

nostus, Jaekel, has the same type-species, *A. lævigatus*, Dalman, as *Lejopyge*, Corda. In none of these cases can there be any reason for accepting the new names proposed by Jaekel. Two of the other new genera founded by Jaekel were based on new species, but they seem, nevertheless, to be synonyms of two of Corda's genera. Jaekel proposed to found the new *Leiagnostus* on his species, *L. erraticus*, associating with it *Agnostus nudus*, and others. Corda's genus *Phalacroma*, with *A. bibullatus*, Barrande, as the type, includes *A. nudus*, and Jaekel's *L. erraticus* has the same generic characters, so that there is no reason to displace Corda's old name. *Metagnostus*, Jaekel, was founded on another new species, named by him *M. erraticus*. This species differs in very minor characters from *A. glabratus*, Angelin. *Metagnostus erraticus* and *A. glabratus* have the same short glabella with faint basal lobes, and the same type of pygidium, as *Agnostus tardus*, Barrande, which is the type of *Arthrorhachis*, Corda, and *Metagnostus* therefore seems superfluous. Unfortunately, *Paragnostus*, *Metagnostus*, and *Leiagnostus* are the genera which Jaekel considered typical of three of his new families, and their rejection forces the rejection of the family names derived from them. Corda's family name *Phalacromidae* would apply to the *lævigati*, and, using the same types as Jaekel the *Paragnostidae* would become the *Condylopygidae*, and the *Metagnostidae* would be transformed into the *Arthrorhachidae*.

Barrande,³ Walcott,⁴ and Lake⁵ have pointed out that *Microdiscus*, Emmons, was founded on an immature specimen of *Cryptolithus* (*Trinucleus*), and is not, therefore, at all the *Microdiscus* of Salter, Walcott, and authors generally. Walcott has suggested that *Pemphigaspis*, Hall,⁶ may be the same as what is generally meant by *Microdiscus*, and so take its place, but he has not followed this course himself. The writer has recently examined the type of *Pemphigaspis bullata* in the American Museum in New York, and is unable to connect it with what we usually call *Microdiscus*. It therefore seems best to rehabilitate *Eodiscus*, as defined by Matthew,⁷ to include a part, at least, of the species now known as *Microdiscus*. *Eodiscus schucherti*, Matthew, from the Lower Cambrian of Troy, N.Y., thus becomes the type. The name *Eodiscus* was first used in manuscript by Professor Hart, and mentioned by Walcott,⁸

³ Bull. Geol. Soc. France, ser. 2, vol. 18, p. 280, 1861.

⁴ Bull. U.S. Geol. Survey, No. 30, p. 152, 1886.

⁵ Paleontographical Society, vol. 61, p. 30, 1907.

⁶ 16th Ann. Rept. N.Y. State Cab. Nat. Hist., p. 221, 1863.

⁷ American Geologist, vol. 18, 1896.

⁸ U. S. Geol. Survey, Bull. No. 10, p. 24, 1882.