

hearing some careful attention
opposed to this, said he did
not believe it, "for Nature
never lied" — I am just in
this predicament & repeat
to you that "Nature
never lies"; ergo, ~~therefore~~
are always right. —

In reading your paper, one
point struck me as
well worth working out,
if it could be done,
viz a comparison of the
principal force of abolition

7

John Bromley Kent⁺
Jan. 1st

My dear R. Gray

I have received the 2^d part of
your paper, & though I have
nothing particular to say, I
must send you my thanks
& hearty acknowledgments.

The whole paper strikes me as
quite exhausting to subjects,
& I quite fancy & flatter
myself I now appreciate
the character of your Flora.
What a difference in regard
to Europe your remarks in

relation to the genera makes!

I have been extremely
glad to see your conclusions
in regard to ^{species of} large genera
widely ranging: it is in
strict conformity with the
results I have worked out
in several ways. It is of
great importance to my
notions. By the way you
have paid me a great
compliment: to be simply
mentioned even in such
a paper, I consider a very

great honour. — One of your
conclusions makes me
guess, viz that the
time of connection of the
strictly alpine plants is
through Greenland: I sh^d.
extremely like to see your
reasons published in detail,
for it "riles" me (this is
a proper expression; is it
not?) dreadfully. —

Let me tell you, the hypothesis
having a theory about when
Laurians were first created, or

is very striking, & to more so,
as he made 3 classes of
Trees, Bushes, & herbaceous
plants. - (He says further
he shall work the
Jasmanian flora on
same principle.) The
Bushes hold intermediate
position between the other
two classes. - It seems to
me a curious relation in
itself, & is very much
so, if my theory &
4 phanerogams are correct. May be at
least Charles
Jr's most untrammelled
(L. Darwin)

327
in the U. States of the
320 European plants in
comparison with your
115 representative species & the
15 strongly marked varieties
= 130 species; & there
again induly with the
(4th + 5) classes of strictly Asiatic
& perhaps Japanese Conifers
species. - I should be
interested if you do not
get a very curious &
harmonious result, it
on the great principle

the nature were lies. —
Overwhelmed as you are, I
dare say you will say
that I am an odious
plague; — but here is
another suggestion! I
was led ^{one of} ~~by~~ with
speculations to include
(though it be nothing to
do with geograph. ~~statistics~~
distributions, yet it has
with your Statistics)
the Trees would have things
tending to have flowers with

Cissurus, monicum or polygamic
structure. Seeing the trees
seemed so in Persson, I
took one little British
Flora, & describing trees
from Buxton according to
London, I have found that
the result was in species,
genera & families, as I
anticipated. So I sent my
notes to Hooker to ask
him to tabulate his Indian
Flora for this end, & he
thought my result sufficiently
curious to do so; & the
accordance with Britain

May 7

J.S.

You might give me a valuable
piece of information, with-
out little trouble to yourself. - I have
been comparing, as far as I can,
Portean genera, & have left off in a
state of perplexity. By Portean genera,
I mean such as hardly two Botanists
agree in about to species, - what
to call species & what varieties.
Now what I want to know is,
whether such genera as *Salix*,
Rubus, *Rosa*, *Mentha*, *Saxifraga*,
Hieracium, *Nyctaginia*, ^{or} have equally
Portean species in the States; even if
they have only one, but more
especially if they have many.
I think you have no *Rosa*, &

I forget how it is with some
of the other genera. - The common
can w. be equally valuable
to me if you would think
over your half-dozen or
dozen worst genera which
have any European species,
& then I could find out
whether such are very
unpleasant in Europe. - I
think Hooker told me that in
Himalaya, Rubus & Salix, though
large genera, were not unpleasant
to notice at. - I think Potamo-
genon of shells are unpleasant
at all ^{geographical} times & in all places.



Darwin, Charles. 1857. "Darwin, Charles Jan. 1, 1857." *Charles Darwin letters to Asa Gray*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225921>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/254287>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Arcadia 19th Century Collections Digitization/Harvard Library

Copyright & Reuse

Copyright Status: Public domain. The Library considers that this work is no longer under copyright protection

License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>

This document was created from content at the **Biodiversity Heritage Library**, the world's largest open access digital library for biodiversity literature and archives. Visit BHL at <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org>.