



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.

Wrote
W. C. C. C.
Oxford
TELEPHONE: OXFORD 3322.

SCHOOL OF RURAL ECONOMY.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

A. N. 32.

Dear Professor James

I enclose some recent reprints with many thanks for the help you have given me.

You will be surprised to hear that the Botanical Department of this School is no more! Now agriculture is to be taught with out proper instruction in Botany, I don't know; but the Department of Agriculture having come under Ministerial & University lime-light recently (owing to one of its staff practising forgery & embezzlement to a vast extent), the Institute for Botanical Education. I have decided to do so by "sweeping" all its botany staff & concentrating on the more economic & historical aspects of Agriculture.

So Miss Dickson & I are going over to the Imperial Forestry Institute as (for the moment; at any rate) unpaid workers in the systematic anatomy of plants - precisely what we want to do of course! And we hope that in due course stipends for both of us may be forthcoming. In the meantime, however, we have various papers for publication, especially "Some Stages in the evolution of Rhoadalean Gymnoecia" (Miss Dickson's own work); & her thesis on *Glaucom flavum* & the

generally
Papaveroidae will be ready by the end of this
year, or the beginning of next. Our difficulty
is this. The "Annals" & the "New Phytologist" are
over loaded by Mrs Saunders & Mrs. Arber, & are
not anxious to take any other people's work on
the subject of Floral Anatomy; The Linnean
Society has masses of Floral Anatomy work
sent in, & rejected - for the simple reason I
suppose, that Mrs Saunders, having constituted
herself the "authority" on such work, is intolerant
of others; & anything which does not fit in with
her ideas has no chance at all; So I have
been advised to send Mrs. Arber's work
there. Our first study - the history of
Pelargonium - we published ourselves, at our
own expense, because we did not wish to wait
for the paper to appear, & also because we wanted
to have our diagrams published in a clear,
readable series - not telescoped & muddled as
for example Mrs. Arber's sometimes are in the
"New Phytologist"; & we were rather afraid that
they would be "fitted into" one another if we
left them to an editor. We were contemplating
publishing the "Evolution of Rhoeo adalean Synecchia"
when we got "aced"; & we cannot possibly contemplate

SCHOOL OF RURAL ECONOMY,
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

The diagrams were exhibited & explained at the recent meeting of the British Association at York, & aroused a good deal of interest; but Miss Saunders was horrified at the suggestion that

School of Rural Economy
University of Oxford

Some of the Rhoeadales like Receda, Platy Stigma &
Platy Stemon had ordinary "valve" carpels like
Rose of the Ranalis. She does not think there
is such a thing as what she calls a
"monomorphic" ^{apocarpous} Syncarpous gynoecium. Dr.
Burt Davy & Mr. Parkin are anxious that
Miss Dickson's paper should appear as soon as
possible; Dr. Burt Davy, in particular, is keen
interested, especially as we are going to work
with him in future. Do you ^{think} we might send
the paper to the American Journal of Botany,
as we have suggested Dr. ^{English} Journal?
Our ideas are at any rate, in accordance
with yours & Dr. Wilson's! And they are not
in accordance with Miss Saunders entirely, nor
with Mrs. Arber entirely, nor with Henslow
Thomas's at all!

I do hope this is not bothering you too
much; but if you think it is any use, we
will make up the paper according to the value &
requirements of the American Journal of Botany.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Helen Bancroft