

THE ANNALS  
AND  
MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY,

INCLUDING

ZOOLOGY, BOTANY, AND GEOLOGY.

(BEING A CONTINUATION OF THE 'ANNALS' COMBINED WITH LOUDON AND  
CHARLESWORTH'S 'MAGAZINE OF NATURAL HISTORY.')

CONDUCTED BY

P. J. SELBY, Esq., F.L.S., GEORGE JOHNSTON, M.D.,  
CHARLES C. BABINGTON, Esq., M.A., F.R.S., F.L.S., F.G.S.,  
J. H. BALFOUR, M.D., Prof. Bot. Edinburgh,

AND

RICHARD TAYLOR, F.L.S., F.G.S.



VOL. X.—SECOND SERIES.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY TAYLOR AND FRANCIS.

SOLD BY LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS; S. HIGHLEY AND SON;  
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO.; PIPER, BROTHERS, AND CO.; W. WOOD,  
TAVISTOCK STREET; BAILLIÈRE, REGENT STREET,  
AND PARIS: LIZARS, AND MACLACHLAN AND  
STEWART, EDINBURGH: CURRY, DUBLIN:  
AND ASHER, BERLIN.

1852.

## XXXII.—On the Priority of the Term Polyzoa for the Ascidian Polypes. By GEORGE BUSK, F.R.S. &amp;c.

To the Editors of the *Annals of Natural History*.

GENTLEMEN,

FROM the published Reports of the discussions, in the Zoological Section of the British Association at Belfast, it would appear that there is still some difference of opinion among naturalists as to the proper appellation of the Ascidioid Zoophytes. As, however, questions of this kind cannot be too soon definitively settled, and as, in a Catalogue of the Marine Species in the British Museum Collection, I have, not without consideration, adopted the term 'POLYZOA,' you will perhaps allow me to say a few words in justification of the use of that term instead of 'BRYOZOA.'

The question, at least as I understand it, appears to be of a very simple nature and to admit of a very easy solution.

Mr. J. V. Thompson's memoir, constituting the 5th Part or Number of his 'Zoological Researches,' in which the term '*Polyzoa*' is for the first time employed, and its explanation given, was published in December, probably on the 1st of December 1830—of this there can of course be no doubt.

Ehrenberg's paper on the Corals of the Red Sea, in which the term '*Bryozoa*' is first proposed, was read, or rather was in part read, before the Berlin Academy on the 3rd of March 1831. It was not, however, completed till December 1833, nor published till February 1834. The former date, however, only is of consequence here, because in June 1831, that Part of '*Symbolæ Physicæ*' containing the "*Animalia evertabrata*," may be said to have been published;—though it was probably not really published till long afterwards.

The evidence upon which these dates rest is short and satisfactory.

1. With respect to the Paper on the Red Sea Corals. This paper is given in the volume of Berlin Reports, professing to contain those papers which were read before the Academy in the year 1832, and which volume was published in 1834. It appears somewhat remarkable that Ehrenberg's paper is the only one in the whole volume which was not read in 1832. It has for its title, "*Beiträge zur physiologischen Kenntniss der Corallenthierie im Allgemeinen, und besonders des Rothen Meeres, nebst einem Versuche zur physiologischen Systematik derselben,*" and bears the prefix, "*(Gelesen in der Academie der Wissenschaften, am Marz 3, 1831—mit Zusätzen, gedruckt am 1 Dec. 1833).*" Allowing, therefore, the earliest date for the *quasi* publication of

this paper, it is at least three months later than that of Mr. J. V. Thompson. This, however, appears to me a mode of stating the point far too favourable to Ehrenberg. From the prefix above quoted, and still more from intrinsic evidence, it is clear that part at least, and probably a very great part of the paper as it now appears, was not written till 1833, as it was certainly not published in a complete state till after February 1834. From the paper itself it is impossible to say what part was read in 1831, and what added or altered afterwards; and I cannot avoid the remark, that it appears not a little discreditable to the publishing management of the Berlin Academy, that such a confusion of dates should be allowed to exist in memoirs published under their direction. The fact is, that with respect not only to this paper, but also to a second by Ehrenberg in the same volume of Reports\*, which was read on the 22nd of March 1832, but not "revidirt und gedruckt" till February 1834, as no means exist by which it can be determined what part was really read at the times specified, and what subsequently added or altered, the only just and safe way of applying them in questions of date would be to take that of their final and real publication, viz. 1834.

2. With respect to 'Symbolæ Physicæ,' no difficulty whatever exists in our assigning the date of 1831 to the Part with which we are here concerned, viz. that containing the "Animalia evertebrata, exclusis Insectis." For in the first place, that is the date given to it upon the cover in which it is stitched; and in the second place, Ehrenberg himself in the former paper above referred to, p. 254, gives the date of that Part of 'Symbolæ Physicæ' as June 1831. Moreover, though the further citation of evidence is supererogatory, in the commencement of the same paper read March 3, 1831, he styles it a precursor "Vörläufer," to the further details which he intended to give in 'Symbolæ Physicæ'; and again in the latter work itself, he adverts to the above paper as having been read before the Academy "some months previously," "abhinc aliquot menses."

With reference to the other portions of 'Symbolæ Physicæ,' (leaving out of the question that or those containing the Insects, by Klug) as they are not concerned in the present inquiry, I would merely remark, that in them, as in the papers read before the Berlin Academy, such a confusion of dates appears to exist, that notwithstanding the title-page and preface, both of which are dated 1828, it would seem from intrinsic evidence that a consi-

\* "Ueber die Natur und Bildung der Corallenbänke des Rothen Meeres," &c.

derable part, if not the greatest part, cannot have been published before 1833 or 1834.

Having thus endeavoured to show that the term 'POLYZOA' has a priority over 'BRYOZOA' of at least three, or more correctly perhaps of six months, I cannot conclude without an additional observation upon the former term, which after all does not appear to be used at present with strict propriety. It seems to have escaped notice that the word 'Polyzoa' is employed by Mr. J. V. Thompson in the *singular* number, with the plural 'Polyzoæ,' which latter term ought in strict right therefore to be employed as the appellation of the Ascidioid Polypes. As, however, the word has come to be generally employed, and, as far as regards rules of construction, much more correctly employed, in the plural sense, it may probably now be allowed to remain in peace and to claim universal adoption.

I am, your obedient servant,  
 GEORGE BUSK.

XXXIII.—*Note on a new species of Clionites.*  
 By N. T. WETHERELL, Esq., F.G.S., M.R.C.S. &c.

[With a Plate.]

DURING a recent visit to the Isle of Wight, I obtained among other interesting fossils a specimen of flint which had evidently formed a cast of a large species of *Inoceramus*, probably *Inoceramus Cuvieri*. The specimen is about 10 inches in length, the fibrous part of the shell having decayed away, with the exception of some small portions.

The cast itself exhibits a numerous but very irregularly disposed series of small siliceous oviform bodies with a granulated surface, and most of which were joined together by small threads of flint. These bodies were unquestionably the casts of some parasitic animal which perforated the test of the *Inoceramus*, and which may possibly be due to a species of *Clionites* (*C. Conybearei*), as they appear to resemble those generally referred to that genus, described and figured in the 'Annals,' vol. viii. pl. 4, for August 1851, but from which they differ in form, as will be seen by comparing the figures.

Mr. Morris informed me that he had previously seen some small specimens of the species in the collection of Dr. Mantell, but he rather doubted their specific value. The large specimen now discovered, of which only a fragment is figured, and the uniformity of the character would lead us to infer a specific difference, which I have much pleasure in dedicating to my friend Dr. Mantell, who long ago noticed these singular bodies. Mr.