



Brady

Hillfield.

Gateshead.

Sept 5th 1879

My dear Mr Dawson

Many thanks for the paper on the Stromatoporidae, which I found amongst the pile of literature collected during a somewhat long absence from home, on my return a few days ago.

About Eozoon, if people could only be persuaded not to find characteristic specimens there would be little difficulty in convincing them of its organic origin. Had I been dependent on my own specimens I should have been as bad as the rest, for I have been singularly unfortunate in my sections. - I have been unlucky in the pieces selected for examination I suppose. I do not think it is want of skill in printing hard sections, for I am generally pretty successful. But I have never met with anything causing conviction with it, as some of your specimens I recollect, & Dr Carpenter's seem to.

About Stromatopora I have no belief in the wholesale assumptions of the

the "Hydractinia"-men. At first blank,
after Carter's first paper, I thought there
might be something in the idea & I went
to Basle & Saltz to see the specimens he
had founded his theory upon, but I am
bound to say whatever doubts he had raised
in my mind were quickly dispelled on seeing
his specimens & realizing how small a
groundwork he had for his superstructure.

Steinmann seems simply to have swallowed
Carter's paper whole, without question & relayed
upon it - after reading him one asked
"Does this man really know anything about
Foraminifera?"

Have you specimens of Parkeria and of
Loftusia persica? I still have some of the
former, and perhaps fragments of the latter
which are at your service if you desire
them.

This is another theory of Carter, Sallas,
& Zittel's, such as a Chemist I cannot
digest. I mean the assumed substitution
of Carbonate of Lime for Silica in
sponges & supposed to have been originally Silicious,
and other organisms.

I should never have meddled in this matter
- as not concerning my immediate work but
that it came before me in connection with
some minute geometrically constructed organisms
occurring in the Carboniferous Limestones of North
Wales. There were supposed by the men on the
spot to be embedded Radiolaria & they
were announced as such, & then a lot
of them were sent to me to describe. I
examined them & then quite apart from their
being Calcareous, replied that I doubted, indeed
more than doubt, their Radiolarian affinity;
that they certainly could not, were were they
silicified, be assigned to any known family
of Radiolaria, - that I suspected they were of
vegetable origin. Since then Williams
has I think quite satisfactorily settled this
matter - yet I've found ~~in~~ these men holding
their view of the fact that Radiolaria are
found in these limestones with the silicified
skeletons replaced by Carbonate of Lime.

Coates can not pretend to any chemical
knowledge - he says of his sponges three things
are so & you may use for it - as you like -
but Dallas seems to have just a smattering
& actually frames a theory & gives a
diagram of decomposition which is

supposed to explain it - all of the formation
of an intermediate Carbonate of silica -
The thing completely took my breath away
- to my mind a Carbonate of silica would
be just about as unlikely a compound as
Carbonate of carbon & I rushed off with
it to my friend Prof. Marceco who
made grey men with the whole thing as
something very near an absurdity.
Subsequently in correspondence with Williams
I asked him to show Dallas's paper to
Roscoe & Schorlemmer & ask their opinion
what he did & received a very emphatic
reply - "unless you have evidence amounting
to proof that this change does take place we
should regard it as impossible almost to the
extent of impossible". So there I left
the matter - The sponge men must settle
it amongst themselves, I am not surprised
the Gittel should have adopted this view,
without question, apparently.

Dilem' Ore

My dear Dr. Dawson

Ever faithfully yours

Henry R. Brady

I will strike us this
in Chap. 1 of my second
preliminary
paper