



Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation
5th Floor, Hunt Library
Carnegie Mellon University
4909 Frew Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890
Telephone: 412-268-2434
Email: huntinst@andrew.cmu.edu
Web site: www.huntbotanical.org

The Hunt Institute is committed to making its collections accessible for research. We are pleased to offer this digitized item.

Usage guidelines

We have provided this low-resolution, digitized version for research purposes. To inquire about publishing any images from this item, please contact the Institute.

About the Institute

The Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation, a research division of Carnegie Mellon University, specializes in the history of botany and all aspects of plant science and serves the international scientific community through research and documentation. To this end, the Institute acquires and maintains authoritative collections of books, plant images, manuscripts, portraits and data files, and provides publications and other modes of information service. The Institute meets the reference needs of botanists, biologists, historians, conservationists, librarians, bibliographers and the public at large, especially those concerned with any aspect of the North American flora.

Hunt Institute was dedicated in 1961 as the Rachel McMasters Miller Hunt Botanical Library, an international center for bibliographical research and service in the interests of botany and horticulture, as well as a center for the study of all aspects of the history of the plant sciences. By 1971 the Library's activities had so diversified that the name was changed to Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation. Growth in collections and research projects led to the establishment of four programmatic departments: Archives, Art, Bibliography and the Library.

AL 111

52 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge

July 28

1936

Dear Mr. Holttum,

A good many years ago I had some material of Gigantochloa Scortechinii Gamble, and Oxytenanthera nigrociliata Munro from the Straits Settlements ^{F.M.S.} which proved to be very interesting because, above the fertile flowers in the spikelet there was a flowering glume with no flower in its axil, and this flowering glume actually terminated the axis. I should very much like to know whether this leaf member is entirely terminal to the axis in the earliest stages, and I wondered whether there would be any chance of your being able to send me pickled material of very young reproductive shoots of either of these ^{Gigantochloa or Oxytenanthera} bamboos (or of any other species of ^{either genus?} ~~either genus~~)? I should be extremely grateful if you were able to let me have material on which I could work out the development of the spikelet.

With apologies for troubling you in this way,

yours sincerely

Agnes Arber

Box 8. 1927
Gynerosolobus Kingii. Measure A3
then is drug Dept Kingy.

A3 $\frac{III}{(South)}$ -6

Use B2 of measur
Scotekheimii & 2

Gynerosolobus
Box 2 1925

Systematica myriophylla D1

$\frac{II}{6}$
Rothmaldel tamed leaf

B1 is very good dens.
Illustrated in Fig 6 p 458.

Alum called the one
Bambusa I

Gynerosolobus Scotekheimii A5
good dens.

C1 good dens

Box 17. 1928

Schynobolobus Hankarbaum very good. not to

Apply the method = 2 have parts in II 10
In the case of leaf is not completely covering

This case = super diff for Gynerosolobus by measur. Better
measur is a future reference.

Write Hollum of development material
+ Bot Jour Dept
July 18. 36.



Botanic Gardens, Singapore,
STRAITS SETTLEMENTS,

It is requested that the following number be quoted in the reply to this letter.

No. 460/36.

28th August,

1936.

Dear Mrs Arber,

I have received your letter of the 28th July on the subject of *Gigantochloa Scortechinii* and *Oxytenanthera nigrociliata*.

The *Gigantochloa* is a common large bamboo in many parts of the Peninsula, especially at medium elevations on the mountains, but we have no plants here, except a doubtful one that has not flowered within my memory.

I fear therefore that it is very unlikely that we could find fresh young flowers of this species in the near future. There is however a small species, *G. Kurzii*, in Singapore, and this flowers more frequently than some bamboos, so that we might obtain flowers of that if they would be of interest.

There is a clump of what I take to be *Oxytenanthera nigrociliata*^a at Government House, Singapore, and this fortunately flowers fairly often. It is now flowering but I fear the inflorescences are too far advanced to show the early stages you wish to examine. We will keep a watch on this plant, and I hope to be able to send you pickled specimens of various stages of development; but I cannot promise how soon this will be.

Thank you for the reprints you have sent.

Yours sincerely,

R. Holttum

Dr Agnes Arber,
52 Huntingdon Road,
Cambridge,
ENGLAND.

A2 113

ПОСОЛЬСТВО
СССР В ВЕЛИКОБРИТАНИИ
TELEGRAMS: SOVPOL, LONDON
TELEPHONES: BAY 3626 3629



EMBASSY OF THE UNION OF
SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
13, KENSINGTON PALACE GARDENS
LONDON, W. 8

With the compliments of
M. B. Karavaev, First Secretary of the
Embassy, and on behalf of the U.S.S.R.
Society for Cultural Relations with
Foreign Countries, in Moscow.

12th October, 1945

TELE:
OXFORD 3151 & 3152.



IMPERIAL FORESTRY INSTITUTE,
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

24th August 1928

Dr. Arber, F.L.S.,
52 Huntington Road,
Cambridge.

Dear Dr. Arber,

Thank you for the copy of your paper on the Tree habit in Angiosperms, which I have read with very great interest. If I may presume to say so, I feel that you have done good service to taxonomic botany in thus bringing together the facts of the case. You have raised a number of points which I should like to discuss, but to which I feel I cannot do justice in a letter; perhaps we may have an opportunity to talk these over some time.

For the present, then, may I confine myself to saying how much I appreciate the points you have made, and that they have cleared the air for me to a certain extent. The point about evolutionary law^g seems sound; but, (forgive the reservations, please!) is there not something more? I think so, but must try to work out more fully the idea at the back of my mind before trying to put it into words; at present it is but an undeveloped thought.

Again: with reference to your question whether the species referred to in my paper "ought in strictness to be called herbs", how do you define a herb? Asa Gray defines it as "a plant with



UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
DEPARTMENT OF BOTANY

no persistent woody stem above ground," and Daydon Jackson gives practically the same definition. This does not ^{exclude} geophytic shrub-lets! It may be desirable to exclude these, but if so we must publish and teach a new definition of the term "herb"; I do not say that I am opposed to this, but on the accepted definition my argument is, I think, quite sound. The species cited by me conform to the above definition of a herb, for their hypogeous stems are annual.

I might add that the main point of my paper is not affected by this question, as its purpose was to call attention to the suffrutescent habit (not the herbaceous habit) as an adaptation to environment.

While making these small points, I must say that I feel a strong leaning towards your view that many - perhaps most, possibly all - existing arborescent types have been derived from herbaceous types.

The other points I have in mind must await a more favourable season for joint consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

J. Burt Day

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

A 2115

THE EDITOR OF OSIRIS
HARVARD LIBRARY 185
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Nov. 27, 1950

Mrs. Agnes Arber
52 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge, England

Dear Mrs. Arber:

Thank you for undertaking to review
John Finan's "Maize in the Great Herbals".
I am sending you a review copy under
separate cover.

Sincerely yours,

Frances Siegel

Frances Siegel
Secretary to the Editor

Editor, GEORGE SARTON
 Managing Editor, I. BERNARD COHEN
 Associate Editors
 R. C. ARCHBOLD (*Mathematics*)
 LYNN THORNDIKE (*Middle Ages*)
 SOLOMON GANDZ (*Israel*)
 VICTOR F. LENZEN (*Physics*)
 JOHN F. FULTON (*XVIIIth Cent.*)
 CONWAY ZIEKLE (*Botany*)
 ASHLEY MONTAGU (*Anthropology*)
 J. B. DE C. M. SAUNDERS (*Medicine*)
 AUBREY DILLER (*Greece*)
 JAMES R. WARE (*China*)
 O. NEUGEBAUER (*Ancient Near East*)
 FRANCIS R. JOHNSON (*Renaissance*)
 I. BERNARD COHEN (*XVIIIth Cent.*)
 C. D. LEAKE (*Dentology*)
 GEORGE SARTON (*Lilam*)

ISIS

Review of the History and Philosophy of Science
Organ of the History of Science Society
 (Widener Library 185, Cambridge 38, Mass.)

November 18, 1950

Mrs. Agnes Arber
 52 Huntingdon Road
 Cambridge, England

Dear Agnes,

I have just received a very beautiful book from *Chronica Botanica* "Maize in the Great Herbals", by John J. Finan. I wish I might persuade you to review it for *ISIS*, as no one is better qualified to do so than you are. Please answer yes or no by airmail, and if it be yes, as I hope, the book will be immediately mailed to you. The maximum size for a review is 1,000 words (4 typewritten pages).

How are you and Muriel? We are deep down in the valley of despair, for Mabel is slowly dying. She is very courageous, though she knows the verdict, but weakening every day. We have day nurse to take care of her, and I am the night nurse - my last labor of love for her.

Yours sincerely,

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

GS/FS

George Sarton

I think it is an interesting idea to have restricted the herbal study (text and figures) to a single plant.

AL 116 a



CHRONICA BOTANICA CO.

Chronica Botanica House, Waltham, Massachusetts, U. S. A.

Established in 1953 in Leyden where the first world-wide census of research, in any field of science, was published in Chronica Botanica, Vol. I.

October 27, 1950

Professor G. Sarton, Editor,
Isis,
Harvard Library, Room 185,
Cambridge 38, Mass.

Dear Dr. Sarton,

We have much pleasure to send you a copy for review of a handsomely produced account of the early history of maize ("corn") which we just published:-

Finan's MAIZE in the GREAT HERBALS.

This hand bound, limited edition is being issued in cooperation with the Missouri Botanical Garden which published Finan's review, the only modern account of the early history of maize, with special reference to its introduction into Western Europe, some time ago, in its Annals.

Our special edition, which includes a foreword by Dr. Edgar Anderson, was designed by our editor, Dr. Verdoorn.

We hope that you will find it possible to review the Finan book at an early date and shall appreciate it if you will mention the price (\$3.00) and if you will list the publishers as follows:-

Waltham, Mass.: the Chronica Botanica Co.;
New York City: Stechert-Hafner, Inc.

We shall be obliged for two clippings of your review, and remain,

Yours sincerely,

Chronica Botanica Co.

Digitized by eGangotri Institute for Botanical Documentation

A2 117

ПОСОЛЬСТВО
СССР В ВЕЛИКОБРИТАНИИ
TELEGRAMS: SOVPROSOL LONDON
TELEPHONES: DAY 3628 3629



EMBASSY OF THE UNION OF
SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
13, KENSINGTON PALACE GARDENS
LONDON, W.8

23rd October, 1945.

Dear Mrs. Arber,

We acknowledge the receipt of your letter of 16th October enclosing a letter and a number of a separate copies of your papers for Prof. Tackatajan, which we shall be glad to forward to him at the first opportunity.

Yours faithfully,

Podgomaya
Secretary.

Mrs. Agnes Arber,
52 Huntingdon Road,
Cambridge.



TELEGRAMS:
"HORTENSIA SOWEST LONDON."
TELEPHONE:
VICTORIA 4333

All communications should be
addressed to "The Secretary"

Royal Horticultural Society

Vincent Square,

Westminster, S.W.1

21 March 1950

Dear Mrs Arber,

It is very nice to hear from you again. I have intended for some time to write to you about my own doings and to enquire about yours, but a number of more urgent matters and the lack of any pressing reason have made me rather lazy. If I don't write now, your enquiry will probably find itself in the queue!

As regards cacti and other succulents, the most lavishly illustrated modern books are not British, but the following will be found adequate for an amateur who has not developed into an experienced specialist:

Higgins, V. "The Study of Cacti" (Blondford Press)

2nd ed., 1946 10/6

Higgins, V. & Marade, H.T. "Cactus Growing for Beginners"

(Blondford Press) 2nd ed., 1943 3/6

Jacobson, H. "Succulent Plants and other than Cacti"

(Williams & Norgate) 2nd ed., 1948 30/-

Jacobson, H. "The Cultivation of Succulents" (Williams &

Norgate) 2nd ed., 1948 6/7

As regards "The Art of Botanical Illustration", I have yet to receive the proofs of the index, so publication before June is unlikely. Blunt wrote the book, then handed it over to me; he had dealt admirably with the major figures in the history of botanical illustration, approaching their work from the standpoint of the art critic primarily interested in technique and aesthetic effect, but a large number of lesser known people, whose work is of great interest and sometimes very important from a scientific standpoint, had not come to his notice. I therefore contributed accounts of Belleval, Sturm, Habram, Miss Page, Miss Eaton, the Sassi and Mocino drawings, Heyland and many others, and suggested so many additions, alterations and corrections, including the reprinting of Fitch's forgotten but still useful Gard. Chron. articles on botanical drawings, that I now appear on the title-page as a joint author!

My book "The Herbs of the World" should appear this April. It has been so long in the press that I now feel about it as you do about your eagerly awaited book on morphology. It is most exasperating to have new information and new opinions and to know of misprints and names which need correction, yet be unable to do anything about it.

As regards bibliographic and taxonomic work I



TELEGRAMS:
"HORTENSIA SOWEST LONDON"
TELEPHONE
VICTORIA 4333.

All communications should be
addressed to "The Secretary"

Royal Horticultural Society,

Vincent Square,

Westminster, S.W.1.

apart from writing an account of Viburnum X bodnantense
for the Botanical Magazine

have done little lately; so many people have asked me to look over manuscripts etc. that I have had no time for work of my own, not that that is much of a loss to anyone; moreover domestic conditions have not been favourable. Ruth had a miscarriage early this year and was three weeks away in hospital and when she returned home the two children were ill; consequently the house-cleaning, cooking, hospital visits, washing and all the little jobs which go to running a house and looking after two children left me no time to spare for anything else and put me completely behind with my other activities such as indexing the book on botanical illustration, preparing a lecture for the Botanical Society conference on plant distribution, etc. Now I have the renovation of my garden and the work of a new allotment to tackle. So there is no time to be loved!

You will be glad to know Ruth has now recovered from her great disappointment and her physical weakness consequent on a stay in bed.

This letter has been unduly extended by our troubles and bothers. I hope there is none on your side to be recorded, and that all has been going well with you and your daughter.

Yours sincerely
Wm T. Stearn

AE 119a

Erevan, 20th May, 1946

Dr. Agnes Arber
52 Huntington Rd.,
Cambridge, England

Dear Dr. Arber,

I'd like to express you my gratitude with getting your papers. Having always been extremely interested in the works you have published I am very much glad to have them.

In my turn I am sending you some of my papers on morphology, and I deem it my duty to send you all my further publications as well as those of my collaborators..

I'd like to know your point of view about my outlook on the correlations of ontogenesis and phylogenesis in higher plants and especially on the question of distinguishing of the "retentions" and "recapitulations" which is being conducted by me.

Yours most respectfully

A. Takht

Prof. Dr. Armen L. Takhtajan,
Director, Botanical Institute,
Academy of Sciences, Abovian street
61, Erevan Armenian S.S.R.

*Received this in Agnes
V. 12. 21. explaining to me I did not
mean his 1943 paper & 2022 but I could not
accept the term "recapitulation" in his
work is based on the concept
of non-phylogenetic*

A2119

ПОСОЛЬСТВО
СССР В ВЕЛИКОБРИТАНИИ
TELEGRAMS SOVPOSOL LONDON
TELEPHONES: BAY 3628 3629



EMBASSY OF THE UNION OF
SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS
13, KENSINGTON PALACE GARDENS
LONDON, W.8

Our ref.: 640

6th August, 1946.

Dear Sir,

We have much pleasure in sending you the enclosed letter from Professor Armen L. Takhtajan which we have just received from the U.S.S.R. Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, in Moscow.

Yours truly,

Lavelina
Secretary.

Dr. Agnes Arber,
52, Huntington Road,
Cambridge.

AE 120

СССР

ВСЕСОЮЗНОЕ ОБЩЕСТВО КУЛЬТУРНОЙ СВЯЗИ С ЗАГРАНИЦЕЙ

Москва, 56, Б. Грузинская, 17. Тел.: Д 1-11-55, Д 1-06-45, К 3-25-03. Адрес для телеграмм: Москва Культсвязь

THE U.S.S.R. SOCIETY FOR CULTURAL
RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES
Moscow, 56, Bolshaya Gruzinskaya, 17
Cable: Moscow Cultsvias

SOCIÉTÉ POUR LES RELATIONS CULTURELLES
ENTRE L'U.R.S.S. ET LES PAYS ÉTRANGERS
Moscou, 56, Bolshala Grouzinskala, 17
Adresse télégraphique: Cultsvias Moscou

SOCIEDAD DE RELACIONES CULTURALES DE LA
U.R.S.S. CON EL EXTRANJERO
Moscu, 56, Bolshala Gruzinskala, 17
Dirección telegráfica: Cultsvias Moscu

Москва, August 18 1945

Dr. Agnes Arber
52, Huntington Rd.
Cambridge, England

Dear Dr. Arber,

At the request of the Biological Department
of the Armenian Academy of Sciences we are forwarding to
you a book by Prof. Tacktajan. The Department would greatly
appreciate your opinion on it and welcome any material you
can send in exchange.

Hoping to hear from you soon.

Sincerely yours

Staur

Secretary
English Department

A2121

THE SCHOOL NATURE STUDY UNION

(Affiliated to the BRITISH ASSOCIATION and THE SOUTH-EASTERN UNION of SCIENTIFIC SOCIETIES.)

FOUNDED 1903.

OFFICIAL ORGAN—"SCHOOL NATURE STUDY."

President: Prof. E. J. SALISBURY, D.Sc., F.R.S.

Chairman of Executive Committee:

Mr. F. H. C. BUTLER, M.A., M.Sc.

Minuting Secretary:

Miss V. B. A. GREGORY,
25, Aldbourne Road, W. 12.

Excursions Secretary:

Mr. H. T. HODGSON, B.Sc.,
18, Fordhook Avenue, Ealing, W. 5.

Treasurer:

Mr. A. J. POTTS,
4, Ashridge Close, Kenton, Harrow.

Press Secretary:

Miss E. A. LEACH,
14, Deane Way, Eastcote, Ruislip.

Exhibitions Secretary:

Mr. E. H. CADY, B.Sc.,
47, Cheviot Road, West Norwood,
S.E. 27.

Editor:

Mr. R. NOEL BUCKLE, B.Sc.,
57, Falkland Road, Barnet, Herts.

College Students' Secretary:

Miss J. CAIGER-SMITH,
23, Horton St., Kensington, W. 8.

Leaflets Manager:

Mr. E. G. LARKE,
7, Stanley Avenue, Wembley.

Hon. General Secretary: Miss R. F. SHOVE, M.A., F.L.S.,
13, Burlington Avenue, Kew Gardens, Surrey.

Hon. Assistant Secretary: Dr. E. MARY GREEN, M.A.,
Telephone: Prospect 3328.

July 16th 1946

D. Agnes Asher,
52, Huntingdon Rd, Cambridge.
Dear Madam,

At the recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the School Nature Study Union I was directed to write to you to ask whether you would do us the honour of writing an article for 'School Nature Study' in the present series on the history of cultivated food plants. We have so far had an introductory article in January by Professor Sydney Manlyham, followed by articles in April & July on the potato & the maize. I am sending you a copy of the July journal to give you some knowledge of the nature of our magazine.

The next issue will be in October.

I much regret that the Union is unable to offer honoraria to the writers of the articles in our journal, but should you kindly consent to help us in this way, we hope that you would accept six copies of the journal in which your article appeared.

Yours truly
T. J. Show
(Hon. Editor)



ROYAL BOTANIC GARDENS,

KEW, SURREY.

All communications should be addressed to—
THE DIRECTOR,
quoting the following number:

1st July, 1937.

Dear Mrs. Arber,

I have now read your paper with great interest. I hope a few thoughts that it has engendered will not bore you.

The parallel between the phases through which morphological thought and those through which taxonomic thought have passed is very striking! The "Goethian" stage seems to correspond to the Linnean idea of the individuals of a species as the earthly expression of an ideal type in the mind of the creator - in somewhat the same way as Goethe regarded leaves and petals as the expression of an ideal "Blatt". Then came Darwin - and the study of resemblances and differences in both individual organs and individual plants became saturated with phylogenetic explanation. The revolt from phylogeny appears to be more widespread in morphology than in taxonomy - but both involve the realisation that the objective study of attributes and relations is a completely different process from the tracing of evolutionary history - to which the only absolutely sound guide is the fossil record.

I think taxonomists are beginning to realise that a movement away from the idea that a natural classification is necessarily a phylogenetic one is indicated if the subject is to keep pace with recent progress in biology. The trouble is that the phylogenetic ideal in taxonomy is so deeply rooted that if it is given up, no fundamental philosophic basis is left for the majority of taxonomists. Personally I think that such a basis is provided by realising that the real aim of biological classification is to form an essential step in the process of the inductive investigation of living things (see the enclosed reprint of the paper which you so kindly helped me with).

I suppose that it is not surprising that morphology and taxonomy have shown a parallel development as fundamentally they are surely very similar. They are both concerned with the classification of the attributes and relations of living things - morphology taking individual organs as its basic units, and taxonomy individual plants and animals.

Excuse these rather disjointed remarks. I hope we shall see you at Kew soon.

W. G. to Denmark in August
Yours sincerely,

Mrs. Arber,
52 Huntingdon Road,
CAMBRIDGE.

Best wishes to you both

Yours ever

John G. Bennett

Digitized by

The Orchard
 Beaulieu Rd.
 St. Leonards-on-Sea,
 S. x 11. 53.

Dear Mrs. Arthur,

Thank you for the extract from the numerous Times, the prolonged quotation of which makes it almost next to impossible to incorporate with my note in *Schubertiana*. It is astonishing that he has been so much neglected; he is one of the very few Philologists who have taken any interest in biology or shown any understanding of it. I may have read you my "Dove" article before.

I have rec'd a note on the Diversity of Animals which the C. V. P. British Birds and Shell Club would like another publisher. But I find it rather a trifling subject. A longer note on instances and nomenclature is keeping me amused, and will lead me into a *Schubertiana* which may be interesting.

I shall most interested in your note on the Mind and the Eye. My friend Woodhouse has published a fascinating little note on "Tears of the Eye" which I commend to you. We are headed to quote in *Medicine* and about the same.

We moved some time ago to the hills above St. Leonards, finding it rather a nice thing to do. I am a student in your school. You can read my note - my ~~best~~ paper is the one on the second and third.

All best wishes from us all.

Yours very sincerely

J. H. Russell

77, HIGH ROAD,
 EASTON STONE,
 BUCKS.

My dear Agnes

Nov. 11. 32

I wish you could have been present last night at the
 dinner meeting to listen to Dr. Hamshaw Thomas' lucid
 exposition of "The Old Morphology & the New".
 You will have received the abstract with the notice of the
 agenda, and no doubt you are familiar with
 most of what he said. He referred to your
 work appreciating & to your support of "Dollo's
 Law of Irreversibility". He illustrated his views
 with a number of lantern slides representing fossil
 forms, which were very interesting, whether they

did more than suggest a possible
line of descent from *Pteridosperms*
or a ^{much} closer connection. He was not
assertive in any way, but seemed anxious to
free the minds of botanists from the old 'foliar'
theories - Of course the *Rhynia* group was
depicted & described & his *Caytoniales* -
I wish that Dr. Scott could have been there, with
his wisdom & experience, but "fog prevented him"
(he had no trace of fog in London) - I remember
hearing him say after a previous paper by D.H.H. Thomas
that his theories of relations of these *Caytoniales* were
all conjecture. Unfortunately last night so
much time was wasted so that the time for
discussion was limited: letters from B. Rendle & Prof. Bennett

were read referring to the 'new theory';
then the Zoologists were asked to
speak (Prof. Macbride, & a Br. Museum
man I did not know), then Miss Saunders, who did
not seem quite to have grasped Dr. Thomas' point
of view, - & then the time being up, Dr. Thomas
was asked to reply - It is always "as
good as a play" as my mother used to say, to
hear the varied points of view - the
room was packed - It is always a privilege
to listen to a man who is so keen & so knowing
but I am too ignorant judge of the value of these
wide generalizations -
I hope that Murch is enjoying his work &

121 HIGH ROAD,
LEYTONSTONE,
LONDON
E16 5JX

is feeling to grasp it,
Comforted that you are well,
With our love to you both
Very affectionately yours
G. Hirst

THE LINNEAN SOCIETY OF LONDON

GENERAL MEETING

10 NOVEMBER 1932

The Old Morphology and the New.
By Dr. H. Hamshaw Thomas.

[ABSTRACT.]

In recent years a great gulf has arisen between the classical concepts of plant morphology and the new ideas which have been suggested by a study of the modern pteridophytes and of the older Palaeozoic floras. A century of Botanical investigation has not strengthened the foundations of the old morphology, but its modern exponents on the Continent have been led to regard much of what is termed morphology as irrelevant, and they reject all considerations of phylogeny, as well as the studies on the anatomy and cytology of plants. On the other hand the foundations of the old system have been seriously shaken.

Goethe, in a passage which has been generally overlooked, recognized the validity of some of the considerations of the new morphology, the name applied to the concepts put forward by Lignier, Bower, Tansley, and others. According to this view the body of the higher plants is derived from a thallus with forking branches bearing terminal sporangia; large leaves were derived from branch systems which may or may not have continued to bear sporangia. Thus the reproductive structures of the seed plants are to be considered as modified branches or branch systems rather than as modified foliar structures. The application of these ideas to the flowering plants may lead to considerable changes in our ideas of primitive characters. It is suggested that the flowering plants may be derived from the palaeozoic pteridosperms, and this leads to some new suggestions as to the morphology of modern floral structures. These suggestions are put forward with the object of showing that there may be new ways of interpreting floral structures, and of bringing the new morphology to the attention of botanists who are studying the flowering plants.

Leighton

Nov. 25. 82.

My dear Agnes

I looked out for you at the dinner last evening in the hope that your New Phyt. paper might have appeared, & you would be here to come & give your views on Dr. H. H. Thomas' paper. I had a little talk beforehand with Dr. Scott & told him that you were writing on the "Flora" for the N. Phyt. & so did not want to be mixed up with the present discussion. He remarked that if you were writing on the Flora from a general point of view it would probably be my good. - He had read Dr. H. H. T.'s mon., and had written out ^{most of} his comments on it. He began by saying what a warm admiration he had for Dr. Thomas' work, and how he was one of the people who really did original work & what a landmark his studies on the *Caenozooids* made. As he had studied both *Palaeozoic* & *Neozoic* Floras directly he was more entitled to form an opinion than most people. Then he began a rather close criticism, saying that when you are dealing with Pteridosperms, leaves as we understand them had already been differentiated & whatever their ancestry from branched systems may have been, leaves they were, and on them were borne the seeds.

- W. Woodell found off his faith in "the older mother" with his usual amusing vigour: he a little rambled on about Ginkgo fruits being much reduced from a more complex sporophyll: & emphasized "a stamen is not a branch, but a sporophyll; and they are homologous with petals, though not derived from them." He also remarked that a Pine's *ovuliferous* scale represented 'a reduced semiferous shoot'.

- W. Parkin? said he regarded the *Caytoniales* as having a cupular structure round their seeds rather than a true seed-vessel: - perhaps rather a question of names. S. Ransbottom read various quotations, from Darwin, Dea Gray &c. & said how glad it was not to become stereotyped in our minds. That the idea of 'unity of plan' running through plant life seemed to be a legacy from the ^{old} idea of special creation; he also said that, while he was not qualified to speak of higher plants, you can't get unity of plan in Cryptogams. He referred to the peculiar structure of the Angiosperm embryos & double fertilization, having no apparent ancestry in Gymnosperm ^{or fern} structures. Miss Benson complained (as you do) of the lax way in which D. Thomas ~~referred to~~ uses his terms, which lead to confusion. She also launched out into a description, illustrated by a

diagram (Lantern slide) of her own view of plant
 Phylogeny - It had been published ^{in the N. Amer. Bot. Soc. Trans.} long ago, ^{she said,}
 & had not had the attention it deserved, even from
 D. Scott. It was rather pathetic, & she had to leave
 directly after. The plan was so unfamiliar to me that
 I could not take it in - but I gathered that she
 considered 'leaves proper' never occurred in Conifers!

Then D. Thomas replied, very genially & modestly,
 he never pretended that "the new morphology" was
 to ~~be~~ 'discarded' or first set forth by himself (as
 I think you almost infered?) or that he thought that
 the views he had presented were at all final. But
 we know have a series of facts & observations
 picked thru during previous time, and it was only
 natural that a scientific mind should try to
 arrange them in some other - <sup>"let us try to make a picture from our data, by a well-
 arranged series of facts & observations"</sup> ^{it seemed generally}

concluded now that a leaf was originally a stem structure
 taking on photosynthetic functions -

He emphasized the embryonal ^{the embryo has to go almost to paleozoic times for its origin -} as a mystery still
 (or some such words) ^{well} I took a
 few notes, but they will only give you the
 barest notion of the discussion, but this will, I hope,
 show a little the general way the subject was
 aired. As Prof. Weiss said it was my goal for
 us to take these reviews from time to time -
 I think most people felt the subject too vast for them

able to speak concisely and clearly in their criticism, & D. Scott's written notes came out with power. Please excuse all this rigmarole!

I am delighted to hear that Muriel is so happy in her work; she has grown up to appreciate the privileges of social life among her fellows, but what a rich benefit she has had of quietly growing & expanding in your beloved company!

I had not seen the notice of Mrs. Oliver's death; I knew her only very slightly, but she always seemed very pleasant. I remember Mrs. Scott's speaking very warmly about her, though they took some time to know each other.

We have just had a dear cousin staying with us with a nurse, after an operation on her eye; the nurse is half Russian. - The account she gave of some of her Russian friends' sufferings, and almost starvation in S. Russia now, practically depending on the parcels of food she sends them, is very sad.

Edith has just carried through her share of the usual autumn sale for 'Mabys' in Chelsea Tambo. She has cleared £30, & is content, & meanwhile enjoyed meeting many friends.

With our much love to you both

James G. Lister