

a peculiar genus of Acalepha, and both as distinct from all the other genera of Polyyps and Medusæ known at that time. The genus *Scyphistoma* is considered as intermediate between Hydra and Coryne; *Scyphistoma filicorne*, the only species described, is characterized as having twenty-four to thirty-two tentacles, the mouth as being retractile and protractile, and the body as annulate. This last indication shows, that the *Scyphistoma* first observed by Sars was on the point of passing to the *Strobila* condition. The genus *Strobila* is thus described: *Animalia nunc simplicia et libera, nunc plura invicem conjuncta, alterum scilicet super alterum positum, ita ut seriem forment, cujus extremitas infima pedunculo brevi est affixa, singulum animal disci formam referens, supra paullulum convexum, subtus concavum, margo disci in radios plures divisa. Os subtus maxime prominens tetragonum. One species, Strobila octoradiata: Margo disci in radios octo dichotomos divisa. When free, these discs are said to move like small Medusæ. The eight small ocelli between the lobes of the eight rays were correctly observed, and compared to those of the Medusa (*Aurelia*) aurita and Medusa (*Cyanea*) capillata. Thienemann, who furnished the abstract for the *Isis*, suggests that Sars should ascertain whether this is not the embryonic state of some Medusa. Sars himself considered *Strobila* as establishing a transition between the fixed Zoöphytes and the Medusæ, while Ehrenberg¹ mistook it for a *Lucernaria* in the process of transverse division.*

In his later work, published in 1835, Sars gives a more detailed account of the *Strobila*, and shows that the animal he had described as a distinct genus under the name of *Scyphistoma* is simply an earlier stage in the development of the *Strobila*, and that the free discs of the *Strobila* are themselves closely allied to the animals described by Eschscholtz as *Ephyra*, a genus referred by the latter to the *Acalephæ cryptocarpæ*. This is illustrated by figures, on his Pl. 3d. These observations establish beyond the possibility of a doubt the fact, that extraordinary changes take place in animals that were at first considered to be Polyyps, and the growth of which ends in the production of animals belonging unquestionably to the class of Medusæ. In a later note, Sars declares² that he has satisfied himself that the *Ephyra*-like Medusa arising from his *Strobila* is a younger state of the common Medusa (*Aurelia*) aurita, without, however, furnishing the evidence of this assertion, which is still questioned by Wiegmann.³

In 1841, Sars takes the whole matter up again, and in a masterly paper⁴ demon-

¹ EHRENBURG (C. G.). Die Akalephen des rothen Meeres und der Organismus der Medusen der Ostsee, Berlin, 1836, p. 52.

² Wiegmann's Archiv für Naturgeschichte, 1837, vol. 1, p. 406.

³ Wiegmann's Archiv für Naturgeschichte, 1837, vol. 2, p. 276.

⁴ Sars (M.). Ueber die Entwicklung der Medusa aurita und der Cyanea capillata, Wiegmann's Archiv für Naturgeschichte, 1841, vol. 1, p. 9-34.