

My very thorough & patient the
series being, I suppose
ranges and belong to
much genera; so you
may imagine how much
interest I felt in taking
on your note on this
my subject. -

Your list of the trees made
by months rather useless
to know what proportions
had sexes in some degree
separated; - on which subject

9

Down Bromley Kent
May 4th

My dear D. Gray

I must thank you for your
new part of Statistics: if
feeling the most lively
interest in reading it can
make me worthy of receiving
it, assuredly I am worthy.

I will not trouble you by
specifying the many points
which have particularly
struck me; but the
note at p. 387 I must
allude to, as I want to

ask a question which I think
it cannot take 5 minutes to
answer, namely to how many
genera do 49 species belong:
as there are ^{many} six cases there
cannot be more than 44: I
tried to go through list, but
I do not feel sure in
separating the 3^d head from 1st
& 2^d. Heed - I want to
know to see more clearly
in proportion to ^{the} ^{Flora} ^{area}
how large the proportion of
monotypic genera are in

the disjoined species. This
subject interests me very much:
I began to try to work
out this point in all the
cases of much disjoined
species which I met with;
but I failed for want of
knowledge: I tried also to
make out whether the
disjoined ^{species} would not ~~generally~~ ^{or always}
belong to the same families,
again I failed, ^{for want of knowledge,} though
the cases in which I could
find ^{out} something, confirmed

to be, I think, the far
west in some latitude,
& not the standard of
the individual country.

Though why I sh^d. trouble
you with an old
exploded notion of
mine, I know not.

With my sincere thanks
to good wishes.

Believe me

Yours most sincerely

(Ch. Darwin)

See add sheet

May 9

I wrote you a ridiculously
long letter some weeks
ago.

I am so glad that you
are going to attack
your introduced plants
in the next number:

I may mention that two
or three years ago I
compared the populations of
the British introduced
species to the native

Flora & it was in several
cases indicating close:
I then took your first
Edition & led to same,
but the proportions here
were very different; but
I think the point

is to be just with
looking to, for chance of some
~~not~~ ~~for~~ result.

I have just looked at my
1st useful notes, & I
see I made out in your
March 20 6 introduced

Plants & of them Composite
(as I thought)
from $\frac{1}{8}$ & 10 to 80
indigenous composite. -

In Britain for the various Cybele		
	<u>Introduced</u>	<u>Indigenous</u>
Composite	$\frac{1}{10}$	$\frac{1}{9}$
Umbelliferae	$\frac{1}{22}$	$\frac{1}{23}$
Labiatae	$\frac{1}{28}$	$\frac{1}{30}$
Leguminosae	$\frac{1}{20}$	$\frac{1}{18}$

I happened to turn the
then results first, &
was inclined to think
something of them; but I
suppose all, chance &
errors.

The standard proportions ought



Darwin, Charles. 1857. "Darwin, Charles May 9, 1857." *Charles Darwin letters to Asa Gray*

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

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/254289>

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>.