

and I much regret that I should have been the cause of his not having the holotype at hand for comparison.

Whether his two species belong to *Ottawacrinus* at all is a question that might be raised. If they do, then my present interpretation of that genus will not hold. But more than any of the precise differences noted above do the Kirkfield specimens seem to present a difference in the relation of the arms to the cup, in that the limit between the two structures clearly falls at the top of the plates which Mr. Springer calls radials, but which in the present paper are termed inferradials.

This is the point that makes all these minutiae of description worth while. Have we in *Ottawacrinus* a form, or a series of forms, teaching us that in the earlier Inadunate Crinoids there was no fundamental morphological distinction between radials and brachials, and that the horizontal suture between super-radials and inferradials was of the same nature as the joint between the superradial and the proximal brachial? This conception, however revolutionary it may sound, would be consistent with that view as to the origin of Crinoid brachia to which I was led by a study of *Hybocystis* (1900 "Treatise on Zoology" III, pp. 95, 96); and in connexion with a species of that genus I hope before long to revert to it.