

to correct what is wrong in "old established" ideas and expressions, and in science we are sure that accuracy of expression is essential for the diffusion of clear and correct ideas, so that if even great authorities are found resisting needful improvements, the movement belongs to those who insist on their importance. *Gamopetalous* is, after all, an awkward figurative term; but to *Synpetalous* and *Synsepalous*, there can be no reasonable objection, and *apopetalous* or *dialypetalous* will serve for the contrasted term. If being established is a good excuse for retaining a term, invented when the true nature of the case was not understood, and expressing a false view, we see no chance for improvement.

Again, we cannot help objecting very strongly to the use of *Pistil*, as a collective name for the carpels which make up the inner circle of the flower: *Gynœcium* we think the most appropriate term. A pistil, according to Linnaean ideas, is an apparently distinct part of the gynœcium, being either one of the carpels of an apocarpous gynœcium; one style and stigma where the ovarian portions of the carpels cohere, or the seemingly single organ formed by the complete coherence of the carpels.* With our present views of structure, such a term is useless except in applying the Linnaean System, and ought no longer to be employed in descriptive botany. The inner circle of the parts of a flower is the gynœcium, its several parts or the several modified leaves of which it consists are carpels, and each carpel consists of ovary, style, and stigma. We cannot accept, judging from our own experience and reading, Mr. Bentham's statement that *pistil* is generally applied in a collective sense, and we believe it to be now generally used in a very vague manner, which needs correction; this is easily applied by using pistil only in its Linnaean sense, and having good names both for the whole circle, the several pieces of which it is composed, and the distinguishable parts of each.

We note minor objections because so few occur to us, and we so very much admire and value the work, which we in conclusion most warmly recommend to all who are engaged in botanical studies.

W. H.

* Observing that the Linnaean use of the term *pistil* has been a subject of controversy, we turned to the *Philosophia Botanica* and carefully re-examined every sentence in which the word occurs. The result is a confirmed conviction that Linnaeus could not possibly have intended *pistil* as a general name for the inner circle of a flower. He speaks of pistils as one or more. The theory of the carpels not having been yet thought of, an entire or almost entire union of styles and stigmas was to him: one pistil, whilst any considerable separation of styles, with or without coherence below, was regarded by him as several pistils. His authority cannot be used in favour of Mr. Bentham's application of the term, which is otherwise very objectionable.