

except that the fixing of its tentacles caused a swelling. If either of his species is entitled to be considered as a Medusa, it must be the smaller; the larger or fixed one appears in one respect to resemble the *Amphitrite magnifica* :* they are stated to use the rock to which they are fixed as a shell, whence it should seem that they retire occasionally into it, like the above animal. With regard to his second species, though some parts of his description agree with the common jelly-fish, yet their devouring Echini and Cockles seems to indicate some animal furnished with a more powerful apparatus for making their way to the animal inhabiting these shells. Pliny does not, in his description, merely copy Aristotle; for he speaks of his sea-nettle as producing the same effect as the vegetable nettle. Yet he mentions them and the sponges as being something intermediate between the animal and the plant, which can scarcely apply to our Jelly-fish. It seems, I think, probable, that the term in question was employed by the ancients to designate more than one group of animals, and more particularly the *Tunicaries* of Lamarck, both those that are fixed and those that are free. Aristotle's fixed species, which he describes as retreating into the rocks, as into a shell, will probably one day be found near the eastern coast of the Black Sea. It is worth while also to inquire whether any animal answering the description of Aristotle's second species is still eaten, in the winter, by the Greeks, customs of that kind seldom changing.

NOTE 23, p. 236.—*It seems to me most probable that they are the animals, and not the pholads, as is usually supposed, which the Roman naturalist describes under the name of Dactyle.* Pliny says of his *Dactyli*, that they are so called,

* *Tubularia magnifica*, Linn. Tr. v. 228. t. ix.