this condition. Thus, the points at any particular eliciting velocity in the ascending linear portions of these curves (below 60 rpm) are not significantly different.

DISCUSSION

This study was designed to test the differential predictions of three hypotheses concerning the relationship between eliciting motion and the magnitude of spiral aftereffect. The results of five of the six Ss tested are compatible with the Pythagorean hypothesis in a variety of tests. A single S, L.F., yielded data which failed to support this hypothesis. However, the data of this S did not clearly support any of the preconsidered field-effect hypotheses.

Data obtained by the method of constant stimuli agreed with analogous

data obtained by the method of velocity estimation for all Ss in this study. Thus, the velocities of movement of the test stimulus under the conditions of measurement by the method of constant stimuli were sufficiently small that they did not contribute to a detectable difference in SAE rate. This finding supports the algebraic additivity assumption previously examined by Scott et al (1963).

An interesting result which may deserve special mention is that shown in Fig. 2 (K.S.). Although the initial rates (zero delay points) in these curves differ by an amount which is consistent with the Pythagorean prediction, the slopes differ in a direction which tends to equalize the amount scores. This difference in slope could possibly represent an effect

induced by the normal motion at the test radius independent of the radial component.

REFERENCES

- MILLIGAN, W. L., & SCOTT, T. R. Spiral aftereffect: Rate, duration and amount. *Journal of Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 1969, 28, 935-938.
- SCOTT, T. R. Psychophysical measurement of the spiral aftereffect: The MMG. *Newsletter for Cooperative Research in Psychology*, 1960, 2, 24-31.
- SCOTT, T. R., JORDAN, A. E., & POWELL, D. A. Does visual aftereffect of motion add algebraically to objective motion of the test stimulus? *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 1963, 66, 500-505.
- SCOTT, T. R., & NOLAND, J. H. Some stimulus dimensions of rotating spirals. *Psychological Review*, 1965, 72, 344-357.
- SPITZ, H. H. Expansion aftereffects without perceived contraction of the inspection-figure. *American Journal of Psychology*, 1965, 78, 582-588.

(Received for publication February 17, 1971.)

ERRATA

WALKER, J. T. Visual capture in visual illusions. 1971, vol. 10, pp. 71-74.—The captions under Figs. 1 and 3 should be interchanged.

GILLAM, B. The depth processing theory of the Poggendorff illusion. 1971, vol. 10, pp. 211-216.—On Page 212, in Line 27 of Column 3, the word *perspective* should be altered to *projective*. The entire sentence should read: "The peculiarity of viewing line drawings is that projective processing and depth processing can both occur, the former being distorted in the direction of the latter."