

finds, however, that "they are not far from their original position" (p. 107, lines 18-19). That they were thrust to their present position after the burial of the specimen is made manifest, not only by the plates in the immediate vicinity, but plates now lost must have communicated this thrust to interradius 1, and there not only turned the secondary jaws, but displaced one of the mouth plates and the oral. Dr. Raymond's assertion that "if these were plates foreign to this specimen, they would not maintain their natural position in relation to each other, but would be separated," is evidently meant to indicate that the overriding movement was not of great magnitude. He must have frequently found forms buried serially over each other, without necessarily finding all the plates of the upper specimens "separated." An examination of our plate VIII, fig. 1, with a stereoscope leads me to doubt if (y) belongs to (x) any more than (z) does. I find plate (y) depressed; the meeting faces neither parallel nor of the same form; and if the plate really belonged to (x) shifted a little toward radius 1, though I should have expected the thrust to have made it slip in an opposite direction. The movement instead of *separating* these plates has thrust them together. Dr. Raymond asserts that (y) cannot be an adambulacral of another specimen (p. 107, lines 12-14) because it "is larger and of different shape." It has two diameters perpendicular to its sides of about 0.8 mm each, which is a little less than the transverse diameter of the adambulacral just back of the undisturbed mouth plate in radius II. Turn this adambulacral on its side and you will have a plate displaying an area greater than that now shown by (y). Plate (x) "is pointed at the wider end" (p. 107, line 6), but I cannot be positive that the faces on each side of the angle are either true sutural faces or that this is the original orad end of the plate. The smaller face seems to possess the granular ornamentation of the aboral end of a marginal and the lines of blackened organic fragments buried in the plate run parallel to the long face while in the stereograms (photographs) these lines are distinctly sub-parallel with the sides next the first arm marginals. If plate (y) belonged to the aboral skeleton it is sheltered enough to have retained some ornamentation, but it is as smooth as a sutural face of an adambulacral. As all other plates have been completely weathered away we must credit the remaining big plate with a serious loss of its original surface. I would not like to assert of this plate, which shows rotation on both its long and short axes in addition to great loss of surface, that it has the "same form" (p. 107, line 19-21) as an interradiial supero-marginal of *Palæaster matutina*, Hall.