

nous semble compliquée. Il nous appartient pas de la résoudre, et dans le doute, nous avons adopté le nom généralement admis dans tous les pays, et que nous voyons introduit jusqu'en Amérique, par J. Hall, dans son bel ouvrage sur la Paléontologie de New-York."<sup>5</sup>

The next year, Salter<sup>6</sup>, in speaking of the name *Trinucleus* says: "The name of the genus can only be retained by general consent, for the typical species was formerly denominated *Cryptolithus*, and sufficiently described by Green;"..... "But in this case strict priority may be allowed to yield to classical feeling." In 1854, Angelin<sup>7</sup> used the family name *Cryptolithidae* though he employed *Trinucleus* for the genus.

From 1854 to 1890 *Cryptolithus* seems to have been pretty effectually submerged, but attention was drawn to it in the latter year by Vogdes<sup>8</sup>, who says of *Cryptolithus*: "This generic name should replace that of *Trinucleus*"; and again: "Sir. R. I. Murchison has revived this old name of Lhwyd's, and all subsequent paleontologists have adopted it. Lhwyd's description meant no more than the general name trilobite of the more modern writers, and could not, except by courtesy, set aside Dr. Jacob Green's genus *Cryptolithus*."

Thus we may divide the users of these names into three classes: first, those writers who from 1832 to 1851 used *Cryptolithus*; second, those who, like Hall, Barrande, and their followers, turned to *Trinucleus* on the ground of supposed priority; and third, men like Murchison, Salter, and many modern writers, who knew that *Cryptolithus* had priority, but who preferred the better name. On the mere ground of sentiment, which of course should have no weight at all, there would seem to be as much in favor of *Cryptolithus* as *Trinucleus*, and as a matter of simple justice everything points to the former name. The only argument against returning to *Cryptolithus* is the one of present convenience, and I must admit that is, practically, a very weighty argument. *Trinucleus* has gotten such a firm hold upon us that it will take more than ordinary courage to give it up. And it should be pointed out that we are in a fair way to saddle ourselves with more cases of this same kind. It will be interesting to see whether present day paleontologists are going to allow such names as some of those recently proposed by Jaekel for Agnostid genera or the still more flagrant *Glockeria* of

<sup>5</sup>Systeme silurien du centre de la Boheme, vol. 1, p. 610, 1852.

<sup>6</sup>Memoirs Geol. Sur. Unit. Kingdom, Dec. 7, p. 5, 1853.

<sup>7</sup>Palaeontologia Scandinavica. Pars 1. Fasc. 2, p. 64 of 3d ed., 1878.

<sup>8</sup>Bull. U.S. Geol. Survey, No. 63, pp. 107, 148.