

or Greek name, or was advanced by the additional burden of a new nomenclature. Another objectionable practice, prevailing quite as extensively also, consists in the change of names, or the modification of the extent and meaning of old ones, without the addition of new information or of new views. If this practice is not abandoned, it will necessarily end in making Natural History a mere matter of nomenclature, instead of fostering its higher philosophical character. Nowhere is this abuse of a useless multiplication of names so keenly felt as in the nomenclature of the fruits of plants, which exhibits neither insight into vegetable morphology, nor even accurate observation of the material facts.

May we not return to the methods of such men as Cuvier and Baer, who were never ashamed of expressing their doubts in difficult cases, and were always ready to call the attention of other observers to questionable points, instead of covering up the deficiency of their information by high-sounding words!

In this rapid review of the history of Zoölogy, I have omitted several classifications, such as those of Kaup and Van der Hoeven, which might have afforded an opportunity for other remarks, but I have already extended this digression far enough to show how the standards I have proposed in my second chapter may assist us in testing the value of the different kinds of groups generally adopted in our classifications, and this was from the beginning my principal object in this inquiry. The next step should now be to apply these standards also to the minor divisions of the animal kingdom, down to the genera and species, and to do this for every class singly, with special reference to the works of monographers. But this is such an herculean task, that it can only be accomplished by the combined efforts of all naturalists, during many years to come.