

glass. The heads soon curled over and showed a decided disposition to drop off. At a haul made soon after we got more, and being afraid to put so many of them in the tank together I tried to delude the animals into the idea that they were in their native temperature by putting them into ice-water. This worked well, although some of them became exasperated, and shed some of their arms. They lived in the ice-water two hours, until I transferred them to the tank. They moved their arms one at a time. Some of the lilies were white, some purple, some yellow; the latter was the colour of the smaller and more delicate ones." Mr. Alexander Agassiz<sup>1</sup> records that "our collection of Pentacrini is quite extensive; we found them at Montserrat, St. Vincent, Grenada, Guadeloupe, and Barbados, in several places, in such numbers that on one occasion we brought up no less than one hundred and twenty-four at a single haul of the bar and the tangles. We must, of course, have swept over actual forests of Pentacrini crowded together, much as we find the fossil Pentacrini on slabs. I have nothing to add to the general description of their movements given by Captain Sigsbee, with the exception of their use of the cirri placed along the stem. These they move more rapidly than the arms, and use them as hooks to catch hold of neighbouring objects, and, on account of their sharp extremities, they are well adapted to retain their hold. The stem itself passes slowly from a rigid vertical attitude to a curved or even drooping position."

Although the dredgings of the "Blake" have shown that *Pentacrinus decorus* is extremely abundant in the neighbourhood of several of the West Indian Islands, it does not appear to have been discovered till a century after *Pentacrinus asterius*. Its distinctness from that type was first recognised by Mr. Damon of Weymouth, who procured an example of it from the seas of the Outer Antilles. Its occurrence was recorded by the late Sir Wyville Thomson in a popular article on Sea Lilies, which appeared in the Intellectual Observer for August 1864, but he published no further description of it before his death. When he first noted its discovery he seems to have been unacquainted with the description of *Pentacrinus mülleri* by Oersted, published six years previously; for he spoke of *Pentacrinus asterius* and *Pentacrinus decorus* as the only two known living species of Stalked Crinoids. But in the following year<sup>2</sup> he referred to *Pentacrinus mülleri* as well, Lütken's Memoir having appeared in the interval; so that he evidently regarded *Pentacrinus decorus* and *Pentacrinus mülleri* as distinct species.

Later on, however, as I have described above, he came to the conclusion that his *Pentacrinus decorus* was identical with Oersted's type,<sup>3</sup> and he seems to have held this view till his death. For he wrote "*Pentacrinus mülleri*, Oersted," on a copy of Pl. XXXIV. This represents a specimen which he had obtained from Sir Rawson Rawson, and it is totally different from *Pentacrinus mülleri*, as is evident from a glance at Lütken's

<sup>1</sup> *Bull. Mus. Comp. Zool.*, vol. v., No. 14, p. 296.

<sup>2</sup> *Phil. Trans.*, vol. clv., 1865, p. 542.

<sup>3</sup> *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edin.*, vol. vii. p. 766; and *The Depths of the Sea*, p. 442.