arenaceous type like Saccammina with ornamented exterior.

me that the object was a calcareous organism and that its affinities are with the objects that I have described from wales under my name of Calcisphera — Of course your specific names must stand as soon as I have the opportunity of making the correction, I will do so — When I described the object neither I nor Brady could learn that it had hitherto received any name

I am ever Yours

W. C. Williamson

Nicholson, if I understand him rightly, thinks there is no need of such a supposition, except to make the sponges accommodate themselves to a method of grouping adopted by Carter & Sollas; — that they are perfectly intelligible as Calcareous skeletons otherwise.

By the way when I was last in Munich I saw a lot of specimens of Receptaculites which rather shook my faith in the Foraminiferal character of that genus — I saw them I should have set them without hesitation as sponges! — Your American Selenovides I suppose to be truly Receptaculitic; I only know it by Owen's figure.

About Eozoon I had missed Hahn's paper but will get it —

I have not seen your review of Möbius — but Möbius has sent me his reply to it — Otherwise I have the Eozoon literature nearly complete

Yours very faithfully

H. B. Brady.

[illegible]
Brady
Nov 79

Hillfield Gateshead, Oct. 19/79.

My dear Dr Dawson,

Many thanks for yours of Sept 18th which reached me ten days or a fortnight ago.

About Stromatopora I am obliged to speak with much caution, so as to keep within my knowledge, which in respect to that genus is very limited. I have had no opportunity of examining any really good series of specimens & the mere polished slabs of our Devonshire rocks do not convey any very succinct story to my understanding. My idea is that they are pertozoa - perhaps a distinct group - ranking between sponges and rhizopods. But I should find it difficult to convince any one else from any consecutive argument at my disposal. If this were so I think

Parkeria & Loftusia would be the connecting links — Loftusia being of much the most essentially foraminiferal in structure. I am bound to admit some difficulty about Parkeria — But the Hydractinia theory I see neither rhyme nor reason in, from any arguments hitherto put forward.

— Saccammina Eriana:— I have never satisfied myself about the aperture of it & I am much inclined to regard it as belonging to Williamsons group of Vegetable microzoa — with Traquairia & the so-called Carboniferous Radiolaria. There is another organism called Rennulina Sorbyana of Blake that is quite similar ~~but~~ & occurring in large numbers, only generally kidney-shaped. — Of course it was made a Foraminifer because Blake didn't know what else to do with it — but without the very slightest evidence so far as I can see.

But even if a Foraminifer your fossil is Orbulina rather than Saccammina in its affinity — I cannot imagine an