July 14, 1936

My dear Mr. Standley:

have been identified. I found nothing new, although there are several very interesting things in the lot. This morning in working up Epidendrum Vieiii Reichb. f., identified as E. fastigiatum, I found in my unpublished manual of the Genus Epidendrum in the United States and Middle America, under E. Vieiii, in synonymy, E. fastigiatum Ruiz & Pavon ex Reichb. f. non Lindl. (Lindley has two species under this name in Fol.Orch., neither of them referable to E. Vieiii), and I am wondering about the coincidence! Is it possible that the Sesse specimen is in reality one of the Ruiz & Pavon things? I have a faint recollection of reading somewhere that there was some confusion in this regard.

I understand that there are some additional specimens to come? Have you yet decided on the form of publication?

In studying the Epidendrums I find many gaps in the collection in hand. That is, all of the species described in Sesse & Mocino are not represented.

With all good wishes,

P. S. Is there any prospect of having copies made of the ordine species (if any) in the collection of at Genevor.

A



Ames, Oakes. 1936. "Ames, Oakes July 14, 1936 [to P.C. Standley]." *Oakes Ames Orchid Herbarium correspondence files*

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/262757

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/280746

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Harvard University. Anonymous Donor.

Copyright & Reuse

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

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.