Dear Mr. Davenport:

Mr. Fernald and I have been examining your manuscript with much interest. We appreciate its wise moderation and general excellence but are fully agreed that it loses most of its force from the fact that you cannot state definitely what was said relative to Mephrodium in that problematic "Bort. Med. Par. Cat." By a re-examination of Pritzel's Thesaurus I find that a catalogue of this nature was published by Marthe. It seems very likely that this was the one referred to, for it was published in 1801 and contained 140 pages. I am sorry to say we do not possess the work, but were I in your place I should wish to see the work before publication. There would be a fair chance of finding it in some of the great libraries in and about Boston or if not here at least it is very likely in the Surgeon General's Library in Washington, where the authorities are very accommodating and would probably be willing either to lend the work if they possess it or to have a copy made for you of whatever is said therein relative to Nephrodium.

Without seeing this work it will be almost impossible for you to bridge over what seems to be a serious gap in your train of logic. On your first page you say "* * makes it probable that the genus may have originated there instead of in Michaux, and if so then * * * * " This is of course a very tentative and hypothetical statement and does not seem to furnish any secure basis for the later statement "Having thus established the fact of Richard's earlier publication we may * * * * ". This weak point in your chain of evidence will certainly be apparent to Professor Underwood who will not be slow to take advantage of it.

Under these circumstances would it not be much wiser to hold your article

H

over a month or so until you can get further information and thereby strengthen your position? Surely such an important matter as the validity of a large and important genus like Nephrodium must be determined by ascertained facts rather than suppositions.

Kindly let me know whether under these circumstances you do not agree with us that your article would better be held over rather than to go to pressin its present rather vulnerable form.

Cordially yours,

M3. L. Robinson

Mr. George E. Davenport.



Robinson, Benjamin Lincoln. 1902. "Robinson, B.L. Apr 7, 1902." *George Edward Davenport correspondence* –.

View This Item Online: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/175185

Permalink: https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/326923

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

IMLS

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.