

Hillfield,
Gateshead.

Nov^r 18th 1879.

Dear Dr. Dawson,

Again just a line,
thanks for your letter & enclosed
specimen - which I shall have pleasure
& instruction in examining very carefully.

I shall also go into the matter
of Saccamina eviana again as soon
as I get a little leisure. For the
moment my "Challenger" plates
seem to take every available hour
I can command. There is one little
circumstance that has some weight
in my mind - hardly amounting
to an argument - indeed not an

- but I strongly suspect this intended to have been
Phetic's - I have been sorry on a lot of stuff from
the same ticket next. 1857 enough finished
had come to the same conjecture from different evidence
- The visit to New York intended I am convinced
from the same & asking to visit is absolutely agree.
- More next will find that Mr. Stone the Church
has ~~the~~ has been summing the same thing after the
administration of this New York's.
- I shall await with interest your & Carpenter's fresh
business re. Egypt - Will send beyond
from South Hill & Chicago

Wm. H. P. Brady.

argument at all, - namely that I know of no instance of a Foraminifer of a single species existing by itself in any deposit recent or fossil. It is very common for one form to predominate but there are always other forms present.

- This seems to me easily explained. -

- Do we know as yet of any true Foraminifera in the Devonian beds?

- I mean setting this one aside, for the moment. I have always expected to find them & have searched large amounts of the likeliest material both British & American, without any result.

I should not like to say that we know of any true land shells Foraminifera from either Old Red or New Red strata. You will remind me of Parker & Jones's "Chellaston" paper; -

McGILL UNIVERSITY
ARCHIVES
ACC. NO. 2211/69
REF. 57

Brady
Nov 19