

*repanda*, var. *menardii*, subvar. *pauperata*," are something more than names; and resemble too much the descriptive sentences which did duty with the præ-Linnean writers to find general acceptance. Some of the difficulties inseparable from this mode of writing may be gathered from the examples above quoted. For instance, if *Lagena* is to be treated as the typical and *Entosolenia* as a subordinate group, the immediate relationship of *Entosolenia globosa* is with its ectosolenian form, *Lagena lævis*; so that to be complete the name should be *Lagena sulcata*, var. *lævis*, subvar. (*Entosolenia*) *globosa*. Again, it may be true that *Lagena sulcata* is the original type of the genus and *Lagena lævis* the variety; but, judging from the Silurian and Carboniferous specimens, the converse is at least equally probable; and there are some who would prefer to regard the simpler smooth-shelled organism as the type, and the forms with superficial ornament of one sort or other as varieties; and this view would involve a change affecting the entire generic series. The second example is open to similar objection. To speak of *Pulvinulina pauperata* as a sub-variety of *Pulvinulina menardii* involves an assumption which, so far as I am able to judge, is founded on inference rather than on observed facts. The distinctive features of *Pulvinulina pauperata* are remarkably constant, and I have never met with a specimen, at any stage of growth, with characters presenting the least approximation to those of *Pulvinulina menardii*.

Thus, whilst recognising fully the value of the plan introduced by my friends, the authors referred to, of grouping the almost endless varieties of the Foraminifera round a small number of typical and subtypical species, as a method of study, and indeed as almost the only means of obtaining a serviceable knowledge of the entire Order, I have been unable to follow them so far as to make it a basis of nomenclature.

It is surely not requisite for purposes of this sort that a uniform standard of fixity of characters should be adopted; or that a set of beings of low organisation and extreme variability should be subjected to precisely the same treatment as the higher divisions of the animal kingdom. The advantages of a binomial system of nomenclature have not diminished since the days of Linnæus, though the views of the naturalist as to what constitutes a "genus" or a "species" have changed and will probably continue to change; but be that as it may, the Linnæan method is too simple and convenient to be abandoned without some better reason than the different value of these terms, as employed in different zoological groups. The practical point upon which all are agreed is that it is impossible to deal satisfactorily with the multiform varieties of the Foraminifera without a much freer use of distinctive names than is needful or indeed permissible amongst animals endowed with more stable characters.

That specific names have been needlessly multiplied becomes manifest on a very slight acquaintance with the literature of the subject; indeed the process of re-naming has been carried to such an extent as to be a source of constant embarrassment to the student and an obstacle to the progress of knowledge. The lists of synonyms appended to the