are necessary to co-ordinate the life-history, and enable us to correlate formations.[1]

The nomenclature of species, on the other hand, is not in such a condition as to promote geological peace of mind. More than sixty years ago, when a committee of the British Association, with H. E. Strickland as reporter, was appointed to consider the rules of zoological nomenclature, comments were made on the 'anarchical state of their science' with respect to names of genera and species.[2] Since that time it can hardly be said that the confusion has become less confounded.

Modern palæontological nomenclature is based on the binomial system, introduced in the tenth edition of the 'Systema Naturæ' of Linnæus (1758–59). The 'law of priority' is regarded as its fundamental maxim; and a great impetus towards an ultimate fixity of names on this basis has been given by the indefatigable labours of Mr. C. Davies Sherborn, in his 'Index Generum et Specierum Animalium.' This, however, has not proved an unmixed blessing, as names zoological and palæontological have been changed and changed again, often beyond recognition by the ordinary student. To those who are not devoid of sentiment it appears serious that the historical landmarks are one by one removed or obliterated, and associations are lost, while a great burden is put on those who require to translate modern names into intelligible form.

In addition to this, the study of phylogeny has naturally become of absorbing interest to the palæontologist, and has led to a subdivision of genera and species, necessary in the process of research, but appalling to most brethren of the hammer.

In his address of 1893 Mr. Hudleston commented on the terrible tax imposed on the memory by the pace at

[1] See W. T. Blanford, Address to Geol. Soc. 1889; and J. E. Marr, Address to Geol. Soc. 1906.

[2] The latest rules are the 'Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologiques adoptées par les Congrès Internationaux de Zoologie,' edited by Professor R. Blanchard, Paris, 1905.