



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.

ansd.
9.8.23

British Association for the Advancement of Science.

(OFFICE: BURLINGTON HOUSE, LONDON, W.1. TEL.: GERRARD 72131)

From Recorder, Sir John H. (Anthonys?)

Finchley,
Chase Court Gardens, Enfield
M'x
Aug. 1923

Dear Sir David Prain

I am writing to you at the suggestion of Sir John Russell of Rothamstead in reference to the discussion on the subject of Domesticated Plants & Animals which is to be held in Section H. at Liverpool. The discussion will be opened by Mr. Percy S. Newberry, a copy of whose introductory statement is enclosed. Would it be possible for you to take part in the discussion? Mr. Newberry who is our President, is particularly anxious that the question of domestication has should receive adequate attention. As you probably know he himself is particularly interested in this question in relation to Egypt.

The date of the discussion is not finally fixed but it will be either Monday 17th or Tuesday 18th September at 2 p.m.

I should be glad if you could let me know whether you would care to take part in the discussion at your earliest convenience.

Yours very truly
S. H. Dallwitz, Recorder

The BRITISH ASSOCIATION meets annually, for one week or longer, with a view to the promotion of general interest in science and its applications, and for the purpose of conference among its members, or, in exceptional cases, to receive communications from others. Admission to the sessions being by Members' Ticket, it is hoped that readers of papers who propose to take any further part in the proceedings will join the Association if they have not previously done so. Membership involves neither special qualification nor proposal. The terms for new Annual Membership are: for the Meeting and the Annual Report, £1 10s.; for the Meeting only (or the Report only), £1; for duly qualified Students, 10s.; Life composition, £15.

Full particulars may be obtained from the Secretary of the Association.

BRITISH ASSOCIATION
 Section H Liverpool, 1923.
 Discussion on the Origin of Domesticated Plants
 and Animals.

Abstract of Introductory Communication
 by P.E. Newberry, M.A., O.R.E.

During the past twenty years many important discoveries have been made relating to the early history of cultivated plants and domesticated animals, but botanists and zoologists have paid little attention to these subjects. Anthropologists need their help and cooperation. That the cultivation of a plant began in the country where that plant was found growing wild is obvious, yet how little is really known about the native habitats of many of our common cultivated plants. There for example was the original home of flax, or of the date-palm, or of the vine? A subject of great interest to the anthropologist would be the study of weeds. Schweinfurth, when in Central Africa, noticed the preponderating Indian origin of the common weeds of the wide stretch of country between Pondy and the Dyoor, and he pointed out that a better acquaintance with the geographical facts connected with them would probably be as trustworthy an indication of the various migrations of an uncivilized people who have no history, as either their dialect or their physical development. Cornfield weeds are most important evidence for the original home of wheat and barley. There are many questions relating to domesticated animals that have as yet received no satisfactory answer. From whence came the domesticated sheep and goat? From whence the ass, the horse, and the camel? Notwithstanding the work of Rolleston and others we know hardly anything about the origin of the domesticated breeds of swine. And where was the ox first brought under domestication? These are some of the many questions that can only be answered satisfactorily by botanists and zoologists working in cooperation with anthropologists: the answers to them must necessarily throw considerable light on the early migrations of man.

Ans'd 8.23
30.

from Fallaize

"Vinchalez",
Chase Court Gardens,
Windmill Hill,
Enfield,
Middlesex.

August 16th 1923.

Dear Sir David Prain,

I am much obliged by your interesting letter of the 9th, but extremely sorry to hear that you will not be able to put your views before Section H. in the discussion at Liverpool.

I have not the least doubt that the botanist could be of the greatest assistance to anthropologists. I have a case in mind at the moment. In a recent book, "The Children of the Sun", the author, W.J. Perry, argues that the bread fruit and the coconut palm were introduced into Polynesia by man and artificially propagated there by man on the ground that the former had become seedless under cultivation in its original habitat (Malay Peninsula, etc.) while the latter had its original habitat in America, and as it does not spread spontaneously, its extension through Polynesia etc. must be artificial. Would you consider

this a correct interpretation of the evidence?

I should be glad if you would open or take part
in a discussion on this ^{in general} subject at the Royal Anthropological
Institute in the autumn. If, with your assistance, we
could draw up a list of points upon which information is
desired, this could be circulated among our Local Corres-
pondents in various parts of the world, and should produce
some evidence of value. If you think favourably of the
idea I should be glad to come to see you after the British
Association meeting is over, to discuss details.

Yours very truly,

Digitized by Hunt Institute for Botanical Documentation

F.S. I enclose a paper which appeared in August Man,
which it may interest you to see. Norton is, however,
primarily interested in linguistics.

Sir Davis Prain, F.R.S.

Vüichedig
Cham (not Sweden)
Enfield, N.Y.
4. 9. 23.

Dear Dr. David Davis.

Many thanks for your interesting letter
August 20th and for the information about the
breadfruit and the coco-nut. I have ~~some~~^a papers
about plants used in dyeing in Assam. This is not
yet published, but will probably appear in the November
number of Nature. I send you an uncorrected proof. I think
very interested you.

I shall be very pleased to see you
when the British Association meeting is on. I
will let you know which Saturday or Sunday
it will be as soon as I get back.

Yours very truly
E. H. Silliman