

Palaeozoic and Palaeozoic.

Permit an old worker in fossils to protest mildly against the slap-dash manner in which reviewers sometimes hit off great palaeontological questions. In your review of Roemer's valuable *Leithaea Palaeozoica*, it is stated that in regard to *Eozoon Canadense* he "accepts the verdict of Möbius against its organic origin and rejects it from the list of Palaeozoic fossils". Now as to the acceptance of the "verdict" in question I have nothing to say except that the Naturalist who has assumed the functions of Judge and jury very obviously lacks some of the qualifications necessary to those functions and has not been required by those best qualified to understand the case of *Eozoon*. But why Roemer should be called upon to reject *Eozoon* from the list of Palaeozoic fossils I fail to understand. As a writer on Palaeozoic Fossils he has nothing to do with *Eozoon*. It belongs to that great series of Eozoic or Archaean formations which precedes the Palaeozoic and which probably occupied an equally long time and may have been separated from the earliest

Palaeozoic by an unrecorded interval, little it is true is known of the fossils of these oldest rocks; but what we do know of <sup>its</sup> Eoroon, Archaeosphaerina, Scolithoid glunders, Spiral chonetes and Aspidella, and of its immense deposits of graphitized plants, is sufficient to assure us that the life of the Eozoic period was very different from that of the Palaeozoic. Eoroon, whatever its nature is one of the most characteristic of these Eozoic fossils. It has now been recognized through a great vertical thickness of beds, ~~it occurs~~ and over so wide areas that it is now equally characteristic of Eozoic rocks in Canada and Brazil, in ~~Other~~ Bavaria and Scandinavia. Further, it has obviously been connected with the accumulation of some of the greatest limestones of the Eozoic time. One can understand and excuse a palaeontological fancifulness with Mesozoic or Cretaceous fossils when he stops at such obscure markings as Oldhamia or at these scarcely intelligible markings & scratches on Welsh slates which are recognized as

Tubobates and Sponges, but we should think  
them important if the Pomponi proposed  
to regard them as Neuroic Fossils. For  
as in Canada also have long regarded  
the loose formations as quite as im-  
portant in a physical point of view  
with the Palaeozoic it is a matter  
of consequence that they are less  
attracted so much of the attention  
of the best geologists, and we hope through  
their palaeontology state is <sup>more</sup> than ever  
being tried to see the Cambrian  
fauna through a few with the  
its present satisfactory condition with  
not <sup>less</sup> ~~discovery~~ <sup>discovery</sup> of the Laurentian  
a horizon; but in the mean <sup>time</sup>  
we shall thank these geologists who  
I say them these great formations  
with of rocks in the clastic  
north to north themselves with the  
regard a receipt of some fossils, which  
they could be expected to appreciate

accounted  
as fossils

My  
to  
to



