

*Encope.**Encope*, Agassiz, 1840, Cat. Syst. Ectyp.*Encope emarginata.**Echinodiscus emarginatus*, Leske, 1778, Kl. Add., p. 136.*Encope emarginata*, Agassiz, 1841, Mon. Scut., p. 47, pl. x.

Off Bahia 20 to 70 fathoms.

PETALOSTICHA.

Sub-order PETALOSTICHA, Hæckel, 1866, Generelle Morphologie (*emend.*).

CASSIDULIDÆ.

Family CASSIDULIDÆ, Agassiz, 1847, C. R. Ann. Sc. Nat., vol. vii. p. 147.

NUCLEOLIDÆ.

Sub-family NUCLEOLIDÆ, Agassiz, 1847, C. R. Ann. Sc. Nat., vol. vii. p. 147.

*Echinolampas.**Echinolampas*, Gray, 1825, Ann. Phil.

It certainly is very unfortunate for Paleontological nomenclature that both Gray and myself should have felt compelled to adopt the name *Echinanthus* for *Clypeaster rosaceus*. Desor and D'Orbigny starting from different standpoints, the one in his zeal to restore the old names of Breynius and the other with the idea of not abandoning names of types which had become generally recognised among Echinologists, limited Breynius' genera without any reference to the previous limitations of the same genera suggested by Gray. Gray's suggestions were completely overlooked by Paleontologists, and the confusion which might have been avoided has, I fear, been only increased by these subsequent attempts to reinstate old genera within limits which were not intended by the original author. The limitations originally introduced by Gray, dating back as they do to 1825, have fully as much right to recognition as a similar attempt to reinstate the same old genera within different limits dating from 1855. So that, even granting that it was not worth while to attempt to reinstate the genera of Breynius, it was worth while to take into account the divisions adopted by Gray. But with the insufficient distinctions now shown to exist between *Echinanthus* (fossil) and *Echinolampas*, it may be wisest to retain *Echinolampas* alone for the group now known among Paleontologists as *Echinanthus* and *Echinolampas*.