The reading asserts that there are three different theories which are indicating that how Agnostids were living. The lecturer, however, finds the idea dubious and casts doubt on the reasons proposed by the reading passage.

The author argues that the agnostids might be predators animals like other otropods which were swimming fast and ate smaller animals. Conversely, the lecturer brings up the idea that hunting needs well developed eyes vision but the agnostids had tiny poor eyes and because of this they could not able to chase after preys and they could not be predator.

Furthermore, the reading passage holds the view that they might have lived on the seafloor like other types of athropods. On the contrary, the professor underlines the fact that animals which were living on the seafloor did not have the ability to move fast and they lived in localize areas but finding the species that lived in different areas indicates that they could able to move very fast and it is unusual for seafloor dwellers.

Finally, the reading asserts that it could be possible that agnostidss were parasites and they might have lived on fishes or other larger athropods. In contrast, the speaker dismisses this issue due to the fact that there are signs which indicate that the population of agnostids were very vast and this is unusual for parasites, because this matter leads to kill the host. So the large population of agnostids ruled out the theory that they might be parasite.