ART. XL.—*Note on the Names Amphion, Harpina, and Platymetopus;* by PERCY E. RAYMOND.

AFTER my recent paper on the Chazy Trilobites (Annals Carnegie Museum, vol. iii, No. 2) was in type, Dr. W. J. Holland called my attention to the fact that the name *Amphion* was in general use for a common genus of moths. A little investigation showed that not only *Amphion*, but *Harpina* and *Platymetopus*, two other generic names used in the paper cited, were likewise preoccupied.

The first use of *Amphion* as a generic name was by Hübner, who, in 1816, applied it to one of the Lepidoptera.* Pander proposed the same term for a tribobite, in 1830,† and designated *Amphion frontiloba* = *Asaphus Fischeri* Eichwald as the type. Since *Amphion* is thus preoccupied, it becomes necessary to find some other name to apply to this trilobite. Angelin, in 1854,‡ used *Pliomera* as a new generic designation for trilobites of the type of *Asaphus Fischeri* Eichwald, evidently intending to restrict the genus to its original meaning. This name *Pliomera* should now be adopted to replace the preoccupied name *Amphion* Pander.

The Chazy species *Amphion canadensis* differs in several particulars from the European form *Pliomera Fischeri*. In the American species the median furrow of the glabella is very faint and frequently absent; the second pair of furrows are much further apart, thus producing one large frontal lobe instead of two small ones as in the Russian species; the facial sutures reach the lateral margin in front of the genal angles; the frontal border is not denticulate, and the two species do not have the same number of thoracic segments.

The absence of the median glabellar furrow and of the denticulate margin seem to be of considerable taxonomic importance, as this furrow cannot be regarded as due to the mechanical effect produced by the enrollment of the animal in pressing the spinose tail against the glabella. This is proved by the fact that no pygidial spine is situated opposite the median furrow, but that the two median spines of the pygidium are placed so that one comes on either side of the frontal furrow. Again, the second pair of glabellar furrows are longer than this median furrow, and the third set is still longer, as would be the case if all were glabellar furrows. Finally, in *Amphion canadensis* there is a smooth border around the front, and the median indentation is almost obsolete, while the pygidium

* Verzeichniss bekannter Schmetterlinge.
† Beiträge zur Geognosie des russischen Reiches, p. 139.
‡ Palæontologica Scandinavica, p. 30.

is exactly similar to that in the European species. If this median indentation does represent the first pair of glabellar furrows, and *Amphion canadensis* has lost it and the denticulate glabellar margin as well, then *Pliomera Fischeri* denotes an earlier stage in the development, and it will probably be best to separate the American forms under the name *Pliomerops*, with *Amphion canadensis* as the type. *Amphion convexus* Billings and *Amphion Westoni* Billings appear to belong to this subgenus. In regard to *Amphion Barrandei* Billings states that a small median pit is present in exfoliated specimens,* indicating the presence of this median furrow in a rudimentary but deep-seated condition.

The generic term *Harpina* was first used by Burmeister, in 1844, for a species of Coleoptera,† while Böck used it for a crustacean, in 1870.‡ Novák proposed the name a third time, in 1884, for a subgenus of *Harpes*,§ using it to designate the Lower Silurian forms of the genus. The hypostoma differs in the Upper and Lower Silurian species, and it was on this difference that the two genera were separated. The hypostomas of the Chazy forms are not known, but it is probable that they will be found to agree with those of the species from the Ordovician investigated by Novák. In any event, it is necessary to supply a new name in place of the preoccupied *Harpina*, and *Eoharpes* is herewith suggested.

*Platymetopus* was first used by Dejean, in 1829, for a species of Coleoptera,‖ and by Angelin, in 1854, for a subgenus of *Lichas*.¶ In 1902, Reed** saw that the name was preoccupied and suggested *Paralichas* to take its place. Unfortunately this name had been applied by White, in 1859, also for a species of Coleoptera,†† hence it will be necessary to give a new name for species of Division 3 of Schmidt, of which *Lichas lævis* Eichwald is the type.‡‡ For this purpose, *Amphilichas* is proposed, and should be applied to the Chazy species now known as *Platymetopus minganensis*.

Paleontological Laboratory, Yale University Museum, March 23, 1905.

* Paleozoic Fossils Canada, pp. 288, 321, 322.
† Handbuch der Entomologie. ‡ Overs. Dan. Selsk.
§ Studien an Hypostomen der böhm. Trilobiten, No. 2, p. 4.
‖ Species général. des Coléoptéres, vol. v, p. 815.
¶ Palæontologica Scandinavica, p. 68.
** Quart. Jour. Geol. Soc. London, vol. lviii, pp. 62, 89.
†† Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 4, vol. iii, p. 284.
‡‡ Rev. der Ostbalt. Silur. Tril. Mém. Acad. Imp. St. Petersbourg, ser. 7, vol. xxxiii, No. 1, p. 49.