

could blind him to the fallacy of the consequent reasoning. The analogy attempted to be drawn between the eggs of zoophytes and the seeds of plants has no existence, for every tyro knows well that the coat or skin of a seed in no instance ever pushes forth radical fibres, or ever exhibits any sign of vegetation;—it is a dead part which is cast off or corrupts, and exerts no further influence on vegetation than as a protection to the cotyledons and embryo which it invests, so that if it is true that the coat of the ova of zoophytes is the source of their vegetative part, as Baster says, that coat must be of a very different nature from the skin of seeds. It would have been better to have compared the oviform bodies of the zoophyte with the buds of the tree, and he might have disported with this fancy to some effect, for there are many analogical resemblances, and the inapplicability of the illustration is not so very plain. Still it is inapplicable, for buds grow from the absorption of water and inorganic matter which is diffused and assimilated by means of a certain determinate organization, while the covering of zoophytes receives no increase except through the medium of its polypes;—it has no sap-vessels, no spiral tubes, no cellular parenchyma, no absorbent roots, no pores and spiracles on the surface, so that all its material must be derived from an internal source; and to say that a body vegetates when the nutriment is received and assimilated in a different manner, and by a different structure from what it is in plants, and is productive in its assimilation of opposite principles, is to use terms in so vague a sense as would be intolerable in any science.

Neither the authority of Linnæus, nor the imperfect experiments of Baster, had any effect on Ellis, who steadily opposed this vegeto-animal doctrine, and whose superior knowledge made it easy for him to detect and point out the erroneousness of the observations on which it principally rested. In reference to the opinion itself he wrote to Linnæus,—“artful people may puzzle the vulgar, and tell us that the more hairy a man is, and the longer his nails grow, he is more of a vegetable than a man who shaves his hair or cuts his nails;\* that frogs bud like trees,

\* Bohadsch in answer to those who believed that the *Pennatulæ* were plants uses the same argument.—*De Anim. Mar.* p. 123. This author, who wrote in 1761, was a strenuous advocate for the unmixed animality of zoophytes.