

Wedekind⁹ to get the same standing that *Trinucleus* has.

Enough of the destructional phase of the subject. When I wrote before I did not see any way in which the name *Trinucleus* could be retained, but after studying the large collection in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, a way has presented itself. The present tendency is to split our large genera up into a number of smaller groups, and "*Trinucleus*" must doubtless be so divided. There are at present only two divisions in use, *Cryptolithus* or *Trinucleus*, and *Tretaspis*, McCoy. As stated in my previous paper, Murchison's first species, *Trinucleus caractaci*, is strictly congeneric with *Cryptolithus tessellatus*, but fortunately Murchison described six species when first proposing *Trinucleus*. The fifth of these species, *Trinucleus nudus*, is well known to be an *Ampyx*, and the sixth, *Trinucleus? asaphoides*, was referred by Salter to *Ogygiocaris buchii*. This leaves four species, the first and fourth of which, *Trinucleus caractaci* and *T. lloydi*, belong to the earlier genus *Cryptolithus*. The second and third, *Trinucleus fimbriatus* and *T. radiatus*, have been referred by Salter¹⁰ to *Tretaspis*. Now the type of *Tretaspis* is *Trinucleus seticornis*, (Hisinger), as that species was understood by McCoy¹¹. *Tretaspis* differs from *Cryptolithus* in having only the anterior part of the glabella bulbous, while the posterior part is constricted and shows two pairs of deep glabellar furrows. The cheeks also show eye-lines and simple eyes are present, even in the adult. Young specimens of some species of *Cryptolithus* show a poor development of these same characters, but as they are retained in the adult of *Tretaspis seticornis*, *T. bucklandi*, and other forms, (*Tretaspis reticulatus*, Ruedemann is a good American example), the genus is a valuable one, and well founded. *Trinucleus fimbriatus* and *T. radiatus* do not, however, conform strictly to the type of either *Cryptolithus* or *Tretaspis*.

⁹Since my previous paper was written, this recent blunder, for such it seems, has come to my attention. Wedekind, in an article on the "Klassifikation der Phacopiden" in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen Geol. Gesellschaft, Bd. 63, heft 3, p. 323, 1912, has proposed the generic name *Glockeria* with *Phacops glockeri* as the type. Reed, as recently as 1905, on page 226 of the Geological Magazine of that year, proposed the name *Phacopidella* with *Phacops glockeri* as the type. Wedekind refers frequently to Reed's paper, and quotes *Phacopidella*, though he nowhere says that that name is preoccupied or otherwise unusable. Wedekind's *Glockeria* is not the same as Reed's *Phacopidella*, but it seems obvious that we can not found two genera upon a single species. I regret to have to add that the name *Reedia* was used by Ashmead in 1904 for a genus of wasps (Canadian Entomologist, 36, p. 9), so that Wedekind's intended compliment to Professor Reed is lost. In passing, it might be noted that *Phacops fecundus* Barrande, is not the type of *Phacops* s. s. as Wedekind has made it.

¹⁰Mem. Geol. Sur. Unit. Kingdom, Dec. 7, p. 8, 1853.

¹¹Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 2, vol. 4, pp. 401, 410, 1849.