

through Milne-Edwards, whilst the German naturalists, taking Eschscholtz as their guide, left many genera of Péron and LeSueur unnoticed, which, as we shall see presently, ought to have been retained, and described them anew. The nomenclature of Eschscholtz himself is not entirely unobjectionable, and it is a question whether he was justified in retaining, in 1829, the name *Medusa*, in which all *Discophoræ*, and even other *Acalephs*, had been mixed up, as a distinct genus for the common *Medusa aurita* of Europe, when, in 1809, Péron and LeSueur had already shown, that that species should be considered as the type of a distinct genus, to which they gave the name of *Aurelia*, which is exactly synonymous with Eschscholtz's *Medusa*. Though, as a question of principle, I am satisfied that generic names ought not to be discarded, when a better knowledge of the species referred to them shows the necessity of further divisions, I think that such groups as the genus *Medusa* of Linnæus, which includes a whole class of animals, can hardly claim a restoration after a quarter of a century; especially when that name is needed to designate the adult condition of *Acalephs* generally. I shall, therefore, give the preference to Péron and LeSueur's name for our *Aurelia*, and hereafter employ the word *Medusa*, as I have those of *Scyphostoma*, *Strobila*, and *Ephyra*, to designate one stage of growth of these animals. The genera distinguished by Péron and LeSueur as *Ocyrœ*, *Evagora*, and those mentioned under the names of *Claustra* and *Biblis*, by Lesson, being founded only on mutilations of true *Aureliæ*, can have no claim to recognition; and the fact that, owing to mistaken estimations of their affinities, some species of the same genus have been referred to the genera *Cyanea*, *Rhizostoma*, and *Orythia*, which belong really to other families, justifies us in setting aside, for the present, the consideration of the true affinities of the last genera. There remains, therefore, only one doubtful point respecting the nomenclature of *Aurelia*, namely, whether *Diplocraspedon* of Brandt differs generically from it or not; for *Monocraspedon* of Brandt is unquestionably identical with *Aurelia* of Péron and LeSueur. It is equally unquestionable, that *Macrostoma* of Lesson is synonymous with *Biblis*, the latter name having been substituted for the former, which was already preoccupied. *Ocyrœ*, of Péron and LeSueur, without being objectionable on that ground, has an homonym among the *Ctenophoræ*.