

Abondale Road, Croydon

Feb. 20. 1888

Dear Sir J. W. Dawson,

Your letter of the 2<sup>nd</sup> inst.

and the notes accompanying it have duly reached me and the box of specimens has been delivered at the South Kensington Museum. I have not done more at present than unpack the box; in one case a thin slab of shale has broken in two, but without damaging the specimen on it; the other specimens are intact and in excellent condition. Until I have studied them carefully I cannot write about them in detail, but it seems to me that it may be a difficult point to decide whether Cyathophycus or Cyathospongia can stand separately from Protospongia. I am very glad

Stickle

therefore that you have included a genuine specimen of  
"water" genus which will be of material help in judging  
the question — The specimens are, in some respects,  
marvellously preserved, and in no other fossil in-  
stance have I seen the connection of the anchoring  
spicules with the body of <sup>the</sup> sponge as shown in some of  
these specimens.

If this should reach you before your preliminary  
notes are published, I would suggest an alteration in  
the term "tetractinellid" which you have applied to the  
cruciform spicules in these sponges, since though cor-  
rect in the sense that the spicules consist of four rays,  
it will be misunderstood, as the term has been already  
applied by Marshall, Zittel and others for four-rayed  
spicules of a fundamentally different type to these  
cruciform spicules. F. E. Schulz in the *Challenges*  
*Work on Hexactinellid*, vol. xxi, p. 35, has employed the  
term "tetracts" for spicules like those in question but  
this abbreviation is a very objectionable one, and I  
should rather prefer "cruciform" instead.

I will examine carefully the residue of the  
Mingan material which you have sent. I am  
glad to have your opinion that the spicules were  
quite independent of the Archocorythos in

which they occurred. This intermingling of detached  
fossil spicules in other organisms present in the  
same beds with them has been a source of error  
in several instances. I think that Walcott  
has been decidedly wrong in placing A. Minganensis  
as the type of another genus for it is quite evident  
that Bellings regarded it as the type of Archaeocythus  
and others have acted on the same view.

In the course of a fortnight or thereabouts, I shall  
hope to be able to write you fully on the sponges.

Believe me

Yours very truly

Georg J. Hinde