

XII. Mr. Narraway's very kind second loan of the type has enabled me to make a number of stereograms of it, and since returning the specimen to him, I have found three among them that offer more important evidence concerning the nature of the aboral skeleton than I had before noted. In plate VIII, fig. 1, the present floor of the oral cavity shows a number of very small ossicles having diameters of between 0.10 and 0.15 mm. These are most clearly seen around the inner margin of the "torus," in interradius 1. To the right of the whiter of these ossicles there are a number of darker molds or thinly covered ossicles having similar diameters and an alternate arrangement. The half tone process will hardly allow these to be seen, but in plate IX, fig. 2, thin, angled plates with a diameter of 0.2 mm should be visible on the dark background of the upper part of the figure. A transverse row of three of these will be found just above the last adambulacral and marginal at the right. There is also one quite clearly revealed two centimeters (measured on the stereogram) above the right-hand marginal and on a line with its inner face. These plates are very regularly arranged and each has a small central projection about 0.03 mm in diameter. Twenty-five or more of these plates can be recognized in the photographs from which this figure is produced. There is a median row of slightly larger plates, and on each side of this at least five other rows arranged in regular alternation. A number of the same plates may also be seen near the end of ray IV. As *P. narrawayi* can hardly have had its oral skeleton sandwiched between two aboral skeletons, I think this case does not need further argument.

Dr. Raymond in his criticism has kindly sought to share a responsibility for my errors and to make Mr. Narraway assist him in this, by frequently using the pronouns "we" and "our" to represent an offending trio who persisted in their error even though (p. 105, line 24) "it must be confessed, all dissented from our view." This use of these pronouns is misleading. Dr. Raymond had a manuscript copy of my paper before its publication and duplicates of some of my photomicrographs. My experience with "paleontologists and students of recent echinoderms" was not as he unwittingly represents it. On p. 106, lines 28-32, he states: "The chief reason that Narraway, Hudson and myself had for thinking that *Protopalæaster narrawayi* was exposed from the actinal side was that the covering pieces did not look like ambulacral plates, * * * *". Here again I believe the statement would have gained in accuracy had the first two names been omitted. It must be evident at least that Dr. Raymond did not know my reasons. To Mr. Narraway is due the credit of recognizing the true character of the "covering pieces." Aside from agreeing with him in this,