

Manchester O. Aug 17. 1879

My dear Sir:

Your kind favor of the 12th inst.,
reached me a day or two since. Yesterday, I
spent an hour with Mr. DeCamerex comparing
views in regard to the ^{upper} Traverly plants of which
I have written you. We agree in this that my
larger forms, some of which are 5 or 6 inches long
with leaves nearly an inch in length, and also the
intermediate forms, between the large & the fine
feathery form, are so distinct from your Philo-
phyton as defined & illustrated by you that a new
genus will be required for them. The feathery
forms will need careful study. Those in the same
concretion with the larger kinds are fragmentary.
Although the first impression on our minds is that these
They are generically united with the large, I shall
myself hold the question in abeyance ^{until there is time to study them}. I have found
about the same geological horizon, but from another County,
very beautiful specimens of a feathered form which
may upon examination be specifically different.
None of all the foregoing, large & small, of which I have
a very large number of specimens altogether,

show any tendency towards a circinate character
which marks your ^{figure of} P. Thompsonii. But I have
from the lower Waverly, two leaves, of a different^t
species, perhaps, with the circinate curves.
The leaflets are much longer than in your P. Thompsonii
& the structure of the stem is pretty well known,
indeed the plant has little in common with your
P. Thompsonii except the circinate feature, which
is not the most important. None of my forms have
much resemblance to yours by Cepodites pleuralis
perhaps
One is more like L. Vanuxemi. If, as now appear
probably, Mr. Koenig does not have the time to
study & discuss this material. I shall do it myself
as best I can. There is material enough in our
Waverly plants for a little monograph, & I think
you will, on examination of the drawings I hope to
obtain, agree with Mr K. that the plants are
of much interest.

It had not occurred to me that the Lepidodendron quad-
rilaterum, of which I sent a dim impression on poor
paper, was closely allied to Lepidophlojos. I have
a few distinct forms of the latter, but they are quite
unlike the L. quadrilaterum. I showed my specimens
to Mr. Koenig - who, like all the older & more ex-
perienced workers, does not like to admit a new spe-
-cies if it can be avoided. He agreed with me that it
~~was~~ new. I have recently obtained perfect & distinct

specimens of my Lepidodendron Rushvillense,
(Vol. II. Ohio Report) + this also he considers a
new valid species, the specimen from which
the figure in the Report was drawn was poor,
I have several forms of Lepidodendron, which
puzzle me as they do Mr. K - but I hope in
time to study them out.

I am glad you are working on the Lepidophloia
types, it has given me some trouble & I should
welcome a thorough discussion of the subject.

I have your Report on Lower Car. & Mill Street
Types of Canada - thank you very much for your generosity,
In other - pg. 20 of the Report, you speak of having
rec^d from "the lowest Carboniferous beds of Ohio
specimens of Lepidodendron corrugatum!" Do
you remember the locality? I do not remember
to have seen it.

Kindly send me a letter whenever you

may write yours

E. S. Andrews

J. M. Dawson L.L.D.,

Montreal, Canada -

Andrews

Aug 7/9