

but was not used in any definite sense until Matthew's publication.

The case of *Cryptolithus* versus *Trinucleus* has been reviewed recently by Foerste,⁹ who comes to the only possible conclusion, which is, that the use of *Trinucleus* is unjustified. The present habit of dating *Trinucleus* back to Lhwydd (1698) can not be upheld, as he was a pre-Linnaean writer, and his use of *Trinucleum* was not at all in a modern generic sense. Murchison was the first describer of *Trinucleus*, which thus dates from 1839 (Silurian System). In 1832, two names were given to the trilobite which we usually call *Trinucleus*, *Cryptolithus* by Green in the monthly "American Journal of Geology and Natural Science," and *Nuttainia* by Eaton in the second edition of his text book. Both names appeared in the latter half of the same year, and it is not absolutely clear which appeared first. Dr. Foerste has stated the circumstances in detail, and shows that the evidence rather favours Green's name. Green certainly claimed priority, and we have no evidence that Eaton insisted that his name was published first. It is worthy of note that *Cryptolithus* was adopted by Bronn, Goldfuss, Emmrich, and Angelin, while Eaton's name was never again used by anyone for this genus.

In cases of priority, where the same species was not used as the type by both authors, it is of course necessary to proceed with caution, for further investigation may show that the two type-species really belong to different genera, as has proven the case with *Cheirurus* and *Ceraurus*, genera which have long been considered identical. In the present case the two types seem to be congeneric. Green's *Cryptolithus tessellatus* was founded on a specimen found in the shale at Waterford, New York. Murchison's first species was *Trinucleus caractaci*, which must be taken as the type of *Trinucleus*. Green's species differs from Murchison's in lacking the genal spines, and in having three instead of six rows of punctures on the border. The presence or absence of the genal spines is a condition of preservation, as the genal spines are on the free cheeks, and the number of rows of punctures varies within the limits of a single species, so it seems unlikely that these two species will ever require separate generic names.

The *Ogygia*, *Ogygites*, *Ogygiocaris* tangle is complicated but yields a satisfactory solution, as I have briefly shown recently.¹⁰ *Ogygia* was proposed by Brongniart,¹¹ who cited two species.

⁹ Bull. Denison Univ., p. 78, 1910.

¹⁰ Trans. Roy. Soc. Canada, ser. 3, vol. 5, sect. 4, p. 116, 1912.

¹¹ Histoire Naturelle des Crustacés Fossiles, p. 7, 1822.