

there is a suggestion of similarity to our plant in the general character of the fundamental tissue, and the presence of numerous mucilage passages. These latter, however, are small and apparently altogether separated from the vascular bundles.

Subsequent observers have not been unmindful of certain structural aspects in these plants, which have seemed to suggest their possible relationship to the palms, and more particularly to that type of structure represented in the genus *Dracæna*, but much doubt has always been entertained as to the possibility of monocotyledons occurring so far back as the Carboniferous. These doubts were first prominently expressed by Brongniart as the result of comparing with the plants figured by Cotta and Corda, new material obtained from Autun, France.<sup>16</sup> He says "il y ait des différences fort essentielles et què rendent très difficile d'établir des rapports entre ces fossiles et les végétaux vivants." He therefore preferred to regard Cotta's *Medullosa elegans* as the representative of a new genus, for which he proposed the name *Myeloxylon*, which thus seemed to indicate the leading structural features indicated by the former name, the significance of which was thereby perpetuated.

Fifteen years later, Goeppert, in reviewing Cotta's species, regarded *Medullosa elegans* as possessing characters which were variously represented in the gymnosperms, in palms, and in the ferns. As a generalized type, he applied to it the name of *Stenzelia*.

In 1873, Williamson first drew attention to the belief that the relations of these fossils had not been correctly interpreted, and expressed the view that they were really ferns allied to the *Marattiaceæ*.<sup>17</sup>

In 1874, Renault reviewed the fossils obtained from the Carboniferous beds at Autun, as a result of which he supports the conclusions reached by Williamson, and while he regards the name proposed by Corda to be wholly untenable, and those of Cotta and Goeppert to be insufficiently indicative, he views that

<sup>16</sup> Tab. des gen. de Vég. Foss. 60. 1849. (Quoted from Williamson.)

<sup>17</sup> Brit. Ass. Adv. Sci. 1873.