This article was downloaded by: [North Carolina State University]
On: 16 March 2015, At: 20:20
Publisher: Taylor & Francis
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number:
1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street,
London W1T 3JH, UK

Annals and Magazine of Natural History: Series 2

Publication details, including instructions for
authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tnah08>

XXI.—Rejoinder to Professor Milne-Edwards and Mr. Bowerbank

Professor Sedgwick ^a

^a Cambridge

Published online: 23 Dec 2009.

To cite this article: Professor Sedgwick (1854) XXI.—Rejoinder to Professor
Milne-Edwards and Mr. Bowerbank , Annals and Magazine of Natural History:
Series 2, 14:81, 195-197, DOI: [10.1080/037454809496550](https://doi.org/10.1080/037454809496550)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/037454809496550>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

XXI.- *Rejoinder to Professor Milne-Edwards and Mr. Bowerbank.* By PROFESSOR SEDGWICK.

To the Editors of the Annals of Natural History.

GENTLEMEN,

ON my return to the University, after an absence of almost three months, I found that Professor Milne-Edwards and Mr. Bowerbank had replied to my comment on "two statements published by the Palæontographical Society in their volume for 1852*." I now request you to publish my final, and short, rejoinder, both to Professor Milne-Edwards and to my friend Mr. Bowerbank.

I have the honour to be,
Gentlemen,
Your faithful Servant,

A. SEDGWICK.

Cambridge, August 21, 1854.

Rejoinder, &c.

So far as regards Professor Milne-Edwards, I have only to request any Member of the Palæontographical Society carefully to read over Professor M'Coy's letter to myself, and then to put it side by side with Professor Milne-Edwards's reply. That *reply* does not so much as *touch* the facts and statements of Professor M'Coy's clenching letter. The reader must, therefore, conclude, that Professor Edwards can neither prove, nor make probable, the charges he has insinuated against Professor M'Coy, and consequently that the insinuations recoil upon their author. Under this entire conviction, I venture to call upon the Council of the Palæontographical Society, as a matter of common literary justice, to disclaim the charges insinuated against Professor M'Coy in the 151st page of their volume for 1852.

My rejoinder to my friend Mr. Bowerbank need not be very long. On one point (and one point only) he has the advantage over me. He alludes to a "short" conversation he held with me, during a public meeting at Ipswich (in 1850), when he made a request for a loan of certain Cambridge corals. Of that request I have no remembrance; and, considering the occasion

* My comment (containing a letter from Prof. M'Coy) was published in the 'Annals' for April 1854. The Replies of Professor Edwards and Mr. Bowerbank were published in the 'Annals' for May and June 1854.

when it was made, I may surely be excused for a little lack of memory.

All the statements of my former communication (of April last) stand good and are unshaken. MM. Edwards and Haime visited Cambridge (about the end of the year 1849) and made arrangements with Professor M'Coy for procuring figures of certain Oolitic corals, with a view to their publication in the essay on "British Oolitic Corals," which appeared in 1851. These arrangements were given up, without any further communication from them on the subject, either to Professor M'Coy or myself. Some time afterwards (early in 1850) an application was made by Mr. Bowerbank (in behalf of the Palæontographical Society) for a loan of certain Oolitic corals in the Cambridge Museum, in order that they might be figured at Paris. This request could not be complied with, for reasons given in my "Reply," &c., which was published in the 'Annals' of April last. I can state most positively that Mr. Bowerbank's application (made by letter) did not include so much as one Palæozoic species: but along with it was a formal list (at this moment preserved among the papers of the Woodwardian Museum) of the specimens wanted—all of which were Oolitic.

When, therefore, my friend Mr. Bowerbank laughs at my lack of memory while I was in the pains of a parturient speech; I can, with like good humour, retort upon him with interest, and convict him also of an occasional fit of obliviousness. For in a letter I have before me, he asserts that, on behalf of the Palæontographical Society, "he never wrote to me but once, and that once was regarding the Palæozoic fossils." Now, if he ever wrote about the Palæozoic fossils he must (at the least) have written *twice*; for he *once* assuredly wrote, very specifically and formally, about the Oolitic fossils and about them only.

In his Reply he gives a list of those to whom he *did write* on the subject of Palæozoic fossils, to be published by the Palæontographical Society in 1852. And he appears to have no doubt that he also wrote to me on the same subject. I affirm, on the contrary, that I *never received* from him any letter on this subject. And (if I mistake not), I can, out of his own letters, give him a convincing reason why he did *not* write to me. For he tells me (in a letter I have before me), that my verbal reply at Ipswich (in 1850) was considered by him "as equivalent to a refusal;" and that the subject could not be introduced to me *afterwards* "without the appearance of importunity." Having in 1850 been refused the loan of the Oolitic corals, he quite naturally abstained, on the year following, from making any application to me for the Cambridge Palæozoic corals.

I should be indeed foolish were I to boast of a memory which

has often failed me, or done me but a slippery service. But in what I have stated above, I do not lean upon my memory. On the contrary, I rest only upon documents which admit of no contradiction.

Not to dwell any longer upon blunders and slips of memory, I again affirm, as I did in my communication of April last, that had MM. Edwards and Haime, in their great essay on British Oolitic Corals (published in 1851), charged the University of Cambridge with unwonted illiberality, because the Oolitic corals of our Museum had not been sent to Paris, their charge would, *in letter*, have been true; although (after what took place during their visit to Cambridge) it would, I think, *in spirit* have been both uncourteous and unjust. But they let that occasion slip; and when their charge at length appeared (in 1852), in their essay on the British Palæozoic Corals, it came in such a form as not merely to be wanting in courtesy, but to be incompatible with common historical truth: for, most assuredly, no application had been made to Cambridge for a loan of a single Palæozoic coral.

XXII.—*Notice of a new species of Caulerpa*.

By R. K. GREVILLE, LL.D. &c.*

[With a Plate.]

THE Alga which forms the subject of the present notice was communicated to me for determination along with several others, by my friend Professor Balfour; and was collected in Bass's Straits, Australia, by Mr. James E. Cox.

Singularly variable in external conformation as are the species of this fine and most natural genus, presenting no fewer than six or seven well-defined groups, it will be at once perceived that the present one differs entirely from them all. In general habit it stands alone; and upon a closer view may be said to unite those which possess a dendroid character with others which have a more simple, plane, and pinnate or pinnatifid frond.

The prostrate stem is robust, branched, 12 inches or more, probably, in length, rough with linear simple or forked processes (abortive ramuli), and altogether strongly resembling the creeping stem of a *Lycopodium*. The fronds are erect, arising singly, or often two together, 4 to 7 inches high, of an ovate-oblong outline, and bushy like some species of *Bryopsis*. The numerous ramuli are given off on all sides, an inch or more

* Read before the Botanical Society of Edinburgh, July 13, 1854.