

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.

since the preceding paper on *Cryptonella*, *Centronella*, etc., was published, I have received from Dr. ROMINGER, a figure illustrating the interior of a specimen referred by him to *Centronella glans-fagea*. This figure of the loop is quite different from that given by Mr. BILLINGS for *Centronella glans-fagea*, and shows essentially the same character as that of *Cryptonella*. Should this reference prove to be correct, it may become questionable whether the minor differences already pointed out in the *C. glans-fagea*, and authentic specimens of *Cryptonella*, are of sufficient importance to separate the two genera. It should be observed, however, that at a later date (May, 1861),* Mr. BILLINGS has published *Centronella hecate*, giving, in fig. 99 a, "a specimen with the dorsal valve removed, showing the loop which is covered with minute crystals of silex." In this species, having all the external characters of a congener of *C. glans-fagea*, no mention is made of any difference observed in the character of the loop from that published and illustrated in 1859. We are therefore scarcely warranted in placing in the Genus *Centronella* species having an internal organization so different as that observed in species of authentic *Cryptonella*, until a reëxamination of the original specimens of Mr. BILLINGS shall confirm his first observations, or show them to correspond with those of the genus last named.

Albany, February 25, 1863.

Fig. 38.



CENTRONELLA GLANS-FAGEA. 2211 20/10

Interior showing the loop, from a figure by Dr. C. Rominger.

Letter
Wall
March/65

McGILL UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES
ACC. NO. 2211/20
REF. 10

Albany March 14th 1883

My dear Sir,

I have hesitated
whether or not to send out
the little pamphlet as
it is - But our Institute
are not rich enough to
reprint & at this time
with all the losses I have
had I cannot afford to
do it - so finally I
have added a note -
or rather I should say
the note was inserted
when I wrote you &
I have had it put on
the blank page - This
is all you do now -
The paper will appear with
some slight modifications

in the Geol. Report -

I am compelled to go at once to Mississin, with a slight hope of securing the publication of a second volume of the Geol. Report to contain the Paleontology -

I do not think Mr. B. can have any just reason to find fault with my paper, but that he will do so I have no doubt -

I agree to go with you that Chemung is not carboniferous unless Hamilton be carboniferous & the upper Helderberg limestone carboniferous -

In the east the great physical line is marked by the confluence of the top of the Catskill

In the west this horizon
is not so clearly discernable
and many papers into
carboniferous by insensible
gradations -

I am much interested
in Michell's proposed
subdivisions and hope
to see the localities -
I know the rocks at
Kettle Pt. which are
clearly lower Portage
with Guelph slate
I send this with pencil sketch.
I am very sincerely
Yours
James Hall

J. W. Dawson Esq