

Recd ~~MS 97~~  
Wheatbome. Slave power.  
14th April 1899.

Dear Sir

Your kind favour of the 14th inst.  
has duly to hand. I should have replied  
by return but have been unable to  
do so. Your letter of last autumn  
did not reach me, it must have  
gone astray.

An Arctostaphylos prostrata  
is interesting. Perhaps some of  
my specimens sent in to the meeting  
of the Bot. Soc. when my letter  
Parks. paper was given called  
his attention to these bodies. One  
which I suppose we seem to conform  
very closely to your description -

which Prof. Peal soon some years  
ago found it to contain Streptococcus  
(presumably of plant.). It is  
at present in Glasgow but when

returned I shall be pleased to  
pursue it. It is wholly carbonaceous  
and different from some others  
(casts), which I have usually  
regarded as sponges. In fact  
the only thing I could imagine  
this specimen to be, was a sponge  
showing the external surface.

Dr. Haquain mentioned that he  
was preparing a model of  
*Palaeospongia* which I have  
not seen. but if the paper has  
been published I have not seen  
it. He states the specimen occurs  
in one position namely showing  
the external surface, but in  
one head a part of body I gave  
him rather a fragmentary thing

He stated the dorsal surface  
was shown. I think he draws  
his conclusions from the positions  
of the dorsal and lateral spines.  
The specimen in your possession  
possesses a fairly good body  
& spines seem to me to indicate  
the dorsal surface, from the  
position of the lateral spines,  
and the peculiar form of  
head. I scarcely think the  
Marifotomus region of Halacampidites  
is yet fully made out.

Mr. example likewise to which  
it is compared apparently  
shows the head in three divisions  
while in Halacampidites there  
are but two. I have at times



thought the anterior portion of the  
with the latter "civis sc" may only  
be the worn portion of a  
third anterior portion of the head.

Again the Shields (with cranial plates),  
do not occur in the lamproys  
while the osseous teeth of the latter  
are absent in the former. In  
some specimens the anterior  
appendages seem much larger than  
those of civis, and may be  
harder parts preserved.

Have pleasure in sending by  
this post copy of paper you  
mention; the key of shape for 189  
seemed to know but little of the  
subject and, presently restored  
robustum though correct in the  
proof to robustus.

Wishing you find your health  
improved with best wishes

La. de. Dawson MS

Yours very truly  
James Reid