

find till halfway through that the writer was dealing with a moth, while the reader was searching for information about a trilobite. As specialization goes on, we paleontologists will probably forget that moths exist, so why not let each group have its own set of names? But such a thought immediately suggests the confusion that would inevitably result, and one is driven back to the present rules. That the following of the rules works a certain hardship, I am fully aware, but that it produces confusion, I deny. We all dislike a change, and we hate to see well known things travelling under unfamiliar names. But it is remarkable how quickly we assimilate new names, and, after we once get them, how pleased we are with our new possessions. The very fact that they are new and arouse antagonism in us, fixes them in our memory, and they are further emphasized, because we make it a point to tell everyone what a mess Blank is making of our old familiar genera.

As an illustration of how quickly new names are adopted, one may cite the cases of *Orthis*, *Strophomena*, and *Leptaena*. From 1847 to 1892, those names were constantly on the tongue of every American paleontologist. Between 1892 and the end of the century we had learned a new meaning for each of these names, and had also learned some two dozen new generic names for some of the species formerly known by the names cited. It is quite certain that if we of this generation would straighten out our system of names, the next generation would never realize that it had meant any struggle.

In preparing a review of some of the genera of trilobites for a publication soon to be issued, I have tried to eliminate some of the names, which, according to the rules, do not have a lawful standing. As the changes have affected some very well known names, I have been asked to prepare a statement showing the grounds on which the alterations were made.

Some of the cases are very simple and they may be presented first. Jaekel¹ has recently proposed ten new genera among the Agnostidae, but six of the names have to be rejected, because he did not recognize prior workers in the field. He proposed *Paragnostus*, with *Aagnostus rex* as the type, but this same species is the type of *Condylonyge*, Corda,² which must of course remain the proper name for this group. He further proposed *Dichagnostus* with *A. granulatus* as the type, thus duplicating Corda's *Pleuroctenium*, which must stand. Jaekel proposed *Mesagnostus*, with *A. integer*, Beyrich, as the type, but Corda had already used this species as the type of *Peronopsis*. *Miag-*

¹ Zeit. d. Deutsch. Geol. Ges., vol. 61, pp. 380-401, 1909.

² Prodrum einer Monographie der böhmischen Trilobiten, 1847.