355 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, Mass.

January 5th, 1923.

My dear Mr. Powell:

Your letter of the 22d. December, 1922. has just come. I have already replied to your letter of the 25th.

I wrote to you on December 31st, relative to Nidema. This is a segregate from Epidendrum. I am not prepared to accept it at present. When I can see my way clear to a rational breaking up of Epidendrum I may change my mind. I say this after having worked hard for over a year to find reliable characters for segregation. I really think Epidendrum is too large for comfort, but I do not approve of the procrustean method that some systematists adopt. If a genus exceeds the limits they impose, they reduce it; they allow other genera to grow until their fancy impels them to split them up.

<u>Osmoglossum Schltr</u>. This genus was given as a subgenus under Odontoglossum in ORCHIS 10(1916)164 and included two species: <u>Odont-oglossum pulchellum</u> Batem. and <u>O. Egertoni</u> Lindl. It seems to me that Schlechter has an certain amount of justification for taking <u>Odontoglossum pulchellum</u> and its allies out of Odontoglossum, but I have not followed the matter to satisfactory conclusions. I find that Schlechter leans toward small genera, but that in making them he does not always go deep into surrounding affinities. <u>Osmoglossum</u> <u>acuminatum</u> has not yet been published. I think these remarks answer your question.

Schedulae Orchidianae no. 2. is expected from the printer tomorrow. You will be pleased to get this number as it has many new species from Central America in it.

Yours faithfully,

OVER

P.S. It may be well to delay your letter to Schlechter for a while. I am not sure just how he will react to it. Perhaps it will appeal to him as the most natural thing in the world under the circumstances. and I may do him a grave injustice in thinking anything else. Yet, from little bits of evidence, I am not sure that he will be at all pleased to find a valuable source of material suddenly removed from his grasp. If he resents my entrance into his field he may cease to have tracings made for me of his Costa Rican types that he is now about to publish. From his last letter I gleaned that these were soon to be published. I wrote to him the other day asking him to have tracings made at once. It would be quite too bad to have anything happen that would check the income of needed records. Of course I may be anxious for no cause. But, I am sure that you will agree with me that the bestpolicy is to delay any news that might interrupt work that is of great importance from the point of view of the Central American Orchid Flora. From the evidence it would seem that Schlechter takes a very broad minded view of my work and is most anxious to help me in every way. In fact his friendliness is most astonishing. Perhaps it is a mistake to go into this matter al all. In any event, please regard this writing as confidential.

一世にない いで、学家の日

0.A.



Ames, Oakes. 1923. "Ames, Oakes Jan. 5, 1923 [to C.W. Powell] [2nd item]." *Oakes Ames Orchid Herbarium correspondence files*

View This Item Online: <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/item/262809</u> Permalink: <u>https://www.biodiversitylibrary.org/partpdf/281116</u>

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.