

when we can have no private interest to subserve) are entitled to consideration.
These other modes suggest themselves viz.

1. To omit the Latin character. This would maintain perfectly the popular form of the work; & it presents no insuperable obstacle to the progress of naturalists. On the technical English of Botanical terminology (in its descriptive character must be written) is so closely moulded upon the Latin, & which it was derived that the French or German botanists will have little difficulty in making them out; not so much as he will necessarily meet with in the critical remarks (usually the most important to him of all) which will in any case be in English; & where he will miss the technical form of expression. Besides these characters (being brief) will be immediately translated into Latin, & appear in the yearly summaries of new genera & species, & in the posthumous works, & so be in all scientific hands. I am perfectly willing to adopt that plan, if it be thought proper. The Flora of Porto America, as a scientific work as I know of, is so written, & I have not found that its English does not present any perceptible obstacle to the incorporation of its results with the science of the year, though it doubtless would have been retained more conveniently, on the Continent, & have it in Latin.

I have no objection which denies the publication to appear more easily in Latin by being edited in Latin, at the sacrifice of its usefulness at large; as Bapt. Willd. asserts. — or —

2nd. To omit the English translation of the descriptive character; letting the detailed English description take its place, & fulfil all its ends, while it fulfils this as well: taking care that it contains also that is in the Latin; so that the English account is perfect in itself.

This is what I proposed, & have acted on, — as the simplest mode of making the plan of Mr. Davis's volume conformable to the additional requirement (that of a detailed description), — as the one into which Dr. Smith, having descriptive matters to give, had naturally & almost necessarily fallen, — & so entirely conformable to Mr. Pearce's statement of the view of the Comtee, as given in the 2nd paper

Copy of a letter from Dr. Gray to Prof. Huxley

Botanic Garden, Cambridge, June 2nd 1852

My dear Prof. Huxley,

A copy of a communication from Bapt. Willd. to the Chairman of the Lib. Com., dated April 25, 1852, having been laid before me, I gladly avail myself of your kind permission to recuse the statementrd I have to make in reply, & to place it if useful, before the Lib. Com., who kindly will take no action in the matter, until they learn what answer I have to make to the various charges against me which it contains.

I trust that my answer will be satisfactory, & that the action of the Comtee, whatever their decision, will put an end to this controversy, in which I have unexpectedly become involved.

It is just you in possession of the whole matter, I send you herewith,

1. A copy of the Agreement under which I engaged to prepare the Botany of the Exploring Expedition.

2. A copy of a letter from Bapt. Willd. to Dr. Smay, forwarded to me at Capt. W. request.

3. A copy of a letter which I addressed to Mr. Fox Pearce, Chairman of the Lib. Comtee, on the occasion of receiving the above communication.

4. A copy of a letter received from Mr. Pearce in reply to mine.

5. A letter I addressed to Mr. Pearce in acknowledgement of his above communication, expressing my satisfaction with it, & of my intention to proceed on the suggestions of the Comtee conformable to what I understood to be his views.

These will furnish you with the whole correspondence. I have proceeded diligently & faithfully as I could, with the work, & have accumulated the requisite

tools & material for the purpose. In this, in paying for a substitute to perform part of my sledge duties, & in the expense incurred in going to England, Paris, Geneva, &c. & in prosecuting the necessary researches there, I have expended all I have yet received on my contract, viz. \$3,240.

In the 16th January, 1862, viz. 3 years from the 14th Sept. 1859, I duly notified
 Mrs. Rance, having in this season, declined to correspond with Capt. Willea,
 that I was ready to begin painting, & forwarded a portion of my services free of a
 specimen.

I must here explain that those what I proposed agreed to it, when the arrangement was made at Washington, namely to begin to furnish copies to the printer at that time. I did not expect to have the MSS. completed then. But when I received the draft of agreement from Capt. Miller some weeks after, I noticed the form of statement contained in the 1st paragraph; but did not think it necessary to object formally to it; as Capt. Miller had said that time was of little consequence compared with thoroughness - as I had distinctly stated that the MSS. I understood was a good & good book, & that my accomplishing it sooner would depend upon the amount of assistance I might be able to obtain, and so I felt confident of being ready as soon as the Committee were ready to print. Nevertheless, having signed the contract as it was presented to me, I must abide by the consequences - My object is this, the non-fulfilment of terms by the opposite party, by leaving for a whole year unpaid my quarterly bill, drawn while in a foreign land, since my return -

Now, at the time I undertook this service, I implicitly understood that I was charged with fixing, in conjunction with the other botanists, engaged on some special parts, the particular details of the botanical volumes, so as to render them conformable with each other, & to the other works, so far as the difference of subjects & of mode of treatment properly admitted; I proceeded so to do, as far as was needful, by conference & correspondence before I went abroad. I had no idea that I was to stand out of my province, & interfere with other plans already settled.

Two such were communicated to me, & I had such as Capt. Wilkes has since
inclosed on in his letter to Dr. Torrey been then made known to me, I surely
should have declined to have anything to do with it - Hence my surprise
at being informed by Dr. Torrey of the difficulties he was experiencing, from
which Capt. Wilkes was commanding him to desist, on my opinion being asked, I
expressed myself indignantly on the subject in a letter to Dr. Torrey, & in lan-
guage which, though willing that my opinions should be made known, I
certainly should not have used had I supposed that my private letter to
a personal friend (who was married, as I thought) would have been laid before
a Congressional Committee -

But enough of all this. Let us come to the objection brought by
Seth Miller, in his communications to Mr. Pearce, of April 25th 1842, against
the specimens of my Poem referred to him, viz. that it is a great departure from
the Plan of publication established by the Committee, &c.

Now, with all deference, I conceive that it is not such a departure;
 & that the case is one ^{that} the Committee have not yet decided -

In Don Dana's volume on the Islands, there is first a descriptive character in Latin; then the same in English; & no detailed description of the Island (being a general monograph of the family, from all sources) not requiring the latter - 7.

But the Botany requires not only, diagnostic characters of the new & little understood species, but also detailed descriptions of each. What plan shall be adopted in this case, to meet all the requirements? I understand that proposed by Capt. Miles Breguire, 1st. the Character in Botanical Latin; 2^d. the same in Botanical English; 3^d. the detailed description, which must necessarily contain all that has been given to me before. My objections to this are already given sufficiently in my letter to Mr. Pearce, April 2^d. 1837. I cannot but think that my studies & my familiarity with botanical literature should give me opinion, & that of Dr. Torrey, some weight; & that our strong objections on a matter

graph of his letter, a copy of which (marked *sent*) is annexed. As a rule must be established for this case, as it will be no greater departure than is that suggested & attempted to be enforced by Rapt. Wilkes, is from that of Adams volume, & as it appears from your letter to command itself to you, may I not ask you to use your personal influence to have it adopted by the Com: for the Botanical portion? It cannot be said to render the work more technical or more Latin, than Rapt. Wilkes' proposed plan, there would be just the same Latin in either case.

To the objection that "the incorporation of the English descriptions with the detailed descriptions will make the work less clear & useful to the public," I do not think that it could practically have such an effect. There is to be sure a convenience in having a concise expression of the important characters before the eye. But the Botanical Latin phrase does just as well for this, as all who can possibly see the work at all, as would its Botanical English repetition. I do not believe that the person who can understand, & will have occasion to read or use, the English Botanical descriptions of such a work, who will not comprehend the Latin phrase just as well as he will its technical translation underneath it. If there be such, it must be a rare case indeed, & one to whom the trouble of examining ^{through} the whole English description to get at its most essential points will be little hardship. Better far, if you please, this possible inconvenience in the rarest possible case, than commit a repetition which I must call in metaphorical language, a swell the volume, without adding to their value, by about 500 pages of entirely superfluous printing. It is not unlikely that Rapt. Wilkes confounds the difficulty of printing Latin botanical characters with that of reading them, a different thing. Few thick & thin Bonckewidge could not be able to write Latin characters, on books but they can read them very well. Indeed Mr. B. could not have prepared his report otherwise, as, with two partial exceptions, all the words he had to consult were written either all in Latin, or with Latin characters.

I am sorry to have to dwell on these matters, over & over. Why should not the Stamist be allowed to write their History without being tied up to this one absolute formula. And when that formula has to be modified to meet the exigencies of the case, why should the particular mode of doing so be prescribed by one who does not pretend to be a Stamist or a rationalist, against the views & wishes of those who are? I cannot but think that the Edg. Board would be willing to trust those scholars to the judgments they have thought fit to employ to do the work, & who feel a responsibility to the scientific world for the manner in which they do it.

It is no disparagement to Capt. Wilkes that we do not consider him so well qualified to decide this class of questions. But there are other points in his communication to Mrs. Pearce, which are to me most unexpected & suspicious.

It is objected to pass my accounts because I have been engaged in preparing a paper for the Amthasian Institution, which, says Capt. Wilkes, "I hold to be at variance with his contract; the amount to be paid him was predicated on the express condition that his whole time was to be given to the work of preparation."

In answer to this I refer you to the copy of the contract, herewith annexed. (But) if it be said this was included in the verbal arrangement, I reply that he was far from this, when I was asked to undertake this work, I distinctly stated that the various works I was engaged with must pass with more or less rapidity, & that only a part of my college duties could be performed by proxy. Of course there is no testimony of this conversation. But let me ask if it was supposed that I was expected for 5 years (the time I should it would take) or even for 3, to abandon my other scientific undertakings, & give up my salary from Harvard College, which is larger than the gateway payments I have received from the Edg., & assume myself the additional expense of a voyage to Europe & back, & a long residence there at my own charges, & all for \$440. per annum for 5 years!

Is the remaining charge that I have failed to fulfil my contract by declining the correction & revision of Mss. & proof sheets of the other Stamist portions. I have only to say, that, as my preceding remarks will show, I took even a broader view of my duties in this respect; & have never refused to perform them;—that not a particle of Proof or proofs has ever been sent, or offered to be sent to me for revision or correction; & that my verbal request for such, made to Mrs. Drayton, on my return from Europe, which I presume was communicated to Capt. Wilkes, has not been responded to.

Nor have I shown impediments in the way of the publication, as Capt. Wilkes asserts. I have only when asked, expressed the opinion that the particular plan prescribed by Capt. Wilkes for the Stamists to follow did not meet my approbation; & have asked, as I still do, that it may not be adopted.

I trust I have now answered all the charges in Capt. Wilkes' letter to Mrs. Pearce. I have done it unofficially to yourself, as my friend. And I beg you to read over this statement, to Mrs. Pearce.

If Mrs. Pearce should think proper to send me an official copy of Capt. Wilkes' communication, I will make an official reply to it, embodying substantially what I have here said, if you approve it.

If it was my letter to Mrs. Pearce of April 2. 1851 (p. 3) of which you speak, asking too mainly written, I beg you will read over Capt. Wilkes' communication it replied to (p. 2.), & see if you do not find in it some con-

Believe me to remain, ever

Yours sincere friend,
(Signed), Wm. Gray.



Gray, Asa. 1882. "Gray, Asa [copy of letter to Joseph Henry] Jun. 2, 1882."
Charles Wilkes letters related to the United States Exploring Expedition –.

View This Item Online: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/310761>

Permalink: <https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/342531>

Holding Institution

Harvard University Botany Libraries

Sponsored by

Arcadia (Open Collections)

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>.