

Huddle
Häffe
Arondale Road
Croydon

Nov^r 5. 1888.

Dear Sir J. W. Dawson,

I have
duly received your letter of
the 4th inst. and a copy of
your memoir on 'Specimens
of *Eozoon Canadense*' for
which please accept my best
thanks.

I am much obliged to you
for writing to Mr Whiteaves

respecting the slides of Archaeocyathus
trigonaensis. I have
not yet heard from him, as I pre-
sume that he has not yet return-
ed from his expedition to the
North West. However, if he does
not send them I hope to be able
to obtain a figure of the specular
structure of this form from the
specimens which he has already
sent me, and I have satisfactorily
proved from a thin section of the
interior that the specular struc-
ture is the same throughout.

Mr. C. D. Walcott has been in
London and I have spoken to

him about retaining the name
Archocyathus for septate forms
of the type of A. profundus instead
of applying it, as he has done, to
the A. Atlanticus, which is decidedly
non-septate, and cannot thus
be brought within Billings' own
diagnosis of the genus. At the
same time, there seems to me
a reason for retaining Muhl's
Ethmophyllum for forms in
which there are oblique canals
leading from the interseptal
loculi into the central tube or cup.
These are only shown in E. Whitneyi

and in Ferd. Roemer's A. Marianus
from Spain. The feature is very
novel and may well be of generic
or subgeneric value. I think
Walcott may agree to this proposal,
which certainly is only fair to
Billings, and most subsequent
writers have regarded Archaeops
thus as essentially a septate or
gamisid. Walcott has, it seems
to me, made a great muddle in
his work on the form, for he has
included two, if not three, species
in his Ethmophyl. Whitneyi, as
shown in his figures in plate
4. Bull. No. 20.

I am glad to hear of the

great variety of forms of
Sponges which the Mietis beds
have yielded. I shall be
pleased to see them whenever
you have opportunity to for-
ward them but there is
no hurry so far as I am
concerned for I have plenty
of work on hand.

Sollas' 'Challenges' work
on the Lithistid and Tetracti-
nellid sponges touches very
little on the fossil forms of
these groups. He has introduced

an almost entirely new nomenclature - quite unnecessary it seems to me - and he has carried the practice of giving Greek names to every varietal form of spicules to an absurdly pedantic extent.

Believe me

Yours very truly

George J. Hinde

P.S. The post has just brought me a note from Whiteaves announcing that he has sent me a box with the desired slides of Archaeocyathus.