

I have always meant, some day,
to write out the systematic part
anew, and should be well satisfied
to bring the arrangement or sequence
of orders into conformity with
Hark. & Benth. Gen. Pl.

Suppose you edit an English
ed. of the book, leaving out and
putting in just what you like -
letting me see the proofs - and I
will help you. There are
many detailed matters I should
correct, which, the work being
stereotyped prevents me from
doing now, - and which may
not be done here for a good while.
You can count upon my co-opera-
tion, if you think it worth while
to act on the "idea."

Ever Yours truly

Asa Gray

Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

April 14, 1862.

My Dear Prof. Oliver,

Many thanks for your
interesting note and enclosures
of March 12.

I have been waiting with
interest to receive your paper
on the anther. It is now
too late to notice it in the May
no. of Billiman's Journal; but I
hope to make a few remarks on
it in the July no. At present
I can scarcely find time to read
it. I am still inclined to imag-
ine (and that is all) that the type
of the anther is best represented by
the prevalent conception, and that
that may be harmonized with your
observations, - allowing of course that
only the upper stratum of the lamina
may become polliniferous, and that
the dehiscence - evidently by the weak

point in the common view - may be all as you say.
It is not the greater frequency of intrase anthers
as readily applicable by noting the position of a cluster
relative to the petiole - it being
intrase. And lateral dehiscence is the
normal rule, whether in anthers other than adaxial,
whether intrase or extrase. Liliaceae, by the way -
it is not generally known, but the anthers extrase
inverted. While the dehiscence is lateral or slightly
intrase.

I note with all approval your remarks in p.
425, and I always understood how Bentham
took up such a notion. I do now fancy that
the position of the glands in the bracts of
Calceolaria acted like pollen to fertilize the
ovules. How marvellous!

I mistook the point of Hooker's
enquiry made for you - about
Butulacella. It is now quite
clear. You ask why I included
it along with *Crucianthus*, is -
among plants common only to
S. America & Europe? Why -
because in N. America it is met
with only eastward - does not ad-
vance westward - as you see also
in Hooker's *Table of Arctic Pl.*
also. To be sure it does
occur in Asia as far E. as Sakhalin
- and so you may agree *Platanus*
Nelly, and I dare say partly
that the communication was that way.
But I was only stating the fact, that
it "points in the opposite direction".
- You can turn the point very
well, and of course I like your
view, and would willingly accept your
explanation.

The Atlantis hypothesis, if good
for anything, must apply to an
earlier period.

About Bot. Foot Book. I
believe I once replied to your
suggestion - Mrs. Hooker, that I
should be well enough pleased to see
it coming out, if you think it would
be useful and worth the while. -



Gray, Asa. 1862. "Gray, Asa Apr. 14, 1862 [to Daniel Oliver]." *Asa Gray correspondence : letters from Asa Gray to various individuals*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/225451>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/262412>

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>.