

## TERMINOLOGY.

Concerning the terminology, I have deemed it advisable in the present Report to make use of that best known and most generally adopted by the carcinologists of the present time, though I am well aware that the usual terms have not in all cases a clearly defined scientific character. The manifold modifications, both in structure and functions, affecting almost every part of the body in this extensive class of Arthropoda, must, in my opinion, make it very difficult, if not quite impossible, to establish any nomenclature, that at the same time would give fully adequate terms for the several parts, and also be equally applicable to all forms of the class.

The attempts made with this object in view by certain eminent carcinologists, and most recently by Mr. C. Spence Bate, do not seem to have been generally accepted by specialists in this department, notwithstanding the great skill and inventive aptitude shown in constructing the new terms suggested.

In a strict sense, I think that one of the claims to attention presented by so decidedly new a terminology would be its unquestionable applicability, not only to all forms of Crustacea, but also, as invariably has been attempted with the older one, to its embracing the other classes comprised in the vast subkingdom of the Arthropoda (Pycnogonida, Arachnoida, Myriapoda, Insecta). This, however, would appear to have been far from the object of the above carcinologists. For not only have they restricted their investigations to the class of Crustacea, but it would also appear that the several new terms have been, in every sense, specially devised for some limited group of this class, generally one of the higher ones (Decapods, Amphipods). It is obvious, therefore, that many of the terms, constructed according to such a method, will not apply even to all the Crustacea, let alone to the other Arthropoda.

Indeed, if any attempt be made to construct a new and more generally applicable nomenclature, it seems imperatively necessary that the terms should be relatively indefinite, and, as a rule, not involving the designation of any specific physiological function, but merely structural characters in a more general sense. Only within limited groups would, perhaps to a certain extent, more definite designations be applicable, but even then merely as strict specific terms.

It is obvious that several of the new terms proposed by Mr. Spence Bate are of a strictly specific character, *e.g.*, pereion, pleon, gnathopoda, pereiopoda, pleopoda, and these terms therefore cannot, in my opinion, lay any claim to serve as generally applicable designations for all the Crustacea, although they are extremely significant and sufficiently adequate for some of the higher groups. Thus any carcinologist engaged in studying the very extensive order of Copepoda would, I feel convinced, hardly adopt the terms "pereion" and "pleon" in the same sense as that proposed by Spence Bate; for in those animals the middle section of the body ("pereion"