

Ogygia de Guettard and *O. de Desmarest*, which appear to be congeneric. The type of *O. guettardi*, which is still in the collections at the Sorbonne, in Paris, has recently been redescribed and figured by Ehlert in the first fasciculus of the *Paleontologia Universalis*. It is evident that this trilobite is not at all related to the familiar *Ogygias* of Wales and Scandinavia. Barrande was the first to point this out, and Tromelin and Lebesconte stated it long ago. These latter authors also noted that *Ogygia* was a preoccupied name, having been used by Hubner in 1816 for a genus of *Lepidoptera*, and they proposed *Ogygites* to replace it.¹² Goldfuss, in 1843, without giving any special reason, transferred Brongniart's *Asaphus de Buch* to the genus *Ogygia*, and this species has, in time, thanks to Salter's description, come to be considered the type of the genus *Ogygia*. Now that we know what the original type of that genus is, this later position can not be defended except on the general plea "That everyone knows what an *Ogygia* is, and it will make trouble to change now."¹³ *Ogygia buchi* was not one of the original species of *Ogygia*, is not generically the same as the species originally assigned to that genus, and yet is, by the law of tradition, made the type of *Ogygia*, thus ousting the original species! Truly scientists must venerate tradition! To be logical we must now propose a new generic name for the original species of *Ogygia*! But Sweden has produced a man who was not afraid to look things squarely in the face and defy tradition, and in his *Paleontologia Scandinavica*, Angelin proposed *Ogygiocaris* to replace *Ogygia* in the sense used by authors generally, but not by Brongniart, selecting the Scandinavian *O. dilatata* as the type. Therefore, *Ogygia* disappears, being preoccupied, *Ogygites* takes its place for primitive Asaphinæ with annulated pygidia and forked hypostomata, and *Ogygiocaris* stands for trilobites of the type of *Ogygiocaris dilatata* and *O. buchi*.

Another familiar name which must go, merely because it is preoccupied, is *Bronteus*. Goldfuss¹⁴ described this as *Brontes* in 1839. De Koninck¹⁵ saw that this name had already been used by Fabricius for an insect, and therefore proposed to change the name to *Goldius*, a contraction of *Goldfussius*. This did not appeal to Goldfuss, evidently, for he slightly modified his original term in 1843, making it *Bronteus*. If we can use a name only once in the animal kingdom, we must adopt *Goldius*. Here

¹² Assc. Fr. Avanc. Sci. Cong. Nantes, p. 631, 1876.

¹³ See Schmidt, Revis, Ostbalt. Sil. Trilobiten, Abt. 5, lief. 3, p. 37.

¹⁴ Nov. Act. Acad. Cæs. Leop. Carol., vol. 19, pt. 1, 1839.

¹⁵ Nouv. Mem. de l'Acad. de Brux., vol. 14, p. 6, 1841.