length of the funnels, and the presence or absence of the inner siphuncular lining, our form would have to be brought under Cameroceras. We would then be in the peculiar situation of having three groups of species belonging to three different genera which have in common large preseptal apical cones or nepionic bulbs, indicating long continuation of a very primitive condition in early youth of the forms. In at least two of these genera these primitive groups contrast with the larger number of the younger congeners, in which the siphuncle has been entirely inclosed into the phragmocone and the preseptal cone superseded.

While we do not intend to question Hyatt's view which clearly considers the genus Nanno with the scope and definition given to it by Clarke and Holm, as of polyphyletic origin, and therefore restricts it to Nanno aulema, we are also convinced that it would not serve the ends of a proper delimitation of closely related and equally advanced forms, if one would include in these three genera the forms which clearly represent an older phylogenetic stage than the genotypes. For this reason we propose to separate these phylonepionic forms characterized by preseptal cones from the later and typical phylephebic congeners and designate them as subgenera by the prefix "protero." We thus have a "Proterocameroceras" represented by Proterocameroceras brainerdi, which is a Cameroceras with a large preseptal cone or nepionic bulb; and a "Protero-vaginoceras," which is a Vaginoceras with a like cone. To the latter would have to be referred Endoceras (Nanno) belemnitiforme Holm, while the position of E. (Nanno) fistula Holm and E. (Nanno) pygmaeus Holm is uncertain till their siphuncular structures have been studied. As the long, stafflike, cylindric conchs would indicate, they may belong to neither of the two genera mentioned and be rather genuine Nannos or come under Hyatt's genus Narthecoceras. In the latter case we might have a third genus with "protero" forms and later forms.

It is in line with the more primitive character of Proterocameroceras brainerdi that it occurs in the Beekmantown formation; while Cameroceras does not find its principal development till the Black river and Trenton stages.