

Brady
Succanumina

Hillfield,

Gateshead. Feb. 26 1881.

My dear Dr. Dawson,

Your post-card just to hand. I can reply to your question quite emphatically - that to my knowledge there is "no modern example of a test with one aperture, made up of minute calcareous grains showing more or less of tubercles or ridges". Not only so but I know of no example modern or fossil of a composite rhizopod test (i.e. one built up of grains), with external surface ornamentation of any sort. - In this second statement I exclude Textularia of course, in which genus all sorts of conditions occur; but Helicini it holds equally good there in the truly composite forms. I ~~do~~ include

Zittel is called Saccammina
Schwageri - the specimens of which I
saw last time I was at Munich
- and which I do not accept as Saccammina
at all (if it be even a Rhizopod) nor
between ourselves do I accept his figure
as anything but a highly idealized representation
of his specimen. He did not appear to me
to have material to found anything but
guesses upon -

Foraminifera built of calcareous grains
are not common. Whenever silica is
present there seems to be selective preference
for that, either as angular sand grains
or sponge spicula, as building material.
But of course external circumstances
govern this to a certain extent.

For instance I have Psammophora
fusca, F. E. Scholze, from coral reefs & sponges
built entirely of ^{calcareous} shell fragments & sponges;

but this has scarcely any character
in common with your organism.

The more I examine your little fossil,
(I should have had it sent to me by two or
three different American correspondents)
the more confident I am that it bears no
relation to any Rhizopod-type that
I know. There is a somewhat similar
but nothing called like Renulina
from the Oolite, that I am quite clear
is of vegetable origin.

I do not find the aperture by any means
easily demonstrated in a large proportion
of the specimens - is this your experience?

I sent some bits to Williamson when
we were both interested ourselves about
the so called Carboniferous Radiolaria.

It is rather odd that unknown to each
other we had arrived at precisely the
same conclusion about these

latter organisms. I was even content
to assume that they were, as represented,
Radiolaria - in the first place; - I
began to draw them to compare their
general forms with known types,
recent & fossil; - but found they bore
no resemblance to anything previously
known, in that group. Then I went
to work at the Chemistry of the thing
I was very soon satisfied that they were
nothing akin to Radiolaria, at any rate.

Kind regards

Ever yours faithfully

Henry B. Brady