

them as to the adoption of a new system of terms. As a result we drew up, with the assistance of Professor Stewart of the Royal College of Surgeons, the following scheme, which, as regards the larger spicules, is chiefly founded on the distinction between axes and actines, which I believe I was the first to draw attention to in a paper describing *Tricentrion muricata* (*Plectronella papillosa*).¹ For the general plan of the scheme I am therefore responsible, but several excellent terms proposed by Vosmaer find a place in it.

Dr. v. Lendenfeld was anxious, and I think rightly so, to make as little change as possible in adapting our terms from the Greek, so that they might be used with the same universality as say those of human anatomy; we were thus led to avoid the addition of useless terminations such as "ites" to words complete enough without them, at the same time we felt at liberty to modify the termination for English use so long as this could be done without affecting the root; in other languages other terminations more in consonance with their own genius may be substituted for ours without impairing their intelligibility. Thus it makes little difference whether we say "strongyla" or "strongyle," but the latter has a more English sound.² An abbreviation from "actine" to "acte" as used by Schulze is, however, scarcely admissible, since this not only affects the form of the root, but introduces another of a totally different meaning, "acte" in Greek signifying a sea-shore.

Since Greek lends itself more readily to the construction of compound words we have made use of it in preference to Latin. Further, we have not confined ourselves to finding names for the different forms of entire spicules, but have sought also for terms to designate their several parts or regions, feeling convinced that for scientific purposes a replacement of "vulgar" by classical terms is by no means to be deprecated, but rather encouraged, and that earnestly; for not only are brevity and exactness thus ensured, but the classical tongues being still in a sense common to all nations, all writers alike can make use of terms derived from them, and thus since Latin has ceased to be the universal language we may hope to mitigate the confusion of tongues by the multiplication of universally accepted technical terms. It is a comparatively easy task to read a memoir in a foreign tongue when once one is familiar with all the most important and most frequently occurring words, as one must be if a common nomenclature is used to designate the objects and parts of objects which are the subjects of description. In a word, by the extension of a common scientific phraseology, we may hope to reduce the differences between existing languages to a difference in their framework, which may be filled up with terms having a common signification.

Partly for this reason I have not scrupled to invent a new term whenever the nature of the subject seemed to require it; a further justification is to be found in the increased

¹ Sollas, *Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist.*, ser. 5, vol. iii. p. 236, fig. 3, 1879.

² Thus, as we say spicule and spicules in English, and not spiculum and spicula, so I shall speak of oscule and oscules, of conule and conules, and so forth; if it be remarked, that to be consistent I ought also to write collenchyme and not collenchyma, I admit it, and at the same time confess that it is only by accident that the latter form found its way into the text.