

associating erroneously, however, the sea-urchins with the former. But again, in the second part of his work, which appeared one year later than the first, discussing the characteristics of the *Ostrakoderma*, or Conchifera, and comparing them to the *Entoma*, or Insects, he unites the bivalve and univalve shells into one great division. In this arrangement, Rondelet is already as far advanced as Lamarck, who separates the Cephalopoda as a distinct class from the Conchifera. With reference to the *Entoma*, or Insects, which he characterizes as animals having incisions above or below or on both sides and no bony parts, he unites the Worms and the Annelids with a small Crustacean, and associates also the Star-fishes and Holothuriæ with them, a combination which even Oken has thought natural.

Among the other naturalists of the sixteenth and those of the seventeenth century, there are a few more who deserve to be mentioned as contributors to the natural history of the Acalephs. Matthioli, for instance, while commenting upon the plants of Dioscorides,¹ introduces some remarks upon Acalephs and other Zoöphytes of which he gives wood-cuts. In part second of the same work, published in 1555, there is a figure of a Beroid Medusa, in a short paragraph "De Cucumere marino," p. 131; and another of the "Eschara," p. 133. Wotton, also,² speaking of Zoöphytes, mentions the sea-lungs and sea-nettles; and, somewhat later, Aldrovandi,³ in his gigantic Cyclopædia of Natural History, published in fourteen large volumes, folio, partly by himself and partly from his papers after his death, mentions also some of these animals, without, however, adding any thing that would throw new light upon their nature. The same may be said of the work of Jonston.⁴ It would lead me too far were I to attempt here to give ever so short an account of the rather indifferent notices relating to Acalephs that are scattered in the writings of the other naturalists of this period. It may suffice to quote their works, and refer the reader to the originals.⁵ One remark, however, applies to most of them, and characterizes the spirit

¹ MATTHIOLI (P. A.), *Commentarii in sex libros Dioscoridis de medica materia; adjectis magnis ac novis Plantarum ac Animalium iconibus, etc.*, Venetiis, 1554, fol. fig.—Compare also CÆSALPINUS (A.), *De plantis Libri XVI.* Florentiis, 1583, 4to.

² WOTTON (EDW.), *De differentiis Animalium, Libri X.* Parisiis, 1552, fol.

³ ALDROVANDI (UL.), *Historia Naturalis, Bononiæ, 1599–1640, 14 vols.* fol. fig.

⁴ JONSTON (J.), *Historiæ Naturalis de Exanguibus aquaticis Libri IV.* Francofurti ad Moenum, 1650, fol. fig.—Book IV. p. 72 is devoted to the Zoöphytes in general, among which he includes, with Rondelet, the Actiniæ and Medusæ, the Holothuriæ,

the Ascidiæ, and the Halcyonoid Polyps. His figures are copied from Bèlon, from Rondelet, from Aldrovandi, and from Matthioli.

⁵ SALVIANI (HIPPOCR.), *Aquatilium animalium Historia*, Romæ, 1554, fol. fig.—IMPERATO (FERR.), *Historia naturale, nella quale si tratta della diversa condizione de Mineræ, Pietre preziose e altre curiosità, con varie istorie di Plante e Animali*, Napoli, 1559, fol.—CLUSIUS (CAR.), *Exoticorum libri decem, quibus Animalium, Plantarum aromatum aliorumque peregrinorum fructuum historia describuntur*, Auvers, 1605, fol. fig.—COLONNA (FAB.), *Aquatilium et terrestrium aliquot animalium aliarumque naturalium rerum observationes*, Romæ,