

The fourth species is unmistakably the *Actinia senilis*. Speaking of the fifth species, which is the *Rhizostoma*, he compares the disk to a hat, and the eight pendant appendages to the feet of the Octopus. Of the sixth species, he says that the four feet may be compared to *Acanthus* leaves.¹

Gessner, in his great Natural History of the Animals, has followed Rondelet for the *Acalephæ*, as he did for most of the other productions of the Mediterranean; and also copied his figures and those of Bélon, adding only such remarks as exhibit his vast erudition, but in no way a better acquaintance with the animals themselves.²

It has been a source of constant delight for me, while perusing the works of the earlier naturalists, to sympathize with the genial spirit and the earnestness that pervade their writings, so free from egotism, and animosity against their fellow-students. Their devotion to their studies is equal to the spirit of reverence with which they look upon nature; and it is disgraceful to our age, that we must contrast with such dispositions the ill-will, the jealousies, the quarrels for priority, and the profanation, which pervade the discussions of certain modern authors. Moreover, in a systematic point of view, the great naturalists of the sixteenth century deserve to be studied more fully than they have been thus far. It is astonishing, for instance, to see how near Rondelet, in discussing the views of Aristotle upon the affinities of animals, came to perceiving their true affinities, and their natural classification under four great types. In the 1st Chapter of the 17th Book of his great work, "*De Piscibus Marinis*," after describing the fishes of the Mediterranean, he says, that having thus described the *Enaima*,—that is, the animals provided with blood,—he now proceeds to describe the *Anaima*, among which he distinguishes the *Malakia* in contradistinction to the *Skleroderma*. These *Malakia* are the Cephalopoda, to which unfortunately the *Medusæ* are added on account of the appendages around the mouth, which were compared by him to the feelers of the cuttle-fish. In Book 18th he treats of the Crustacea under the name of *Malakostraca*, and distinguishes from them the *Ostrakoderma*, or shell fishes,

Actinia than any other *Medusa* has; but that he did confound the two is plain from the following words: "Saxis aliquando hæret, aliquando soluta vagatur." The purple color of the *Æquorea* may also have contributed to mislead him.

¹ Here, then, we have for the first time the word *pileus* (hat) introduced to designate the disk of the *Medusæ*, an expression that has been retained by most later writers, while some zoölogists have substituted for it the name of *umbrella*, or *disk*; while the word *feet* stands for the appendages around the mouth, to which the name *arms* was afterwards more generally applied.

² An interesting notice of the life and writings of Gessner, by Cuvier, may be found in the *Biographie universelle*, vol. 17, and in the *Histoire des sciences naturelles*, vol. 2, p. 83. I would gladly also refer to the notice by Blainville in his *Histoire des sciences de l'organisation*; but that chapter is so interwoven with jesuitical insinuations as to be utterly unpalatable to a sober thinker. The chapter on *Acalephæ* in the *Historia animalium* of Gessner is contained in Book 4, *De piscium et Aquatiliu animalium natura*, page 1239, published in Zürich in 1558.—Bélon's book, *de Aquatilibus*, Lib. II., was printed in Paris in 1553.