

This may be compared with the diagram given in the "Treatise on Zoology," vol. III (1900) on p. 178. I regret to find that, on the page in question, the diagram of *Merocrinus* has been interchanged with that of *Dendrocrinus*.

It must, however, be admitted that there are difficulties in this new interpretation. One species at least of *Merocrinus* (*M. salopie* Bather¹) shows considerable differences between the first and second plates of the radial series, leading one to regard them as radials and brachials rather than as inferradials and superradials. Perhaps there is not so fundamental a distinction between radials and brachials as P. H. Carpenter believed.

The originals of the specimens described in my paper on *Merocrinus salopie* (loc. cit.) have now come into the British Museum, with the rest of the G. H. Morton collection. The holotype of *Merocrinus salopie* is registered E14938; and the undetermined crinoid represented in fig. B of that paper is registered E14939.

In the same paper, at the foot of p. 73, *Merocrinus curtus* (Ulrich) was said to have simple armlets. That was the natural interpretation of the phrase used in Ulrich's description (1879); but the species probably has regularly dichotomous simple arms like all others of the genus.

NOTE ADDED JULY 24, 1912.—These two papers were written in the spring of 1910, and the manuscript sent to Ottawa on July 15 of that year. On June 6, 1911, I received from Mr. Frank Springer a copy of his memoir "On a Trenton Echinoderm Fauna at Kirkfield, Ontario," issued by the Geological Survey, Canada, as "Memoir No. 15-P," and bearing the date 1911. Mr. Springer's "Letter of Transmittal" was dated June 28, 1910. That memoir contains an account, with beautiful drawings, of three specimens referred to *Ottawacrinus typus* and three referred to a new species, *O. billingsi*.

Had I been aware of Mr. Springer's work, it is probable that the present papers would never have been written. Even after they were written and the drawings prepared, I should have sought to withdraw them from publication had I anticipated this delay of more than two years. Further, the differences between my account and that of Mr. Springer, based on far

¹Feb. 1896, Geol. Mag., dec. 4, vol. 3, p. 71.