



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.

STATIONS.
OAKLEY 1 MILE.
BASINGSTOKE 4 1/2 MILES.

Jan'y. 21. 1910

EAST OAKLEY HOUSE,
OAKLEY, HANTS.
TELEGRAMS, OAKLEY STATION.

Dear Prof. Henslow,
Your letter interests
me exceedingly. It
is a big question
and I don't consider
it has ever been settled
or even properly
tackled, for everyone's
view seems one-
sided. I should
like to see the
whole morphology
of the cone re-investi-
-gated, from all the

points of view -
anatomical, developmental, teratological, & comparative.
Your idea of a
comparison between
the Conifers and
the Sphenophylls,
as regard the
Cone question, is
a very good one, and
warrants working out.
It was discussed
by F. W. Oliver

in a course of lectures
he gave on Gymnosperms
in 1906. He also
brought in the
Cordaiteae, as the
immediate forerunners
of the Conifers.
According to my notes
Oliver compared the
Sphenophyllene with
the Cordaiteae, the
bract and sporangiothecium
of the former being
paralleled by the bract
and ovule of the latter.
He said that the
Sphenophylls might

effort a clue to the
interpretation of Cordaites
and Coniferae. Certain

character of the
common ancestral
Group, possibly represented
by the Sphenophylls,
may have been
retained all through
the course of evolution
as far as the Cordaites
and Coniferae. Other
views will probably
~~be~~ expressed in
one or other of the
forthcoming books
I certainly think
the idea that, in

STATIONS:
OAKLEY 1 MILE.
BASINGSTOKE 4 1/2 MILES.

EAST OAKLEY HOUSE,
OAKLEY, HANTS.
TELEGRAMS, OAKLEY STATION.

Conifer of the Abietineae,
type, the bract and
ovuliferous scale may
be the dorsal &
ventral lobes of the
same fertile leaf, is
worth considering.
I have never felt at
all satisfied with the
axillary shoot theory,
while the ~~the~~ view
of Jackson & others
that the ovuliferous scale
is a mere "protuberance"

SEASON 1914-1915
STATION 10000
RECORD 10000-10000-10000
Seems an evasion
of the difficulty.
There is an interesting
paper by Chrysler
in the new (January)
number of the

"Annals" on the
fertile spike of
Sphinglossaceae.

His evidence seems
to show pretty
conclusively that
the fertile spike

corresponds to a hair
of fused pinnae,
which, in fusing, have
taken up a ventral
position. This
may also have
analogies with the
strobilophylls on
the one side and
the Annifers on the
other.

You may not know
Worsdell's paper on
"The structure of the
female 'flower' in

Coniferae - an Historical
Study 'Ann. Bot. vol. XIV, 1900
and "Observations on the
Vascular System of the
Female "Flowers" of Conifer-
ifera. vol. XIII, 1899

His facts are valuable
though I don't at all
agree with his theorizing

Abies Douglasii is
certainly a beautiful
example of the 2 scales
- I made out the
vascular system very
plainly.

Yours sincerely
D. H. Scott.