

September 15th, 1920.

My dear Dr. Schlechter:

Your letter of July 3d reached me in good season, but as I was away on my summer vacation I could not give it the attention it deserved and so postponed an answer until this day. The manuscript of *Grobya* came through all right and I have examined it as a type of the treatment we are to adopt throughout our joint work. I think the simplicity of the arrangement will make our task quite easy and enable us to publish a goodly number of species once we begin to get into our stride. If you will let me know what you think will be the best plan so far as actual publication is concerned I will go ahead with the details. Perhaps one of our large presses would handle the work if a guarantee were to be given that no loss should be suffered.

I have in mind for my first contribution the following: *Isotria* (if that is a valid monotypic genus), *Arethusa* and allied genera (the *Bletillinae*), *Spiranthes* and *Goodyera*. I find that I have a pretty good beginning for *Goodyera* as Eaton and I work on the group before his death. This summer I have been studying *Spiranthes* in the field and I have given the species very careful attention. I found the other day near my house a well marked *cernua-gracilis* hybrid. Just at present I am getting together material for a seventh volume of my *Orchidaceae* and I intend to illustrate and describe our native species of exceptional interest. This summer I studied carefully *Pogonia trianthophora*. I have a colored sketch of the plant that Mrs. Ames made many years ago for a book that never was published. I am sending you one of a few proofs that were taken from the sketch. This will be welcome to you for your herbarium. I am also sending you a flower in formalin-alcohol so that you may examine the parts in perfect condition. You will notice that the pollinia are very much like those of *Arethusa* and not at all like the pollinia of the other *Pogonias*. The rigid attachment of the anther is very different from other *Pogonias*. The pollen itself is reticulated, faintly, a characteristic that I have not noted in other *Pogonias*. *Pogonia ophioglossoides* does not have pollen tetrads at anthesis as do the other species referred to the genus. This peculiarity it seems to me would warrant a still more rigid segregation of species than has heretofore been attempted. It would seem that *P. divaricata*, if excluded from association with *P. verticillata*, would become a distinct, monotypic genus. The reason for removing it from the *P. ophioglossoides* category would be based on its having perfect tetrads of pollen. Aside from the unjointed leaves of *P. trianthophora* how do you keep the species out of the *Bletillinae*? That is, how do you keep *P. trianthophora* out of the *Bletillinae*? After your examination of the material I am sending to you to-day please let me have your opinion of my observations.

S. Schlechter

conclusions.

At the Gray Herbarium they have received several centuries of your New Guinea orchids. If these are for sale I wish you would reserve a series for me as I am better able to purchase your sets than to obtain them by exchange.

I have just received from the Berlin Museum 225 duplicates of orchids that are of great interest to me. I will write to Dr. Diels at once and thank him for his kindness in bearing me in mind at a time when so many important matters must be uppermost in his mind.

It will be well, I think, if we are to follow your arrangement of genus-groups for you to send me a revised list of your scheme presented in Orchideen. As I remember the situation you have already added a new group and undoubtedly you have made other changes that have not yet come to my attention. Get this off to me at your earliest convenience as it is very important that we agree on the order of genera and their grouping before we begin to publish at any rate of speed.

Your reprints continue to arrive. Please accept my best thanks for these. Did you remember to obtain for me reprints of the new Philippine species published by Dr. Kraenzlin? You sent me a list of a number of species some time ago.

Did I send you a specimen of the Florida *Oncidium* that I referred to *O. sphacelatum*. I believe I did send you a specimen as I wanted your opinion regarding it. I am pretty sure that it is not *O. sphacelatum*. I think you will find the specimens in your herbarium. If I can find better flowers than went to you I will enclose them in this letter.

I have thrown this letter together with great haste so please pardon slips included and the important omissions that you discover.

With best wishes,

Robert Ames

NEW YORK OFFICE
THE ENGINEERING FOUNDATION
33 WEST THIRTY-NINTH STREET

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

ACTING AS THE
DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND RESEARCH
OF THE

WASHINGTON OFFICE
MUNSEY BUILDING

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

BOTANICAL RAW PRODUCTS COMMITTEE

BUSSEY INSTITUTION, FOREST HILLS, BOSTON, MASS.



Ames, Oakes. 1920. "Ames, Oakes Sept. 15, 1920 [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/281210>

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>.