

author was acquainted only with the short preliminary notice of my researches published in the Jena Proceedings,¹ not with the Report itself; a fact easily understood when one considers how long before the date of publication a monograph constructed on such a plan must be completed. In his comprehensive revision of the Actiniæ, and re-definition of families and genera, he has been prevented from referring to my contemporaneous attempt at revision, since this first appeared in the detailed Report. As it is most desirable that two systems, appearing within a short time of one another, should be brought into such relation as to avoid future discordance and mistake, I accept with pleasure the opportunity of a critical utterance on their mutual relations.

As against the six chief divisions into which I divide the Actiniæ (Hexactiniæ, Paractiniæ, Monauleæ, Edwardsiæ, Cerianthæ, Zoanthæ), Andres erects seven, viz. Edwardsinæ, Actininæ, Stichodactylinæ, Thalassianthinæ, Zoanthinæ, Cerianthinæ, Minyadinæ. With regard to three chief groups we are in complete accord (Edwardsiæ, Cerianthæ, Zoanthæ), except for the fact that Andres, in my opinion, relies on too inconstant and unimportant external characters; while, as I have shown, these groups, at least, admit of anatomical characterisation by the arrangement of their mesenteries, and thus can be far more clearly and sharply circumscribed. If the reader compare in this connection the definitions of the Zoanthæ furnished by myself and by Andres, it will be readily admitted that none of the characteristics of the latter author, such as colony-formation or incrustation, are constant within the group; that, on the other hand, all the forms follow one and the same law of mesenterial arrangement, first recognised by G. von Koch.

If we carry the comparison further, we find that Andres places beside the Actininæ, as separate groups, the Thalassianthinæ, the Stichodactylinæ, and the Minyadinæ; though with a certain caution, as having himself studied no representative of them. I believe that he has here exceeded the systematic value which can be safely assigned to the form of the tentacles and their distribution on the mesenterial chambers. I have studied certain Stichodactylinæ (*Corallimorphus rigidus*, *Corallimorphus profundus*, and *Heterodactyla hemprichii*), and of the Thalassianthinæ, *Thalassianthus aster*, and can assert, as the result of a thorough examination of their structure, that in all important points they agree with the hexamerous Actiniæ; nor have I any doubt that these forms, even if united into separate families, must be ranged among the Hexactiniæ. Finally, the group of Minyadinæ has for many reasons, which I entirely recognise, undergone at the hands of Andres so sharp a criticism, that one can hardly see why he retains it, or why at least he does not allow it to rank merely as a subdivision of Hexactiniæ, until the necessity of its removal from that group is rendered apparent by anatomical investigation.

From the point of view explained, I am of opinion that all the forms referred to

¹ *Jenaische Zeitschr.*, Bd. xv. p. 10, 1881.