

in similar labours; but, proceeding on different principles, they arrived at very different results. The anatomy of the workers or polypes was, according to Lamouroux, so imperfectly ascertained, and from their situation as well as from their minuteness, so little within attainment, that it seemed hopeless to procure materials for a classification from that source, and he confined his attention solely to the polypidoms, on whose *composition* he founded his primary divisions. Lamarck, although he also confined his examination to the polypidoms, took higher ground: he maintained that as these were secreted by the polypes and formed on and by them, a sameness in the structure of the one necessarily implied a sameness in the structure of the other; that in fact we might as safely infer a sameness of structure or dissimilarity from the various configurations of the polype-cells and coral, as we could from an actual inspection of the animated tenants themselves. The experience of a few years has shown either that Lamarck's examination of the coral was hasty, or that his principle was erroneous, for his arrangement is far from being in harmony with a physiological one, and, although greatly superior to Lamouroux's, yet is not the less artificial; there being even in some of his genera, species whose polypes are widely at variance with each other. I do not mean to trace the systems of either of these authors through their various changes, from their first promulgation to their perfection;* an outline of them in their latest state is sufficient for our purpose.

System of LAMOUROUX.† (1821.)

Division I.

POLYPIDOMS FLEXIBLE, OR NOT ENTIRELY STONY.

Section I.

POLYPIERS CELLULIFERES.—Polypes in non-irritable cellules.

Ord. I. Celléporées.—Tubulipore. Cellépore.

Ord. II. Flustrées.—Berenice. Phéruse. Elzerine. Flustre.
Electre.

* Blainville has given a history of *all* the proposed classifications in chronological series in his *Manuel d'Actinologie*, which the reader may consult with advantage.

† The primary sections of this systematist may have been borrowed from J. E. Roques de Maumont.—See Blainv. *Man. d'Actinol.* p. 23.