



Matthews
Messrs

Dear Sir

I have at hand your lecture notes and hasten to reply "2. Upper Huronian or Lowest Cambrian". Where there is doubt this section may be useful. But the "Upper Huronian" of S. N. Bonusta is a system of two series each about 10,000 feet thick and quite separate from the Cambrian. We can now be definite about the Cambrian and should not allow the word to be used for formations below the Basal or Orrellus Series - You will in a day or two have my abstract (which will detail of paper for the Royal Society)

the latest information of about
this horizon -

"Fig 47." *Aspidella* is to my mind
very doubtfully a fossil.

"Lower Cambrian" The genera were
all right as you had them
first. Beside those you have
added you might add for
the Basal series - Paleochorda
Platysolenites, and several
genera of Hapactinellid sponges

"Middle Cambrian" I must
deprecate the reference of the
Paradoxides beds to Middle
Cambrian. They have always
been called Lower Cambrian
in England and it would only
lead to confusion of terms
now to style them "Middle".

The English groups are
Gaeafai } Lower
Solva }
Menevian }

The name is given in allusion
to the simplicity of the skeleton -
single parallel threads with a
few curving cross threads
differs from Euplectella
and Protospongia in that it
is not well worn. I have
two other genera of sponges
from lower horizons in this
series.

Dr Bailey will take
a few fossils and drawings
with him and will have
my abstract, of which an
~~unpublished~~
copy is already in the hands of
Dr Bourinot. In this I limit
the term Etcheminian to the lower
half of the Basal series.

Yours truly
W. M. Mathews