

R Parker

Ithaca N.Y. Apr 28th 79

Principal Dawson:

Dear Sir: your card and article from the Canada Quart. Soc. G., N. York. Certainly the summary of plants in this paper of yours is very interesting. Though as is a common error of Hall and others a load of new names is introduced that no one not a specialist can remember, and not even they. Science is not benefited by a host of terrible Latin names (See the books on Ophthalmic diseases, in my own line, with its ten thousand meaningless new names). Your reference to *Loph. antrovesa* (what a name!) *oblongigensis* is an error so far as the specimen I wrote about is concerned. A reference to Fig 56 Pl. VIII of your article shows the heavy wavy lines of the sections, and the vertical lines,

which are seen in Fig 62 same plate.
But the subderms are not seen at all
in either plant. The perpendicular lines
& the arched lines are seen in Fig 11 (Pl. XII)
The barbarous name called *Dadoxylon*
Halli, or *Halls Fucoid*, of which
I can send you specimens three feet
long & five inches wide from the
Chernung group, — with branches
having all the markings shown in
your figures.

I notice on Pg 307 that *Fig. Vanuxemi*
is said to be found "Halls Nat
Geo. vol. 4. p. 184 fig 51. you prob-
ably mean p. 130 fig 51 as there
is no such figure in the page you
refer to.

Again you say Pg 308 that *Fig.*
Nan. is found at *Ceswago* in the
Chernung group. Now *Ceswago*
is a city just below the Medina
sandstone, on the *Onondaga* and
brary sandstones, of the *Bara-*
doe sandstones of Europe.

We have always regarded the so called
Sperodites Vanuxemi of Pag 314 as
a tentacula of the *Chernia* en route,
and not a plant. Your fig 5-7 Pl. XIII
is a very poor representation of it. It
is not feather shaped as you show it
but occurs in long tube like filaments.

I have seen it
broad and flat
attached to the
mite. It is usu-
ally wide and
also long. It
measures $7/8$ of an
and $6/8$ of an in
according to this it
feet long when it
shown is like you
the base, nearly
rounded at the top
long. Your figure is

midrib is like a plant, not as crinoids
usually are jointed. Yet my best speci-
men has a wavy midrib
somewhat thus.



certainly the authority for calling the *Ilhaea*
crinoid tentaculæ a plant needs to be stated
and defended, which is not even attempted
on Pg. 314 of your Report. I have given away
a hundred specimens of it, and those that
had the direct connection with the crinoid
head.

I see no allusions to plants like the follo-
wing in your report, as well as the same
with leaf continuous

stem. The question
to me is, Are these
leaf shaped objects
with four or five ribs
leaves, as they appear to
be, or marks of the
attachment of fronds.
They are too uniform
and too leaf like for
the latter.

A beautiful specimen
of branched *Sigillaria*
was found here some
6 or 8 ft long and 6
inches wide. I have pieces
of it, but it was badly
broken by the quarry men.
Fragments of plants are
to be had here in large
quantities, with now and then
a crinoid head like *tentaculæ*.
If you want slabs of this
I can send them to you.

But no we solve the
specimen I called your attention to in my last letter,
it is so very rare, indeed till I saw your Report
I was in confusion with me as it is greatly new.
With thanks to you for your kindness, and with
a desire to aid you by specimens as far as I can I am,
Yours,
Richard P. I. S. D. G. S.
Jan. 20,

Specimen I called your attention to in my last letter,
it is so very rare, indeed till I saw your Report
I was in confusion with me as it is greatly new.
With thanks to you for your kindness, and with
a desire to aid you by specimens as far as I can I am,
Yours,