

richer and better material, might well have led to the complete rehandling of my description and speculations.

It has, however, seemed advisable to print the papers precisely as the manuscript left my hands. There will always be some value in the exact description of a type-specimen. Moreover the divergencies between our two accounts seem to require some explanation other than the better preservation of Mr. Springer's material. The chief of them are the following.

The arm-branching is described by Mr. Springer as heterotomous. This is clearly the case in his fig. 5, but it is not quite so obvious in his fig. 6. Fragments from the latter specimen might have appeared as regularly dichotomous as the fragments before me. Therefore I am prepared to admit that there may have been slight heterotomy in the holotype. In *O. billingsi* the heterotomy is strongly marked, and, as Mr. Springer says, quite peculiar.

"The ventral sac," writes Mr. Springer, "is composed throughout of irregularly hexagonal pieces without any longitudinal arrangement." This statement agrees with his fig. 6 but does not appear to be consistent with his fig. 7, which in this respect is closer to the holotype. It is indeed quite inconceivable that the holotype can have had a ventral sac like that shown in Mr. Springer's fig. 6. The fragment shown in my fig. 5 may be open to some slight doubt, but its structure is consistent with that of the main specimen (Plate I, fig. 1) and is quite different from that described by Mr. Springer.

Finally, Mr. Springer lays stress on the presence of "distinct plates in the axils between the rays. This is not entirely constant in *O. typus*, but is observable in the majority of the specimens." Such a plate is shown in his fig. 5. In the holotype, at any rate, there are no such plates, and the arms are so closely fitted in the proximal region that one finds it difficult to imagine the appearance of any interbranchials, except, of course, in the anal interradius.

So much for the differences of description. But examination of Mr. Springer's admirable figures brings to light other differences. Thus the proximal region of the stem has not the curious wavy structure indicated in my figures 1 and 2. Similarly the infrabasals have a pentagonal and not a hexagonal outline. The cup seems to widen upwards more rapidly than in the holotype, and to have more swollen plates. The axillaries are drawn as though relatively larger and more nodose than in the holotype. The stem of *O. typus* is not described by Mr. Springer, but that of *O. billingsi*, which he seems to regard as similar, differs in many respects from that of *O. typus* holotype.

All these differences lead to the conclusion that the specimens referred by Mr. Springer to *O. typus* really belong to a new species,