designation.

Subfamily Amphicyonodontinae

? *HEMICYNON* sp.

A low crowned second or third lower molar is present in the Quartz Basin fauna as represented at UOloc 2465. The specimen consists of the crown only with no indication of the number of roots which may have been present. The tooth measures 10.9 mm long antero-posteriorly and 8.8 mm transversely. The proportions indicate a tooth too wide proportionately for a canid. The very low crown obviates assignment to any canid. The proportions suggest a bear or bear-dog.

Subfamily Amphicyoninae

*AMPHICYON* sp.

A large axis vertebrae and calcaneum from locality 2495, Red Basin, are assigned to *Amphicyon*. The characteristics of the vertebrae are similar to those of *Amphicyon riggsi* as illustrated and described by McGrew (1939). The calcaneum, although slightly crushed, agrees with those described by Olsen (1960). Gazin (1932) previously recognized *Amphicyon sinapius* and *Amphicyon cf. ferdensis* in the Skull Springs fauna from fragmental dental elements. The new material does not provide any basis for specific assignment.

Figure 17. Carnivores, A *Tomarctus rurestrus* right mandible U024191 Red Basin x 1, B *Brachypalaeas* sp. P* U019753 Quartz Basin, x 1, C *Mustella* sp. U019451 Quartz Basin, x 4.25, D *Pseudaelurus* sp. M1, U021559 Red Basin x 1, E *Tomarctus kelloggi* M1, U021559 Red Basin dorsal view x 1, F lateral view x 1, G *Pseudaelurus* sp. canine U023469 Red Basin x 1.

**FAMILY PROCYONIDAE**

*BASSARISCUS* sp.

A fragmental upper first molar with the paracone broken away, U022683, strongly resembles that tooth of *Bassariscus*. This specimen from Quartz Basin, U0loc 2465, has a strong protocone extending as a loph to the paracone. The metacone is small and set in from the labial and posterior borders of the tooth. There appears to be no metaconule. The hypocone is low. The smooth area between the hypocone and protocone extends as a cingulum around the anterior border of the tooth to the paracone. The antero-posterior length of the tooth is estimated at 4.0 mm. The transverse diameter is 5.8 mm from metacne through the hypocone.

**FAMILY MUSTELIDAE**

*MUSTELA* sp. (Fig. 17C)

An anterior fragment of the mandible of a small mustelid including the P4, U019451, was recovered at Quartz Basin, U0loc 2457. An isolated P4 of similar size, U022302 was recovered from UOloc 2465. Both specimens may represent a single species. The anterior posterior diameter of the P4, U019451 is 2.9 mm, of U022302 is 2.5 mm. The mandible is 5.7 mm deep below the single tooth present. This species is the size of the weasel *Mustela erminea* and compares closely with it in as much as the scanty material will allow. *Mustela buwaldi* of the Ricardo fauna has accessory cusps on the P4 and is a larger animal. *Pliogale furlongi* of the Thousand Creek fauna is in the same size range, however, the available material of the two forms does not allow direct comparisons. It seems best to refer the two specimens to *Mustela* noting the strong resemblance to *M. erminea* at least for the present. *Martes (Tomictis) gazini* Hall (1931) from the nearby Skull Springs fauna is a much larger form.
BRACHYPALIS sp.  
(Fig. 17 B)  
An upper fourth premolar, U019753, from Quartz Basin UOloc 2465 represents a moderate size mustelid. The protocone is well separated from the paracone and is a broad flat sided cusp facing the paracone. A strong cingulum extends from the protocone to the base of the paracone then posteriorly along the metacone to the posterior border of the tooth. The parastyle area is damaged. The size and character suggest that this specimen represents a species of Brachypsalis. A large upper canine, U019755, may also represent this genus. 

A mustelid upper molar from Red Basin, UOloc 2495, is the size of the M1 of Brachypsalis and is similar in characteristics although more triangular in occlusal outline than most. The anteroposterior length is 8.1 mm. The transverse width is 10.7 mm.

SUPERFAMILY FELOIDEA  
FAMILY FELIDAE  
Subfamily Nimravinae  
PSEUDAELURUS sp.  
(Fig. 17 D-G)  
An upper canine, U023469, a lower M1 and a fragment of a P4 all from Red Basin locality 2495 are assigned to Pseudaelurus. The M1 has a well developed trenchant heel and is 16.1 mm long.

ORDER PROBOSCIDEA  
SUBORDER ELEPHANTOIDEA  
Family and Genus indet.

A calcaneum, UO24044, from UOloc 2491, tooth fragments from other Red Basin sites and tooth fragments from the Willamette Valley locality, UOloc 2345, indicate the presence of a mastodon but do not provide enough information to determine whether it represents Mammuthus or Gomphotherium.

ORDER PERISSODACTYLA  
SUBORDER HIPPMORPHA  
FAMILY EQUIDAE  
Subfamily Anchitheriinae  
PARAHIPPUS cf. AVUS  
Parahippus is sparsely represented in the Red Basin localities. UOloc 2497 produced a lower molar and an upper molar and UOloc 2496 produced a lower DPm. In the upper molar (U022207) the protoloph does not connect to the protocone. The protocone is well isolated. The protoloph connects very low on the ectoloph. A crochet is present and connects low on the protoloph. No internal cingulum is present. The hypostyle is isolated. Ribs are only slightly developed on the ectoloph between the styles. No cement is present but this is probably an artifact of exposure. On the lower tooth (UO 23870) there is a cingulum only on the antero-

---

**TABLE 15**  
MEASUREMENTS OF THE DENTITION OF Hypohippus sp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tooth</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U06c2497</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023540</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023540</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023540</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023562</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023562</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023597</td>
<td>P2 ?</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U06c2495</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U026617</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U021539</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U023520</td>
<td>M1 ?</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
labial side of the tooth between the hypoconid and protoconid. The mesoconid and mesostylid are separated to the base of the tooth. The entoconid is bifurcated forming a complex crown. The hypoconulid is present but damaged. The upper molar measures 16.6 mm antero-posteriorly and 20.8 mm transversely. The lower molar measures 20.9 mm antero-posteriorly. These specimens agree with the revised diagnosis of *P. avus* and are referred to that species.

**HYPOHIPPUS** sp.

(Fig. 18)

Three localities in Red Basin have produced specimens of *Hypohippus*, UOloc 2497, 2496 and 2495. The material consists primarily of lower dental elements including several mandibles. Several complete and fragmental isolated upper teeth are present. The P1 of this species is very narrow anteriorly. There is no apparent metaconid. A cingulum originates in a reduced hypoconulid and extends to the base of the tooth, labially, and then anteriorly around the base of the tooth. It is absent or greatly reduced at the protoconid then continues to the anterior edge of the tooth rising abruptly to the occlusal surface. On the P3 and P4, the metaconid and metastylid are separated by a short lingual groove. Below this groove the metaconid and metastylid combine in a broad flat lingual face. A well developed hypoconulid is present and the accompanying cingulum is prominent. It extends around the hypoconid and protoconid to the parastylid without interruption in most specimens. In one specimen (UO21539) a P4, the cingulum is interrupted in the same manner as on the P3. The P4 is the largest lower premolar and apparently larger than any of the lower molars.

Figure 18. *Hypohippus* sp., A right mandible P2+4 UO23862 Red Basin occlusal view dentition, B medial view, C lateral view, D left mandible M1-a UO23840 Red Basin occlusal view dentition, E medial view, F lateral view, all x 0.75.
The M1 is the largest of the lower molars. The metaconid and metastylid are less separated on all the lower molars than on the premolars. The hypoconulid of the M1 and M2 is not as well developed as on the premolars. The cingulum, however, is strong and uninterrupted. It appears to merge with the anterior face of the paralophid rather than joining a parastylid. A small cusp is present at the lingual edge of the metaflexid of all three lower molars and another small cusp is present at the lingual edge of the entoflexid of all three lower molars. On the M3, the metaflexid is separated from the metastylid by a prominent narrow groove. The hypoconulid is developed into a third loph but is lower than the entoconid. The cingulum extends around the posterior margin of the base of the hypoconulid. There is a small cingular cusp on the labial side of the hypoconulid. The entoconid is simple on the premolars although it broadens antero-posteriorly with wear. On the molars it is a broader cusp antero-posteriorly even in early wear.

The upper tooth fragments indicate that the postfossette is closed off by the metaloph and hypostyle while the prefossette remains open. A cingulum is present at the base of the ectoloph between each of the adjacent styles. The enamel of the teeth of one of the mandible fragments is horizontally striated while that of the other is crenulated. In another specimen the crenulations appear to be oriented giving a fluted appearance.

Recent work by Downs (1956, 1961) has provided a much more workable base for assigning specimens to the Great Basin species of *Merychippus* than previously existed. A large amount of equid material including palates, mandibles, and appendicular skeletal elements was recovered from UOloc 2495 in Red Basin. Nearly all of this material is assigned to *M. severus*. Measurements of thirty isolated upper premolars and molars agree with those for specimens from the type area. Downs, in his study of specimens from both the Skull Springs and Mascall faunas, saw no significant differences between these two samples. The new material provides no basis for any other conclusion. Localities UOloc 2497 and 2498, also in Red Basin, have yielded specimens which are assigned to *M. severus*.

The occurrence of a number of mandibles with deciduous or permanent dentition provides unusually good material for a description of the lower dentition.

The anterior cingulum of the DP2 extends from the lower labial side of the anterior face of the tooth diagonally upward to the paralophid. The paralophid terminates in a cusp about the same size and shape as the metaconid. The metaconid and metastylid are well separated and in occlusal outline. The metastylid is slightly the larger. The entoconid has an anterior spur. The hypoconulid and the hypoconid form a cingulum-like structure which is recurved to the lingual border of the tooth. A short protosylid is present between the protoconid and hypoconulid. The DP3 and DP4 resemble the DP2 except in the attenuated distal end of the paralophid and the presence of a cingular at the base of the protoconid. The deciduous teeth have cement present at the base of the labial side of the teeth. The enamel of the teeth is crenulate.

The adult lower incisors have a shallow broad fossette which on the I1 opens lingually. The canine is simple but possess a sharp loph on its anterior face. The first premolar is present on young individuals and only occasionally on older adults. It is a simple single rooted tooth. The crown is bulbous, slightly pointed near its crest and has a small loph on the anterior face and also the posterior face.

On the second premolar the paralophid is bifurcate distally. The metaconid is greatly re-
Figure 19. *Merychippus severans* immature, mandible DP2+4, UO22765 Red Basin, A dorsal view, B medial view, C lateral view, all x 0.75.
Figure 20. *Merychippus severus* immature, mandible DP₂-M₂ UO22216 Red Basin, A dorsal view, B lateral view, C medial view, all x 0.75.
Figure 21. *Merychippus seversus* lower dentition, Red Basin, A P1-M3 UO 25437 labial view, B occlusal view, C P1-M3 UO21038 labial view, D occlusal view, all x 0.75.
Figure 22. Merychippus severus upper dentition, Red Basin. A P-M\(^3\) U022830 labial view, B occlusal view, C P-M\(^3\) U023440 labial view, D occlusal view, all x 0.75.
duced but becomes evident in late wear situated antero-labially to the metastylid and only poorly separated from it. The floor of the metaflexid has a prominent invagination. The floor of the entoflexid has a single invagination. The floor of the entoflexid has a prominent invagination or sometimes two small ones. There is an anterior spur on the entoconid. The hypoconulid is well separated from the entoconid. The hypostylid is prominent. The paralophid of the lower third and fourth premolars is straight and attenuated distally. The parastylid proceeds diagonally across the anterior face of the tooth and does not contribute to the occlusal pattern until late wear. The metaconid and metastylid are similar in size and separated by a shallow groove. In some specimens there is a spur on the anterior face of the metaconid. Invaginations of the floor of the flexids are present. In some specimens a plication is present on the anterior wall of the entoflexid. An anterior spur of the entoconid occasionally blocks the opening of the entoflexid. The hypostylid is well separated from the entoconid. The hypoflexid almost completely separates the anterior and posterior moieties of the premolars.

The lower first and second molars differ very little from the third and fourth premolars. The molars are smaller and there is a stronger development of the parastylid on the first molar. The lower third molar has a posterior loph consisting of the hypoconulid and hypostylid and is strongly recurved forming an additional flexure in the tooth.

**MERYCHIPPUS cf. BREVIDONTUS**

Studies of a number of Northern Great Basin Barstovian faunas have revealed the occurrence of a species of *Merychippus* with low crowned teeth. Scharf (1935), Bode (1934, 1935) and Downs (1956) have reported these occurrences from the High Rock Canyon, Skull Springs, Sucker Creek and Paulina faunas. Downs has also recognized this species in the Mascall fauna of the John Day Basin. The upper molar series (UO22740) (UOloc 2495) displays a large number of plications in the position of the plicatus. Other specimens are in early stages of wear so that observations of the complexity of the pattern are of limited comparative value. These specimens are assigned here to *M. brevidontus* with some hesitance.

**MERYCHIPPUS sp.**

(Fig. 23)

The Quartz Basin fauna includes a species of *Merychippus* with teeth similar in size to those of *M. seversus* except in height of crown. A series of twelve upper premolars and molars from UOloc 2465 are little worn to unworn and have an average height of crown of 35.8 mm with a range from 34.6 to 43.9 mm, much higher than *M. seversus* but similar to specimens from High Rock Canyon and Virgin Valley (see Downs 1961). The average, although higher than that of *M. californicus*, may not be significantly higher. The protocone, in slightly worn specimens from UOloc 2465, is ovoid and in some specimens lacks a spur. Several additional specimens from other Quartz Basin localities apparently represent this same species. Some are moderately worn and reveal a relatively simple pattern of plications. The hypoconal groove is open and an anterior cingulum is present on the teeth but only poorly developed.

A little worn lower M₃ (UO19711) associated with the upper teeth reveals something of the character of the lower dentition. Other lower teeth are unworn. On UO19711 the metaconid and metastylid are small and rounded but
TABLE 16
Measurements of Upper Premolars and Molars Merychippus sp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Wear</th>
<th>Height of crown</th>
<th>AP Protocone</th>
<th>Tr Protocone</th>
<th>AP Tooth</th>
<th>Tr Tooth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UOloc 2465</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19690</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19690</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>33.9a</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19687</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19691</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>40.5a</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19699</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19692</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19686</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19693</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19694</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19695</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19685</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOloc 2457</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19435</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19463</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19665</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19665</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19272</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19270</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- U—unworn, S—slightly worn, M—moderately worn.

MERYCHIPPUS sp.

Three specimens from the Basque Cabin locality, 2471, represent a species of Merychippus similar to M. sp. from Quartz Basin. The three specimens are all first or second upper molars. One is slightly worn, UO20373, one is moderately worn, UO20374, the other is incomplete and moderately worn, UO20370. The slightly worn specimen has a height of crown of 31 mm, which is higher than any of the M. Quartz Basin species.

Figure 23. Merychippus sp. upper dentition, Quartz Basin, A P4 UO19688 occlusal view, B labial view, C posterior view, D P3 UO19689 occlusal view, E labial view, F anterior view, G M1 UO19688 occlusal view, H labial view, I anterior view, J M2 UO19688 occlusal view, K labial view, L anterior view, all x 1.
seversus specimens from locality 2495 at Red Basin or from the Mascall as reported by Downs (1961). It is similar in height of crown to the Quartz Basin species. These specimens are also similar to the Quartz Basin species in the poorly developed anterior cingulum and reduced protoconal spur. In UO20374 the hypoconal groove is open whereas in UO20373 it is invaded by two anti pli hypostyles. Assignment to the Quartz Basin species does not seem justified with so little material, but is probable.

**Merychippus relictus** (Cope) (fig. 24)

This small rare species of *Merychippus* occurs in Quartz Basin at localities 2458, 2466, and 2467, in Oxbow Basin, locality 2431 and Kern Basin. No specimens from Red Basin are assigned to this species. A partial upper dentition including P2-M1 and an associated M1-M3 were recovered at locality 2467 in Quartz Basin. A similar upper dentition was recovered from Oxbow Basin, locality 2431. The other occurrences are of single specimens. The Quartz Basin specimens are unworn to only slightly worn whereas the Oxbow Basin material is moderately worn. The teeth are of about the same height of crown as those of *M. seversus* but are much smaller in their anteroposterior and transverse measurements. They are of about the same complexity as *M. seversus*. The protocone tends to be round to oval with a spur. All of the available specimens have a single pli cuballin. A pli protoloph is present on the premolars. The anterior cingulum is only slightly developed. The crowns of the upper premolars are not as strongly curved as in *M. seversus*.

A mandible fragment (UO19902) from locality 2467, associated with the little worn upper dentition referred to above, includes the lower molar series. The parastylid of the M3 is strong and reflected in the occlusal pattern in early wear. On the M3 the upper portion of the parastylid is partially isolated as commonly seen in *Hippotherium*. The metaconid and metastylid are damaged on M1, but on the M2 and M3 they are present and separated by a deep groove. The lingual border is angular on both of these cusps. On the M3 the metaconid has a spur. The metaconid is slightly larger than the metastylid. The entoconid has no anterior spur on any of the molars. The hypoculid and hypoculid form a triangular heel on the M2. On the M3 they form an open curved loph. The paraloph is attenuated. Cement is well developed on all the teeth. Two isolated lower second premolars (UO21818, UO19616) from localities 2462 and 2453 are referred to *M. relictus*.

In these specimens the metaconid and metalophid are only partially separated. The paralophid is broad distally. A spur is present on the entoconid of UO21818 but not on UO19616. No hypostylid is present. The hypoculid is small. There is a small plication on the anterior border of the entoconid and a very small plicabelloid.

There has been considerable question about the type locality of this species. Downs (1956) concluded that it is probably a Mascall locality. He arrived at this conclusion through a misinterpretation of remarks attributed by Osborn to Merriam (Osborn 1918). Downs quotes Osborn as stating that Merriam believed the type material may have come from localities not far from the type area of the Mascall Formation. However, Osborn actually quoted Merriam as saying that the material may have come from outlying beds of the Mascall. This remark was apparently based only on the nature of the preservation of the specimens. The material was collected by George C. Duncan of Silver Lake, Oregon and sent to Cope along with a few other specimens of various ages and representing
TABLE 17

MEASUREMENTS OF UPPER PREMOLARS AND MOLARS

_Merychippus relicus_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Wear</th>
<th>Height of crown</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Protocone</th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>Tooth</th>
<th>Tooth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UOloc 2467</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19994</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19998</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO19904</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOloc 2431</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO24112</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.0a</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO24112</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO24112</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOloc 2466</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOloc Kern Basin</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO24189</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18.7a</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO24190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

U—unworn, S—slightly worn, M—moderately worn.

several types of preservation. No locality data other than “Oregon Desert” was available. It is not clear how the notation “Idaho terrane” appeared in the description since it is not mentioned by Cope in his original notice of the material (Cope 1889) in the American Naturalist but does appear in his American Philosophical Society paper (Cope 1889) of the same year. At that time Idaho was not a state but a territory. It may be that Cope received additional data from Duncan but if so he doesn’t mention it. Duncan was not a collector for Cope but a rancher and the postmaster at Silver Lake. It seems unlikely that he collected the material very far from his home area. It also seems unlikely that he collected it from an area where specimens of other species of _Merychippus_ were abundant yet found none of them. There is no reason to believe that the type specimens came from the Mascall Formation in the John Day River Valley. Downs, with considerable reservation, assigned some specimens to _M. relictus_ from the type area of the Mascall Formation but considered them as integrating between _M. severus_ and _M. relictus_. Several specimens from the Crooked River area have been referred to _M. relictus_ (Downs, 1956) and a specimen in the UOMNH from the same area is apparently _M. relictus_ (UO16993). The Barstovian sediments in the Crooked River area or Paulina Basin are not now contiguous with the John Day Basin sediments although the sequence there is similar to that of the John Day River Valley in the Picture Gorge-Dayville area. Thayer (1966) suggests that the original sheet of sediments was contiguous. The Paulina Basin is thirty miles southwest of the Mascall area. It is conceivable that Duncan’s ranching activities may have brought him into that area, however, Barstovian sediments are also known east and south of Silver Lake. This discussion does not determine where the type locality of _M. relictus_ may be, for with the discovery of a number of specimens in the Owyhee area in a stratigraphic unit which extends into Idaho and Cope’s reference to Idaho terrane the locality seems to be even more obscure.
Figure 25. Aphelops sp. Red Basin. A nasals U024135 dorsal view, B left lateral view, C anterior view, D premolar series U024135 left lateral view, E M3 U024160 occlusal view, all x 0.75.
SUBORDER CERATOMORPHA
FAMILY RHINOCEROIDEAE

APHELOPS sp.
(Fig. 25)

Locality 2493, produced a fragmental skull and lower jaw of a rhinocerotid (U024135) and a partial upper dentition of another individual (U024160) both badly damaged by frost heaving since they were near the surface. Additional teeth and tooth fragments occurred at both of these Red Basin localities. A crushed astragalus and tooth fragments were also found nearby at locality 2497. The upper dentition is that of a subhypodont form with rather simple teeth. The premolars are smaller than the molars and decrease markedly in anteroposterior measurement from $P_4$ to $P_2$. On the $P_4$ a cingulum closes off the transverse valley. It is otherwise much like the molars. Prominent anterior and posterior cingula are present on the upper molars. In late wear a post fossette is present on each of the molars except the $M_3$. A crochet is well developed on the $M_3$ but does not close off the valley to form a medifossette. No cristae is present on the upper molars. A small anti-crista is present on the first and second upper molars. Aphelops from the Clarendonian Black Butte fauna (Shotwell & Russell 1963) is similar in height of crown but has a more strongly developed crochet resulting in medifossettes in the upper molars.

The fragmental skull includes the nasal bones. They are thick and relatively long and slightly pinched in at the ends. Rugosities near the tips indicate that a small horn was probably present. The specimens from locality 2495 include a large upper incisor. It is well worn and has a short abruptly narrowing root. The crown is long and narrow as in Rhinoceros. A lower incisor task is also present. It is triangular in cross section at the point of occlusion and compares closely with that of Aphelops from the Black Butte fauna.

The crushed astragalus compares with that of Aphelops in that the neck is not greatly shortened as in Teleoceras and the ginglymi are fully developed. Metapodial fragments indicate no expansion as seen in Teleoceras.

The material is believed to represent a single species. The nasals were associated with upper molars, the same type of upper molars occur at the localities where the upper and lower incisors and the astragalus were collected. The joint occurrence of a nasal horn, upper incisors, and subhypodont teeth suggests a mixture. Aphelops is believed to lack horns in most species as well as upper incisors but has subhypodont teeth. The characteristics displayed by this species, however, are found associated in the living species of Dicerhinos. The lack of upper incisors in Aphelops may not be as consistent as previously suggested. Very little of the known material includes the premaxillaries. In those few that do incisors are poorly developed or absent. Some specimens also indicate a small nasal horn. The presence of a horn, elongate nasals, and upper incisors obviates an assignment to Peraceras. The best assignment thus seems to be to Aphelops.

Figure 26. Prosthennops sp., mandible fragment with $P_4M_1$ U022607 Quartz Basin, A side view, B occlusal view, both x 2.
ORDER ARTIODACTYLA  
SUBORDER SUIFORMES  
INFRAORDER SUINA  
FAMILY TAYASSUIDAE  
PROSTHENNOPS sp.  
(Fig. 26)

A mandible fragment, U022151, including P₄-M₁, is present in the collection from UOloc 2497, Red Basin. Specific assignment is not possible.

From UOloc 2465, Quartz Basin a mandible fragment, U022607, with P₄-M₁ is present plus several tooth fragments. Specific assignment is not possible with such limited material.

INFRAORDER OREODONTA  
FAMILY MERCYCOIDODONTIDAE  
Subfamily Ticholeptinae  
TICHOLEPTUS cf. OBLIQUIDENS (Cope)  
(Fig. 27)

Ticholeptus is represented by upper and lower dentitions, isolated teeth and partial dentitions in the collection from UOloc 2497, Red Basin. A mandible fragment with the premolars occurred at UOloc 2495 also in Red Basin.

A mandible, with left and right little worn dentition, from UOloc 2497, U026798 best exhibits the characteristics of the lower dentition. The second and third premolars are crowded to the point that they overlap each other and the fourth premolar. They are relatively simple blade-like teeth. The P₄ has a narrow protolophid. In the fourth premolar the protolophid connects to a metastyle which is narrow at the crest but broad at the base. It extends very little anterior to the protolophid but posteriorly it extends to the heel and joins the hypolophid forming an enclosed fossettid. The first premolar is blade-like tooth on U026798, but on another specimen, U023835, a mandible fragment with P₄-M₄ with P₃ missing, the P₃ is a large caniniform tooth. The other premolars present suggest that the two specimens represent the same species. U023835 is of much older individual. In the lower molars a cingulum closes the intercrescentic valleys, but does not support a protostylid. The external ribs of the ectoloph are poorly developed. The stylids are present but not prominent.

The ventral border of the mandible is rather straight and nearly parallel to the dorsal border. A foramen is present at the base of the root of the P₃.

A maxilla, U022192, from UOloc 2497 includes P₄-M₄, alveoli of the canine and P₃. The infraorbital foramen opens above the posterior root of the P₃. The nasals are apparently not retracted judging from the character of the maxilla. The P₄ and P₅ appear to have two broad roots while the P₃ has three roots. The P₆ and P₇ each have a strong protocone with an accessory cusp nearly as large and anterior to the protocone. The accessory cusp is connected to the parastyle by a loph from its anterior edge. It is also connected to the paracanine by a loph arising from its crest. These two lophs form the boundaries of a small anterior fossette on the P₃. Another loph connects the paracanine and anterior border of the protocone forming an open lingual valley. The protocone is connected to the mesostyle by a posterior loph, which in the P₇ completes the encirclement of a posterior fossette. The P₇ and molars all have a continuous lingual basal cingulum extending from the anterior face to the posterior face. The styles of the molars are very well developed. No external ribs are present on the ectoloph of any of the molars. Protostyles are not present.

Published figures of Ticholeptus obliquidens reveal very little of the dental characteristics of the species. The form of the mandible, however, compares closely with the Red Basin material. T. obliquidens was described from the Mascall Formation. Gazin (1932) assigned fragmentary material from Red Basin to Ticholeptus? sp. Scharf (1935) in his study of the Sucker Creek fauna of the Owyhee region compared material from that fauna to T. petersoni but assigned it to Ticholeptus sp. At the same time he also examined the Skull Spring material from Red Basin and found that it also
Figure 27. Ticholeptus cf. obliquidens Red Basin. A left mandible UO222798 dorsal view, B left lateral view, C left maxilla UO222192 left lateral view, D ventral view, all x 1.
compared favorably with *T. petersoni*. Thorpe (1937) assigned the Skull Spring (Red Basin) specimens to *Pronomotherium* sp. and noted a similarity to *P. siouense* in the P. Schultz and Falkenbach (1941) considered the same specimen to represent *Ticholeptus*. In this paper the authors considered *T. petersoni* to represent a subfamily other than the Ticholeptinae. In an earlier paper Schultz and Falkenbach (1940) had referred *Pronomotherium siouense* to the genus *Brachycrus* of the Merycochoerinae on the basis of identity and priority of name. Thus in the past the fragmentary Barstovian oreodont material from Oregon has been usually assigned to *Ticholeptus* but the species compared with are now to be found in three separate genera and subfamilies. None of the previously known material revealed anything of the character of the skull. The present material indicates that the nasals were not retracted and that the infraorbital foramen was above a point between the P3 and P4. These are important characteristics of *Ticholeptus* as restricted by Schultz and Falkenbach (1941). The dental characteristics of *Brachycrus siouense* (=*Pronomotherium*) are indeed very close to those of the Red Basin specimen but so are those of *T. hypsodus*, for instance. Thorpe (1937) and Schultz and Falkenbach (1941) considered *T. obliquidens* and *T. hypsodus* to be very close. Schultz and Falkenbach (1941) considered *T. zygomaticus* to be close to *T. hypsodus* but with a slightly heavier and longer upper and lower dentitions. Some authors have suggested that *T. hypsodus* and *T. obliquidens* are possibly synonymous. Thorpe (1937) attributed their similarities to parallism. If they are synonymous the name *T. obliquidens* has priority. If *T. hypsodus* and *T. zygomaticus* are synonymous as well, then *T. zygomaticus* would prevail for all three of the species.

For the present it seems best to refer the Red Basin specimens to *T. obliquidens* even though that species is not known well from its type locality.

### Suborder Tylopoda

### Family Camelidae

Camelid

Wildcat Creek UOloc 2345, Red Basin UOloc 2495, Quartz Basin localities 2456, 2461, 2462, and Rasque Cabin UOloc 2471 have all produced foot elements of a small camelid. The elements consist of a number of scaphoids, unciforms, fragmental metapodials, two astragali and a single phalanx. None of the material is such that a specific assignment could be made. The most than can be said is that a small camelid is sparsely represented at the above localities.

### Suborder Ruminantia

### Infraorder Pecora

### Superfamily Cervioidea

### Family Cervidae

- **Dromomeryx borealis**
  - Douglas 1909 (Fig. 29-31)
  - *Dromomeryx* is one of the most abundant large mammals at UOloc 2495 in the Red Basin. It occurs also at other localities but not so abundantly. Nearly all elements of the skeleton are present and are described below.

**Mandible:** The mandible is curved, dorsoventrally but not so strongly as in *Dama*. The angle of the jaw is similar to *Cervus* in that it lacks the angular process present in *Dama*. The depth of the jaw is about the same as in *Cervus*. The coronoid process is not complete on any of the specimens but the most complete example indicates that it is much straighter than in living cervids and not curved strongly posteriorly although it may be curved at the distal end. The notch between the coronoid process and the condyle is broad. The diastema is considerably longer than in *Dama* or *Cervus*. It is fifty five
A lower dentition: The incisiform teeth include the three incisors and the incisiform canine. Their relative sizes and morphology compare closely with those of *Dama*. There is a strong rib developed on the inner face of each of the incisiform teeth. It is located closest to the posterior edge of the tooth. The teeth decrease in size from L2-C.

An alveolus for the first premolar is present on several mandibles of mature individuals and also on young individuals still possessing elements of the deciduous dentition. No mandibles of old individuals have an alveolus for the first premolar. In no instance is a DP1, or a P1, preserved. It is not clear whether this species had only a DP1, retained much later in life than the other elements of the deciduous dentition, or whether both deciduous and permanent first premolars were present with the permanent first premolar lost before old age as is the case in some other ungulates.

The P2 is the smallest and simplest tooth of the lower dentition. Lophids are not as well developed as in *Dama* but more so than in *Cervus*. The protolophid is essentially absent since the metaconid, which is very broad at its base, meets the labial side of the tooth at the crest. The paralophid is very narrow. The hypolophid and ectolophid are well developed but low. The P3 is much larger than the P2. The paralophid is branched lingually forming a small open valley. The protolophid terminates in the metaconid which is very narrow at its crest but broad, antero-posteriorly, at its base. The hypolophid and ectolophid join lingually forming a small enclosed fossette. An accessory lophid extends into this fossette from the hypolophid. A broad but short accessory lophid extends into the anterior valley. The highest point on the tooth is the protoconid.

Although the P4 is usually slightly larger than the P3, it is similar in many of its characteristics. Its primary feature is the antero-posteriorly enlarged metaconid which closes off the anterior valley between the protolophid and posterior branch of the paralophid. The P3...
is broader than the \( P_3 \). The development of the tooth is similar to that of *Dama* but lacks the protostylid and metastylid seen in deer.

The lower molars all possess a protostylid and the *Paleomeryx* fold. The enamel of all the cheek teeth is crenulated. Anterior and posterior cingula are present on all the molars. The anterior cingula is the stronger.

The ratios of individual tooth lengths to total tooth row length are as in *Dama hemionus colombiana*. In seven complete lower cheek tooth series the premolars average sixty five percent of the molars in length, ranging from sixty one to sixty nine. This is similar to that of living cervids.

**UPPER DENTITION:** The \( P_2 \) is triangular in occlusal outline with three roots. The anterior-posterior diameter is greater than the transverse. The protoloph is well developed. It terminates labially in a parastyle and lingually at the protocone. The protocone is a prominent feature of the tooth. Small weakly developed cingula occur on both anterior and posterior sides of the protocone. A complete posteroloph connects the protocone to the ectoloph. A small accessory loph connects from the protocone to a point on the posteroloph about one third of its length posterior to the protocone. A small fossette is thus formed. The paracone is massive and the highest cusp of the tooth. Its labial surface has a strong style present.

The \( P_3 \) is similar to the \( P_3 \) in basic pattern. It is broader transversely so that the anterior-posterior and transverse diameters are equal. The cingula of the protocone are much more strongly developed than in the \( P_2 \). It is only slightly larger than the \( P_2 \).

The basic pattern of the \( P_3 \) is as in the other premolars, however, the protocone is much more prominent and the transverse diameter of the tooth is much greater than the anterior-posterior diameter. The cingula bordering the protocone are very strongly developed.

The upper molars are similar to each other but increase in size antero-posteriorly, the first being the smallest. In the upper molars the antero-posterior diameter is nearly the same as the transverse. The ectoloph of each of the upper molars exhibits a parastyle, a broad external rib labial to the paracone, a mesostyle, a strong but narrow external rib labial to the metacone and a metastyle which often appears forked in occlusal outline. The protoloph connects high on the parastyle. The metaloph does not connect to the ectoloph. The anterior crescent is completed posterior to the protocone by a large irregularly shaped crochet which connects in some specimens to the protocone, in others to the metaloph, and often to both. A small fossette is often formed between the irregularities in the crochet and the metaloph connection. The protoloph connects high on the parastyle. The metaloph does not connect to the ectoloph. The anterior crescent is completed posterior to the protocone by a large irregularly shaped crochet which connects in some specimens to the protocone, in others to the metaloph, and often to both. A small fossette is often formed between the irregularities in the crochet and the metaloph connection. The posterior crescent is completed by a structure similar to the hypostyle of equids, however, it does not quite connect to the metastyle in some specimens. The hypostyle is often branched and sometimes has several branches. A well developed anterior cingulum is present on all the upper molars. A much less strongly developed posterior cingulum is also present. A protostyle is present on each of the molars.
A number of specimens have cement present on the teeth. It is only recognized on the labial and lingual faces, extending into the open valleys between cusps. It does not occur in the fossettes of any of the specimens.

**FOREFOOT:** The radial facet of the scaphoid is similar to that of *Dama* but broader ventrally. The scaphoid lacks the strong medial protuberance present on *Cervus*. Its manubrium facet is similar to that of *Cervus*, not broad as in *Dama*. The radial facet of the lunar has somewhat less relief than that of *Cervus* or *Dama* and is more elongate. The articulation with the magnum is similar to both *Cervus* and *Dama*. The scaphoid and cuneiform facets are comparable with *Dama*. The only cuneiform present is distorted to the extent that comparisons are of little value. The pisiform is elongate as in *Dama* and is curved slightly dorso-ventrally. There is a heavy rough ridge running from the anterior end of the cuneiform facet to the distal end of the pisiform. The cuneiform facet is long and ovoid in shape as in *Cervus* rather than broad as in *Dama*. The facet is not so strongly curved antero-posteriorly as in *Cervus*. The magnum is very close to *Cervus* and if it were not for the difference in size in the two animals might be mistaken for *Cervus*. The dorsal unciform facet is nearly square as in *Cervus* not rectangular as in *Dama*. The ventral unciform facets differ from both *Cervus* and *Dama* in that they are round. The unciform is also close to that of *Cervus*. It differs primarily in the facets for the astragalus which are essentially mirror images of the unciform facets of the magnum. None of the metacarpal fragments are complete enough to provide useful comparative data.

**HINDFOOT:** The navicular-cuboid groove of the astragalus is similar to that of *Cervus* in that the medial side is not strongly convex at its border. The lateral ginglymus has a greater diameter than does the medial one as in *Cervus*.

**Figure 30. Dromomeryx borealis, Red Basin, A P 3-M 3 U023705 occlusal view, B right mandible U023905 lateral view, C dorsal view, all x 0.75.**
Figure 31 *Dromomeryx borealis*, Quartz Basin, right mandible P₄-M₂ UO19273, A occlusal view, B lateral view, both x 0.75.

not possible. They appear to be of the same proportions as those of *Cervus*.

**SKULL:** Two badly crushed skulls are present in the collection from Red Basin. One, UO 22219, is crushed antero-posteriory. The horn pedicles are complete but flattened by the crushing. The other, UO2705, is crushed laterally. The horn pedicles are broken off at about one third their length above the skull. The portion of the skull anterior to the P₂ is missing. Details of the skull are largely destroyed by the crushing. The horn pedicles are about 240 mm long. A lateral flange is present. They appear to have been directed forward, however it is not possible to determine to what degree. The recognition of facial vacuities is not possible due to the shattered and distorted nature of that part of the skull.

**DISCUSSION:** The Red Basin specimens agree in size with *D. borealis*. The upper teeth are complicated by spurs in the same way as those of *D. borealis*. The lower dentition of *D. borealis* was described by Douglas (1909) and illustrated. The P₄ differs from most specimens of the Red Basin species in that the metaconid closes off the valley between the protolophid and entolophid. This only occurs rarely in the Red Basin material.

Frick (1937) assigned previously collected Red Basin specimens to *Rakomeryx gazini*. Gazin had earlier (1932) described these specimens and assigned them *D. near borealis*. The assignment by Frick was based on what he considered to be peculiarities of the horn core. The proportional size of the premolars, the enlarged metaconid on the P₂, and the gross size all strongly favor the assignment of *Dromomeryx*. The differences between the Red Basin specimens and *D. borealis* are so slight that there seems to be no real basis for separation. The name *Rakomeryx gazini* is thus not applicable.

**RAKOMERYX** cf. **AMERICANUS** (Douglas 1909)

(Fig. 32)

Two fragmentary mandibles are present representing a small paleomerycid in the Red Basin collection. Neither is complete enough to indicate the length of the diastema or the character of the ascending ramus. The relative depth of the jaw appears to be about the same as that of *Dromomeryx*. A large mental foramen occurs below and anterior to the P₂. The P₂ is the smallest tooth of the cheek tooth series.
The protolophid plus the protoconid and metaconid form a single large cusp which dominates the tooth pattern. The paralophid is small and simple. The ectolophid and hypolophid are well developed but low. The P3 is larger than the P2 but similar in most characteristics, however the paralophid is much better developed and branched. The protolophid is more distinct than in the P2. The P4 is the largest tooth of the premolar series. It differs from the other premolars in the presence of a distinct metaconid well attached to the protolophid. The metaconid is, however, not greatly expanded anteroposteriorly and does not close off the anterior or posterior valley as it does in Dromomeryx. All the lower molars have the Paleomeryx fold, a protostylid and an anterior cingulum. External ribs are present on the ectolophs. The enamel of the molars is crenulated.

The upper premolars are all three rooted. The ectoloph of each premolar includes a low parastyle, a strong external rib and a high metastyle. The paracristid is the highest cusp. The protocone is prominent and is connected to the parastyle anteriorly and the metastyle posteriorly by narrow lophids. Accessory lophids occur posterior to the protocone and on some specimens form enclosed fossettids against the posterior lophid. Cingula are absent or only very poorly developed. The premolars become proportionately broader transversely from P2-P4. The molars increase in size from M1-M3. The ectoloph includes parastyle, external ribs, mesostyle, and metastyle. An anterior cingula occurs on all the molars. Each molar displays a protostylid. The protoloph connects to the ectoloph at the parastyle. The metaloph does not reach the ectoloph. Small crochets are present but are not as well developed as those of Dromomeryx borealis.

The astragalus is the size of Dama (columbiana). The ginglymi are more nearly the same size.

Figure 32. Rakomeryx cf. americanus, Red Basin, A left P2-M1 U022147 medial view, B dorsal view, C lateral view, D P4-M3 U022089 occlusal view, E P4 x U022089 occlusal view, all x 0.75.
TABLE 18
ANTERIOR POSTERIOR AND TRANSVERSE DIAMETERS OF THE DENTITION
OF Rakomeryx americanus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tooth</th>
<th>P2</th>
<th>P3</th>
<th>P4</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UO22146</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22147</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22141</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UO22089</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low crowned teeth, Rakomeryx sp., are similar to those of Dama but with the lateral articulation seen in Dromomeryx borealis. The cingula, stylids and generally deer-like characteristics of this species indicate that it is probably a member of the Dromomerycinae. The lack of molarization of the P4 thus retaining the premolar aspect of that tooth suggests that this species belongs in the genus Rakomeryx. Horn cores are not present in the available material so that assignment cannot be based on them. This species is much smaller than Blastomeryx from the same site and differs in not only size but in molarization of the P4, and complexity of the upper dentition. Frick (1937) has assigned the name Rakomeryx gazinii to specimens reported by Gazin (1932), a DP4 and an upper molar, are larger than Bakstomeryx mollis and apparently represent the small dromomerycyne described here. The lack of molarization of the P4 in this species is similar to both Blastomeryx and Rakomeryx. The size is close to that of Rakomeryx raki. The lophs of the upper premolars are complete and attached to the ectoloph in the Red Basin species whereas they are interrupted in R. raki as illustrated (Frick 1937). The metaconid of the P4 of R. raki is more anterio-posteriorly elongate than in the new species. Although the several dentitions illustrated of R. raki indicate variation in this characteristic, Dromomeryx americanus as illustrated by Douglas (1909) is very close to this new material and close to it in size. Frick 1937 assigned DP4 americanus to Dromomeryx. The specimens described by Douglas and the new material appear close. I am assigning them here to Rakomeryx americanus (Douglas).

SUPERFAMILY Bovoidea
FAMILY ANTELOCAPRIDAE
MERYCODUS sp.
(Fig. 33 A, B)

Red Basin localities 2495 and 2497 have produced incomplete upper and lower dentitions, isolated teeth and fragments of skeletal elements of Merycodus. No horn core specimens were recovered. An upper dentition, UO 22215, from locality 2497 and a partial lower dentition, UO22150, from the same locality best illustrate the characteristics of this form. The lower second and third molars have ac-
cessory pillarlike cusps between the crescents of the teeth. In the upper dentition P5-P6 are three rooted. On the molars a small accessory fossette occurs at the head of the intercrescentic valley.

**MERYCODOUS cf. nevadensis**

(Fig. 33 C-F)

A small species of *Merycodus* is represented at locality 2465, Quartz Basin, by a large portion of the upper dentition, probably of a single individual, a partial horn core, and a fragmental metapodial. The lack of lower dental elements makes comparison with other species difficult. The horn core is compressed on its medial side so that the cross-sectional outline is roughly triangular. No evidence of a burr is present. The horn core fragment is unbranched and is 105 mm long above the base. A small fragment present in the collection indicates that the horn core of this species is branched but the tines are very short.

In the upper dentition the premolars are three-rooted. An intercrescentic accessory fossette occurs at the head of the valley in the M1. On all of the upper molars there occurs an accessory fossette at the anterior end of the posterior fossette just inside the mesostyle. The Quartz Basin species is apparently smaller than the Red Basin material. In size and comparable characteristics the Quartz Basin species is similar to *M. nevadensis*.

**?MERYCODUS sp.**

An ectoloph fragment of a *Merycodus*-like upper molar present in the collection from UOloc 2465, Quartz Basin, represents a much larger species than *M. nevadensis*. Converging styles on a high crowned tooth suggest a species of merycodont.

**Figure 33.** A *Merycodus* sp. Red Basin, right P5-M2 lateral view x 1, B occlusal view, C *Merycodus cf. nevadensis* Quartz Basin, left P3-M2 U019757 occlusal view, D right M2 U019757 lateral view x 2, E ventral view x 2, F horn core UO 19744 x 1.
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