

Medusæ proper with the Siphonophoræ and the Hydroids.¹ Nevertheless, the share of attention bestowed upon the Acalephs is steadily increasing, and many valuable contributions to their history appear during this period; nay, several investigators begin to study with special care these and other soft-bodied animals, as well as the lower animals generally. The extraordinary disclosures of Trembley respecting the fresh-water Hydra,² and the discovery of the animal nature of the Corals by Peyssonnel,³ had a great and lasting influence upon the progress of our knowledge of the lower animals; and even now their investigations are constantly alluded to as the starting points of a better era in the natural history of the Radiates. The paper of Réaumur upon Rhizostoma, and Plancus's delineation of the Marsupialis, were soon followed by Gronovius's⁴ illustrations of several Medusæ; Baster's⁵ descriptions and figures of many others; Bohadsch's⁶ remarks upon Beroë, with a figure; Chanvallon's

¹ The history of the successive editions of the *Systema Naturæ* is instructive, on account of the progress Linnæus himself has made in fixing forever the nomenclature of Natural History. The first edition consisted of a single folio sheet, and has been republished by Ant. L. A. Féc in 1830, in Paris; the last edition published by Linnæus himself is the twelfth, printed in Stockholm in 1767, in 8 vols. 8vo.

² TREMBLEY (ADR.), Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire d'un genre de Polypes d'eau douce, à bras en forme de cornes, Leyde, 1744, 4to. fig.

³ PEYSSONNEL (J. A. DE), Traité du Corail, etc., Phil. Tr. Roy. Soc. London, 1753, vol. 47, p. 445. The history of the views entertained at different periods respecting the nature of the Corals truly illustrates the progress of Natural History. At first considered as stones by Boccone (see note 4, p. 12) and Woodward (An Essay towards a Natural History of the Earth, London, 1695), they were regarded as plants by Marsigli (see note 2, p. 13), who was the first to observe, in 1706, what he called the *flowers of the Coral*. These supposed flowers, which are the individual polyps of the Coral stock, were at once considered as proving the vegetable character of the Coral, and even the greatest botanist of that time, Bernard de Jussieu, shared this view, until he had an opportunity of verifying for himself the accuracy of Peyssonnel's statements. Réaumur opposed Peyssonnel

so pertinaciously that the extensive work of this accurate and ingenious observer never was published (see Flourens in Ann. des Sc. Nat. 2d ser. vol. 9, p. 334), and only an abstract of it appeared in the Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Had the whole been printed at once, naturalists would have known a century sooner, that the animals of the Stony Corals are homologous to the Actiniae and Acalephs, for Peyssonnel does not hesitate to call them by the same name, *Orties*, *Urticæ*, though he also applies to them the name of Insects. The same volume of the Transactions of the Royal Society in which an abstract of Peyssonnel's work was published, also contains, p. 95, an interesting paper by DONATI, entitled "New Discoveries relating to the History of Coral."

⁴ GRONOVIVS (L. TH.). His chief work is the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum, exhibens Animalia, Quadrupeda, Amphibia, Pisces, Insecta, Vermes, Mollusca, Testacea et Zoöphyta quæ in Museo suo adservavit atque descripsit. Lugduni-Batavorum, 1763-1781, fol. fig.*; but for the Acalephs consult his *Observationes de Animalibus aliquot marinæ aquæ innatantibus, atque in littoribus Belgicis obviis, in Acta Helvetica, 1760, vol. 4.*

⁵ BASTER (JON). *Opuscula subseciva, observationes miscellaneas de Animalculis et Plantis quibusdam marinis eorumque ovariis et seminibus continentia. Harlem, 1759-1765, 2 vols. 4to. fig.*

⁶ BOHADSCH (J. B.), *De quibusdam Animalibus*