

fied in re-naming this genus of plants, however unsatisfactory is the name *Adiantides*.

ADIANTIDES OBTUSUS (Dawson) sp.

Plate XVI, figure 42.

- 1858. *Noeggerathia Bockschiana*, Lesquereux, Rogers Pennsylvania Rep., p. 854, pl. III, fig. 1.
- 1862. *Cyclopteris obtusa* Lesquereux, Dawson, Quart. Journ. Geol. Soc., vol. 18, p. 319, pl. XV, fig. 33.
- 1865. *Cyclopteris obtusa* Lesquereux, Hartt in Bailey's Rep., p. 135.
- 1868. *Cyclopteris obtusa*, Lesquereux, Dawson, Acadian Geol., p. 547.
- 1868. *Cyclopteris Bockschiana*, Goepfert, Dawson, Acadian Geol., p. 549.
- 1871. *Cyclopteris (Aneimiles) obtusa*, Lesquereux, Dawson, Foss. Pl. Devon. Upp. Silur. Canada, Geol. Surv. Rep., p. 46, pl. XVI, fig. 188.
- 1871. *Cyclopteris (Aneimiles) Bockshii*, Goepfert, Dawson, Foss. Pl. Devon. Upp. Silur. Canada, Geol. Surv. Rep., p. 46, pl. XVI, fig. 187.
- 1879-80. *Archaeopteris Bockschiana* ?, Goepfert, Lesquereux, Coal Flora, p. 306, pl. XLIX, figs. 1-4.
- 1882. *Aneimiles obtusa*, Dawson, Foss. Pl. Erian Upp. Silur. Canada, pt. 2, p. 101.
- 1888. *Aneimiles obtusa*, Dawson, Geol. Hist. Pl., p. 72, fig. 22A (from 1905 edition).

About the identity of the actual plant which is best known as *Aneimiles obtusa* Dawson, there is no doubt, for the specimen in the McGill University collection, No. 3323, is clearly the original from which Dawson drew his fig. 188 pl. XVI, in his 1871 monograph. A photograph of this specimen is given in my pl. XVI, fig. 42. Nevertheless, about the nomenclature there has been considerable confusion. In his original description in 1862 Dawson (p. 319) allocated his plant to "*Cyclopteris obtusa* Lesquereux." But reference to Lesquereux's species, described in Roger's report on Pennsylvania, 1858, shows that it was the species *Bockschiana* (pl. III, fig. 1) and not *obtusa* which was the same as the Canadian form. In 1868 Dawson in his "Acadian Geology" p. 549 identified a fragment as *C. Bockschiana* Goepfert, but said that he thought it possible that the fragment was the same as *C. obtusa*. In the 1871 monograph, Dawson does not re-describe the plant *C. obtusa* though he gives another and more complete figure, and merely in a line refers to the original incorrect reference to Roger's report.

Schimper in 1874 in his vol. 3, p. 485, discusses these species and points out Dawson's confusion, with resulted in 1882, in Dawson re-naming his plant as *Aneimiles obtusa* which name he perpetuated in 1888.