

North Easton, Mass. July 10th, 1921.

My dear Dr. Schlechter:

I have practically completed a short paper on *Pogonia* and allied genera for "Rhodora". Although I am dealing chiefly with the species of New England and the range covered by Gray's Manual I find that it is necessary to base conclusions on a more extensive representation of the species. We might append to this paper under *Triphora* a joint publication to establish new combinations if you approve of such a plan. This would have to be brief, perhaps a page or two.

My investigations lead me to the conclusion that *Pogonia* proper should only include those species that have simple pollen grains, such as *Pogonia ophioglossoides*, *P. japonica*, *P. parvula* and *P. yunnanensis*. The last two species I name as possibilities. For *P. parvula* I should like to have your confirmation as to pollen characters because I have not seen any specimens. You might send me a tracing of this. *Isotria* includes two species. *Isotria affinis* is an extremely rare plant. I have only seen fresh specimens once! In such large herbaria as those at Washington and St. Louis there is no material and even the specialized herbarium of the New England Botanical Club lacks a sheet of this rare thing. I am sending you a tracing of this species to show the details of the flower. The original drawing was made from Virginian material and will be reproduced in my paper on *Pogonia*.

Cleistes, I think, should be taken up for *Pogonia divaricata* and the tropical species that are allied. It seems to me that *P. divaricata* passes clearly into the genus *Cleistes*. *Triphora* proper includes the species that have the extine of the pollen tetrads pitted or reticulated and propagates by means of very peculiar tuberous underground stems. *Psilochilus* I shall accept as a section of *Triphora* although the gynostemium and root system seem to remove it quite clearly from *Eutriphora*. *Triphora macrophylla* is the type of the section as I understand it, and agrees with *Triphora* in having reticulated pollen tetrads. It differs from *Triphora* in having a mobile anther and in its very different root system.

The following key applies to the genera as far as the United States flora is concerned and may need modification if generally applied. How much it should be modified I am not now sure as I have not yet studied all of the species that enter into the discussion, my interest just at present being in the species of the United States. Perhaps you can from your studies break down the characters assigned when the entire alliance is arranged.

Pollinia composed of simple pollen grains-----Pogonia.

Pollinia composed of tetrads

Pollen reticulated-----Triphora

(Vegetative reproduction by tubers Eutriphora)
X " " A by stems rooting at the nodes
Psilochilus)

Pollen not reticulated

Leaves whorled-----Isotria

Leaves not whorled-----Cleistes.

I consider the early breaking down of the pollen tetrads as a deep seated character in classification, Wettstein to the contrary notwithstanding and I hope that you will agree with me that it indicates a clear mark of generic distinction between *Pogonia ophioglossoides* and its allies.

I have no material of *Pogonia Waderoi*, *P. lutes*, *P. nitida*, *P. debilis* or *P. Wagereri*. I must depend on you for confirmatory notes as to the reticulated pollen holding as a generic character as far as these species are concerned in the *Pogonia* complex.

I am still of the positive opinion that *Pog. mexicana* Wats. is conspecific with *Triphora trianthophora*. My reason for this opinion is based on two specimens, or rather collections, made in the same canyon by Pringle. The type was collected in August and the flowers were well past their prime. In July of the following year Pringle gathered what I take to be a topotype. The material I have examined is surely referable to *Triphora trianthophora*. I agree that the type material of *Pogonia mexicana* has a very different aspect from the usual specimens of *T. trianthophora* one meets with in herbaria, but after you have seen a wide range of material it is quite clear that extreme habitat variation is characteristic, even in the same locality. You apparently have good reasons for a difference of opinion and I shall be delighted to learn what they are.

We have had a very trying time here in the publishing business and I do not believe that we should attempt to go to press just yet. It will be well to work along and assemble a goodly supply of manuscript; then when the proper time arrives it will be possible to bring out the different parts of our *Folia* in rapid sequence, in sufficiently rapid sequence to convince the public that we are in earnest and prepared to push our product with conscientious ardor. In the meantime, however, I must await your reaction to my last letter. You will, I am sure, agree with me that something more than insistence is necessary in the realm of joint authorship if amicable re-

lations are to be constantly assured.

I have been thinking again about the system that underlies our sequence and acceptance of genera. While I agree with you in the main and feel that your scheme is the result of searching study and prolonged observation I cannot help but believe that it would be a mistake to let this system pass as the expression of opinion of a single author in a joint and lengthy undertaking. Therefore, I suggest that we hold back this part of the work until such time as it is possible to publish it as the ripened product of our combined thought. Pending such an issue it would be well to let me know what you think of the new genera recently proposed by Britton, Small and Millspaugh.

Will you please let me have a reply to this letter as promptly as possible. While I await a reply I intend to finish my paper on *Pogonia* and to prepare the joint publication on *Triphora*.

I have just been working on a Guatemala species of *Prachystele*. My analyses indicate close affinity with *P. guyanensis*. I cannot find any characters on which to separate it. In this regard I would welcome a tracing of *P. Pappesii* from Costa Rica.

This letter has been interrupted by very exciting circumstances. On Saturday night, torrential rains came upon us and six inches of water fell in about twenty-four hours adding to an already heavy shower. As a result my big pond began to rise in an alarming fashion and I had to give most of my attention to engineering feats, one of which, the cutting of an outlet for the rising waters, resulted in a torrent that promised to wash away all restraints before I could check it. All is well again and I am finishing this long letter with a very great feeling of relief.

I wish I could see more settled conditions in the world. Sometimes I wonder if the years left to me will witness a return of that stability of affairs that we refer to now as prewar conditions!

Yours very sincerely,



Ames, Oakes. 1921. "Ames, Oakes July 10, 1921 [to R. Schlechter]." *Oakes Ames Orchid Herbarium correspondence files*

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/262889>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/281240>

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>.