

Trembley, and his *Tubularia gelatinosa*, in a living state, and he asserts that the latter—a *Plumatella*—differs from the former—an *Alcyonella*—not solely in habit,* but in having fewer, shorter, and more recurved tentacula. “*Interaneis quoque*” he adds, “*a præcedenti differt et distinctissima est hæc species, quæ interdum in iisdem cum præcedenti (semper rariore, adeoque, ut videtur, minus prolifica) reperitur aquis.*” Muller’s description of *Plumatella repens* certainly affords nothing in opposition to Raspail’s theory, but on the contrary may be deemed favourable to it, since he tells us that it is intermediate between the very species which Pallas considered so widely different, possessing many of the characters of both, and differing principally in the appearance of the polypidom. Lamarck perceived the affinity of the genera, which he nevertheless kept separate, resting the distinction on the massive and ramous forms of the polypidoms. Baër, apparently speaking from personal examination of the productions in question, has expressed his conviction of the perfect distinctness of *Alcyonella* and *Plumatella*, and this subsequent to his knowledge of Raspail’s *Memoir*: and Milne-Edwards has still more recently shown that this essay had at least not conveyed perfect conviction to his mind, otherwise he would scarce have expressed himself in this manner: “*Il nous paraît en effet probable que ces Polypes, observés à des périodes diverses de leur développement, ont été pris pour des animaux differens et décrits sous des noms particuliers. Mais il serait possible aussi que les formes transitoires de l’Alcyonelle décrites par M. Raspail se rencontrassent d’une manière permanente chez d’autres Polypes, et par conséquent, on ne peut encore rayer des catalogues zoologiques la longue suite d’espèces mentionnées ci-dessus.*” *Lam. Anim. s. Vert.* 2de edit. ii. 116.—Under these circumstances I have deemed it the best course to keep the genera separate, as least likely to perplex the student.

Of the *P. Sultana* little is known. I have seen a living specimen in the possession of Sir John G. Dalyell, but had no opportunity of making an examination of it. Naturalists wait with some impatience the publication of a work from this ingenious observer, on which, it is understood, he has been long engaged, and which will disappoint expectation if it does not disclose many novel facts, and illustrate many present obscurities, and give additional respect and permanence to his name and reputation as a naturalist.

* “*Habit* is a general agreement in growth and appearance.” *Linnaeus.*